

REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

ADULT CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM MASTER PLAN- PHASE I

PREPARED FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2007 BOARD MEETING

NOVEMBER 13, 2007



County Executive Office
1195 Third Street, Suite 310
Napa, California 94559
(707) 253-4176
www.co.napa.ca.us

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Harold Moskowitz, District 5, Chair
Brad Wagenknecht, District 1
Mark Luce, District 2
Diane Dillon, District 3
Bill Dodd, District 4

COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Nancy Watt
County Executive Officer

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Mark Luce, County Supervisor and Co-Chair
Francisca Tisher, Presiding Judge and Co-Chair
Diane Price, Judge
Ray Guadagni, Judge
Steve Kroyer, Judge
Rodney Stone, Judge
Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney
Doug Koford, Sheriff
Rich Melton, City of Napa Police Chief
Nancy Watt, County Executive Officer
Britt Ferguson, Assistant County Executive Officer
Stephen Bouch, Court Executive Officer
Mary Butler, Chief Probation Officer
Terry Davis, Public Defender
Julie Hutchens, Director of Corrections
Randy Snowden, Director of Health and Human Services
Ron Abernethy, Chief Deputy Public Defender

COMMITTEE STAFF

Connie Moreno-Peraza, Administrator of Alcohol and Drug Programs
Jay Vanderhurst, Mental Health Director
Helene Franchi, Principal Management Analyst
Molly Rattigan, Management Analyst II
John Pearson, Consultant
Dennis Handis, Consultant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary----- 4

Section I- Introduction -----7

Section II- Corrections and Probation Profile -----10

Section III- Offender Population and Profile -----21

Section IV- Baseline Projections -----26

Section V-Program Evaluation and Potential Policy Changes -----34

Section VI- Adjusted Bed Projections -----42

Section VII- Conclusions and Recommendations-----45

Section VIII- Next Steps and Future Policy Concerns-----50

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 11, 2004, the Napa County Board of Supervisors directed staff to initiate a process develop an Adult Correctional System Master Plan to identify and address the County's jail and other adult correctional system needs over the next 20 years. The Board's direction was to embark on a well-thought out effort to assess the operation of the local criminal justice system and its impact on jail use, and to make reasoned decisions on various issues, including, but not limited to, whether additional jail beds were needed. If additional beds were needed, the key questions were: how many, for what type(s) of inmates, and were there any conditions or changes that might mitigate these findings. The Board's direction to staff was to involve all local criminal justice agencies to work toward addressing these questions, and to return to the Board with conclusions and recommendations.

A Criminal Justice Committee was formed comprised of representatives of the Board, the County Executive Office, all of the County's justice-related departments, Health & Human Services Agency, the Courts and the Napa Police Department. The Committee's work over the last three years has produced a wealth of information and many productive discussions on the state of Napa County's Adult Criminal Justice system. The work presented in this report address Phase I of the Adult Correctional System Master Planning process. The objectives accomplished include:

- An evaluation of the existing Jail and its future utility in the County's adult corrections system.
- An assessment of the "capacity" of current community adult corrections programs available in the County, which will help to define needs for expansion of existing alternatives and/or creation of additional program options as part of an inmate population management strategy.
- An assessment of alternatives for both pre-trial and post-sentenced individuals.
- An analysis of policy factors that may have influenced historical trends in offender population flow and volume.
- Project baseline and alternative forecasts on the County's future corrections population, including bed space needs, through the year 2025, based on analyses of policy and other factors that will likely determine correctional resource needs.

The activities conducted that led to this report's findings and recommendations included the use of various consultants including The Omni Group, Mark Morris and Associates, Carter Goble Lee Associates, The Carey Group, Dennis Handis and John Pearson. Members of the committee have participated in interviews, assessments, mapping exercises and numerous policy discussions.

The Committee presents the following Conclusions and Recommendations to the Board of Supervisors:

Conclusion No 1: The County currently does not utilize evidence-based practices in a comprehensive way to manage the adult offender population, nor are there many intermediate sanctions available to facilitate the use of evidence-based practices. If evidence-based practices programs are appropriately implemented, there is an opportunity to manage limited secure custody

resources more effectively, and significantly reduce offender recidivism, thus enhancing public safety.

- Recommendation No. 1-1: The County should fully commit to implementing evidence-based practices, including the creation of a Community Corrections Services Center and associated intermediate sanctions and programs.
- Recommendation No. 1-2: The County should support the Probation Department's ongoing efforts to implement evidence-based practices.
- Recommendation No. 1-3: The County should support the Health & Human Services Department's efforts to enhance the level of mental health and substance abuse services provided to the adult offender population, including working with contract service providers to ensure that those agencies have appropriate knowledge and training about programs that are effective in dealing with the offender population.
- Recommendation No. 1-4: The County should establish a quality assurance and outcome evaluation capacity that ensures that evidence-based practices are appropriately designed and implemented and having the desired effect in terms of reducing recidivism. This would likely require a Quality Assurance capability that could provide assistance to all corrections-related agencies involved in programming for the offender population.

Conclusion No. 2 A: Without implementing evidence-based practices or other policy changes, it is estimated that an additional 120 rated jail beds may be needed by 2020, with an additional 36 beds needed by as early as 2010 and 78 by 2015. If evidence-based practices are effectively implemented, the need for net additional jail beds could potentially be delayed until 2020 and even then as few as 31 additional rated beds could be needed. However, there are many questions about implementing evidence-based practices and exactly what the impact of these and other changes in policies might be. Consequently, these modified projections must be viewed skeptically. In addition, there are serious limitations in housing options in the current jail.

Conclusion No. 2B: Because the jail lacks the appropriate mix of housing types, risk classification principles are being compromised on a daily basis and the jail faces operational inefficiencies and increasing safety and security concerns. This issue must be addressed independently of whether and when net new beds need to be added and, depending on how this is addressed net additional beds may be required in the near term.

- Recommendation No. 2 -1: The County should proceed to plan for the immediate (within the next three years) reconfiguration and/or replacement of jail beds to change the mix of rated beds in the jail (and potentially add additional rated or specialized beds) so that risk can be appropriately managed and adequate services provided, while creating the capacity to smoothly and expeditiously increase the number of total rated beds by 2020 – or sooner as experience and close monitoring indicate.
- Recommendation No. 2-2: Establish a dedicated staff position that will monitor and provide feedback to management and the Criminal Justice Committee on criminal justice/corrections population data and trends to assist in the population and caseload management of the jail and probation functions.

If the recommendations made by the Criminal Justice committee are approved, staff will move immediately into Phase II to begin designing and developing a Community Corrections Service Center; designing and implementing evidence-based programs; and begin the development of detailed operational and space programming of any new and/or renovated correctional facilities to meet bedspace and program needs. This will start with the assessment of the options for creating the desired mix of beds in the short term and develop plans for the eventual expansion to meet long-term bed space needs projected in Phase I.

Key Steps to be accomplished in Phase II include:

- Determine the precise number of reconfigured or new rated beds needed in the short term and the precise number of additional specialized beds (mental health, health, holding and so forth) needed.
- Determine whether current facilities can be reconfigured, remodeled or expanded, or if it would be preferable to construct a new facility. This will include both creating a new mix of jail beds to meet the classification requirements of the inmates by replacing existing beds, providing for adequate specialized housing units, and preparing for longer term needs for net additional jail beds.
- Create a description of site requirements and objectively evaluate alternative facility locations as necessary.
- Identify the most appropriate facility standards and inmate management approaches to be considered in programming and designing facilities.
- Identify preliminary staffing requirements and operating costs for the desired facility.
- Evaluate alternative construction methods that could be utilized.
- Identify preliminary construction, operation and life-cycle cost estimates for the facility.
- Design and implement a Community Corrections Service Center and associated intermediate sanctions and programs to provide various options for supervision, control and programming for adult offenders. This program will include an evidence-based curriculum and be multi-purpose and multi-disciplinary, with participation from the Department of Corrections, Probation and Health and Human Services.
- Develop and provide for appropriate programs and services in the Probation Department designed to address the criminogenic needs of offenders. This may require the addition of staff to adjust caseloads to meet national standards.
- Develop evidence-based programs in Health and Human Services and among community providers to address substance abuse and mental health needs of offender in an effective community-based manner.
- Create a Quality Assurance and outcome evaluation capacity to ensure that evidence-based practices are appropriately designed and implemented and having the desired effect in terms of reducing recidivism.

SECTION I- INTRODUCTION

Beginning with the 2003-04 Grand Jury report and into late 2004, the Board of Supervisors became aware of concerns that the jail was occasionally exceeding its then-rated capacity of 253.¹ Because of that, and because the last major expansion of the jail occurring, in 1989, the Board felt it was timely to examine the County's jail needs. Consequently, on November 11, 2004, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to initiate a process to develop an Adult Correctional System Master Plan to identify and address the County's jail and other adult correctional system needs over the next 20 years.

In initiating this planning process, the Board recognized that the use of secure custody for pre-and post-sentenced inmates was in part driven by factors outside the County's control, like changes in population and crime rates, and in part was a result of the complex way in which the local criminal justice system polices, procedures, and practices interact. Thus, the Board's direction was to embark on a well-thought out effort to assess the operation of the local criminal justice system and its impact on jail use, and to make reasoned decisions on various issues, including, but not limited to, whether additional jail beds were needed. If additional beds were needed, the key questions were: how many, for what type(s) of inmates, and were there any conditions or changes that might mitigate these findings. The Board's direction to staff was to involve all local criminal justice agencies to work toward addressing these questions, and to return to the Board with conclusions and recommendations.

Criminal Justice Committee (CJC)

In accordance with the Board's direction, the County Executive Office convened department heads of the County criminal justice and health and human services agencies, Superior Court judges and executives and the City of Napa Police Department. This group reviewed the Board of Supervisors direction and recognized that, not only would it make sense to establish a committee to assist in developing an Adult Correctional System Master Plan, but that there was an on-going need to have a more formalized group that could work to examine all of the functions and activities of the local criminal justice system to determine what improvements could be made, including better communication and coordination among the various agencies. This group agreed to meet monthly as the Napa County Criminal Justice Committee (CJC).

Over the last three years the Criminal Justice Committee has included the following participants:

- Board of Supervisors: Supervisor Mark Luce, Co-Chair
- County Executive Office: Nancy Watt, County Executive Officer; Britt Ferguson, Assistant County Executive Officer; Helene Franchi, Principal Management Analyst and Molly Rattigan, Management Analyst II
- Department of Corrections: Directors: Dan Cunningham (2004-05); John Alexander (2005-06); John Pearson (2006-07) and Julie Hutchens (2007-)
- Probation Department: Mary Butler, Chief Probation Officer

¹ Subsequently, the rated capacity was increased to 264.

- District Attorney’s Office: Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney; Lee Philipson, Assistant District Attorney
- Public Defender’s Office: Terry Davis, Public Defender; Ron Abernethy, Chief Deputy Public Defender
- Health and Human Services: Randy Snowden, Director; Jaye Vanderhurst, Mental Health Director; Connie Moreno-Peraza, Administrator of Alcohol and Drug Programs
- Superior Court: Presiding Judge Francisca Tisher, Co-Chair and Judges Diane Price, Ray Guadagni, Steve Kroyer, and Rodney Stone; and Stephen Bouch, Court Executive Officer
- Sheriff’s Department: Gary Simpson, Sheriff (2004-2007); Doug Koford, Sheriff (2007-); Michael Loughran, Undersheriff
- City of Napa Police Department: Rich Melton, Chief of Police

The Criminal Justice Committee was further assisted by staff from the various justice departments and a number of consultants, including the Omni Group, Carter Goble Lee Associates, The Carey Group, Dennis Handis and John Pearson.

Master Plan Development – Scope of Work

The process for developing an Adult Correctional System Master Plan for the County was divided into two phases. Phase I was to focus on defining the County’s future adult correction resource needs, both residential and non-residential. The purpose of Phase I was to assess the merits of existing and potential alternatives to incarceration and to explore the potential impacts of changes in County policies, practices and programs on present and future adult correctional bed space and program needs, both for in custody facilities and in the community. The tasks to be completed in Phase I included:

- An evaluation of the existing Jail and its future utility in the County’s adult corrections system.
- An assessment of the “capacity” of current community adult corrections programs available in the County, which will help to define needs for expansion of existing alternatives and/or creation of additional program options as part of an inmate population management strategy.
- An assessment of alternatives for both pre-trial and post-sentenced individuals.
- An analysis of policy factors that may have influenced historical trends in offender population flow and volume.
- Project baseline and alternative forecasts on the County’s future corrections population, including bed space needs, through the year 2025, based on analyses of policy and other factors that will likely determine correctional resource needs.

Phase II as initially proposed was to focus on the further refinement of recommendations identified in Phase I and, specifically, the development of detailed operational and space programming of any

new and/or renovated adult correctional facilities that the County must provide to meet bed space needs projected during Phase I. The anticipated objectives of Phase II included:

- Description of site requirements and objective evaluations of alternative locations for any new facilities.
- Identification of the most appropriate facility standards and inmate management approaches to be considered in programming and designing facilities.
- Detailed operational and space program, including operational scenarios, space allocation and relationship diagrams for each proposed facility.
- Preliminary staffing requirements and operating costs for each facility as programmed.
- Preliminary construction, operation and life cycle cost estimates for each facility.

Adult Correctional System Master Plan – Phase I

Over the last two and a half years, the Criminal Justice Committee has met over 40 times and staff has provided the Board of Supervisors with a number of updates and four formal reports on the Committee's progress in developing Phase I of the Adult Correctional System Master Plan. This report summarizes the key Phase I information and findings.

The Criminal Justice Committee has now completed the Phase I work and, with this report, is providing the Board with its conclusions and recommendations. If the Board approves those conclusions and recommendations, they would form the basis for proceeding to Phase II of the Adult Correctional System Master Planning process.

SECTION II- CORRECTIONS AND PROBATION PROFILE

A. Napa County Department of Corrections

I. Preface

The Napa County Department of Corrections is responsible for the coordination of all programs and services related to the institutional punishment, care, treatment and rehabilitation of adult offenders including intake screening, diagnosis, classification and programs that deal with sentencing alternatives. The Department has a Fiscal Year 2007-2008 budget of \$10,817,827 of which \$6,228,942 is Net County Cost and the majority of revenue comes from Proposition 172 Public Safety Sales Tax dollars, State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) dollars and the Inmate Welfare Trust Fund. The Department is supported by 82.75 full time equivalent positions. This section discusses the existing Napa County Jail, documents its current physical condition, its spatial configuration and its present pattern of usage. This section will also identify the physical and functional deficiencies where they exist today and highlight the recommendations from various consultants.

II. Physical Description of the Jail

The Napa County jail shares a 5.6 acre “super-block” site in the downtown core of the City of Napa with the Napa County Administration Building, Criminal Court facility and a parking garage currently under construction. This block is bounded to the north by Third Street, to the east by Main Street, to the south by Fifth Street and to the west by Coombs Street. The Napa County Jail occupies space in two attached buildings, the Hall of Justice and the Jail Addition.

The Hall of Justice opened in 1976, housing the Auditor-Controller(basement), Sheriff (first floor and basement), District Attorney, Adult Probation, and Municipal Court (second floor). The third floor was dedicated to a 60-bed jail and support functions, which operates today similarly as it did then. The building is rectilinear in configuration and consists of one below grade level and three above grade floors with dimensions of approximately 120 feet by 150 feet. The building envelope is comprised of poured concrete foundation walls below grade and textured concrete block perimeter wall construction above grade. Interior pre-cast concrete panel walls are primarily utilized on the third floor. The basement was renovated in 1983. The Hall of Justice is currently used for the following purposes:

Table 2.1 Hall of Justice Space Usage

Space Usage	Basement Level	First Floor	Second Floor	Third Floor	Total
Jail Housing	6,880	0	0	7,835	14,715
Jail Support	0	6,150	1,250	7,465	14,865
Subtotal Jail	6,880	6,150	1,250	15,300	29,580
Probation	0	0	9,015	0	9,015
Planning	0	0	2,655	0	2,655
HHSAs	0	0	1,730	0	1,730
Storage	5,770	0	0	0	5,770
Subtotal Non-Jail	5,770	0	13,400	0	19,170
Vacant	0	9,350	0		9,350
Subtotal Vacant	0	9,350	0	0	9,350
Total	12,650	15,500	14,650	15,300	58,100

The Jail Addition opened in 1989. The building is attached to the south face of the Hall of Justice and is roughly configured as a trapezoid with a depth of 90 feet and a width of 175 feet. It entails one below grade level and three above grade levels with multiple points of internal access to the Hall of Justice. The building envelope of the Jail Addition is comprised of poured in place concrete foundation walls below grade and concrete block perimeter wall construction above grade. Interior space is defined primarily by pre-cast concrete panel walls throughout the facility. The Jail Addition is currently utilized exclusively by Corrections for the following purposes:

Table 2.2 Jail Addition Space Usage

Space Usage	Basement Level	First Floor	Second Floor	Third Floor	Total
Jail Housing	0	4,175	8,130	7,675	19,980
Jail Processing	0	3,825	0	0	3,825
Jail Support *	10,400	1,900	1,520	1,425	15,245
Total	10,400	9,900	9,650	9,100	39,050

* Food & laundry services, staff break room, maintenance shop, and storage

Inmate Housing

The housing of the inmate population within the Napa County Jail is supported by a wide variety of cell and dorm housing unit types. Within the Hall of Justice, a minimum security dormitory in the basement houses male inmate workers and those participating in the Work Furlough program. The third floor includes single cells and two small dormitories that are configured off a traditional linear corridor and two temporary holding and processing cells on the third floor.

Within the Jail Addition, inmate housing is provided in a more contemporary configuration, largely operated by means of a “direct supervision” housing and inmate management approach where Correctional Officers are in direct contact with inmates in a common day room. Facility bed types in the Jail Addition include single, double and multi occupancy cells on the second and third floors, and secure dormitories in the basement. The Napa County Jail maintains a rated capacity of 264

beds, not including beds within inmate processing areas, transfer holding bunks and non-rated beds assigned to disciplinary isolations and to medical and mental health services. Capacity rating standards are established by the State Corrections Standards Authority, a division of the California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation.

The rated capacity beds are classified as shown in the chart below.

Table 2.3 Rated Capacity by Type of Bed (Permanent Housing Only)

	Single Occupancy Beds	Double/Multi Occupancy Beds	Dormitory Beds	Total Beds	Distribution Percentage
Maximum Security	44	0	0	44	17%
Medium Security	0	114	0	114	43%
Minimum Security	0	0	106	106	40%
Total	44	114	106	264	100%

Reports from various consultants have indicated that the classification of beds available is frequently inadequate to meet the classification needs of the inmates. Because of this, the assignment of the inmate population to specific housing units and cell types is not solely based upon formal, objective classification criteria and is compromised by bed availability constraints. The majority of the housing environment within the Jail Addition is of a contemporary nature and based upon the direct supervision model. However, due to the mix of beds in the current facility, risk classification principles are compromised on a daily basis, meaning that varying risk and classification levels of offenders are often housed together, such as non-gang and gang members. This results in problems in providing a proper safe and secure custody environment as well as addressing the programming needs for varying types of inmates, and has the potential that low-risk offenders can be influenced by high-risk offenders and non-gang members by gang members. The following chart shows the number of days each housing unit was at, under or above capacity over a period of 303 days.

Table 2.4 Napa County Jail Population by Housing Area: January 1, 2007 to October 31, 2007

Housing Area	Housing Type & Inmate Classification	Rated Capacity	Under Capacity		At Capacity		Over Capacity			
			No. Days	%	No. Days	%	No. Days	%		
North Jail T1-4; single cells	Maximum/Mental Health/Ad Seg	32	276	91%	1 to 10 beds	27	9%	0	0%	N/A
North Jail T5-10; 2 dorms & single cells	Variable: Men: Small Dorm; Ad Seg; Med-Max; Overflow women	28	17	6%	1 to 3 beds	18	6%	268	88%	1 to 9 beds
So. Jail East Wing	Men: Medium Security; 2-3 beds/cell	45	94	31%	1 to 10 beds	42	14%	167	55%	1 to 10 beds
So. Jail West Wing	Men: Medium Security; 2-3 beds/cell	45	104	34%	1 to 9 beds	25	8%	174	57%	1 to 10 beds
So. Jail Center Wing	Women: Medium/Maximum; 2-3/cell	24	161	53%	1 to 9 beds	29	10%	113	37%	1 to 7 beds
So. Jail Secure Dormitory	Men: Protective Custody	36	303	100%	10 to 24 beds	0	0%	0	0%	N/A
So. Jail Secure Dormitory	Women: Minimum security: Inmate Workers & Work Furlough	6	15	5%	1-2 beds	36	12%	252	83%	1 to 2
So. Jail Minimum Security Dormitory	Men: Minimum Security: Inmate Workers & Work Furlough	48	271	89%	1 to 11 beds	32	11%	0	0%	N/A
Total Capacity		264	291	95%	2 to 49 beds	3	1%	12	4%	1 to 8 beds

Notes: 1: Total Capacity numbers do NOT include inmates in temporary housing such as medical, booking, holding cells as they are not included by the Corrections Standards Authority toward the rated capacity; 2: There were a total of 303 days used for the above calculations--two days were omitted because of missing data.

A recent facility inspection by the Corrections Standards Authority notes that the facility complies with State minimum standards with the exception of a minor variation in the required size of one safety cell and a violation due to the existence of only one sobering cell as opposed to a sobering

cell for each gender. The facility also lacks disciplinary isolation and administrative segregation beds, which creates a challenge in appropriately housing and segregating inmates holding a disciplinary infraction, as well as inmates with behavioral problems inconsistent with other housing units. The administrative segregation and protected custody inmates are often placed in general population cells. This places critical strains on the management of offenders in the jail as offenders must be locked down in their cells while each administrative segregation or protective custody offender is moved in and out of their cell for court appearances, visitors, illnesses or programming. Dormitory housing beds are currently being utilized to accommodate both in-house inmate workers and inmates assigned to off-site Work Furlough programs, compromising security objectives and limiting the availability to control contraband.

Inmate Processing

Inmate processing within the Napa County Jail encompasses booking and release functions, the movement of inmates to and from court appearances, and transportation of inmates to off-site destinations for medical treatment or for transfer to other jurisdictions including prison. These activities occur on the First Floor of the Jail Addition in space configured with direct adjacency to a secure vehicle sally port.

There are approximately 35 temporary holding spaces available in the booking area to support booking and release functions and related activities. Seven seats are located in two secure cells, eight are located in a sobering cell and approximately 20 seats are located in two semi-open holding rooms. A safety cell is also located in this area. Court movement operations are supported by an additional 60 seats in holding cells located on the basement level, second floor and third floor of the new Criminal Court facility and accessed by a secure tunnel from jail. The Department of Corrections is responsible for inmate movement to and from court, as well as supervision of inmates in the courtroom, except during trials.

A report from the Omni Group in 2004 indicates that the spatial configuration of the inmate processing is not operationally efficient. The inability to separate the flow patterns for booking versus releasing versus transportation operations results in potentially serious compromises to the security of the facility. The report also indicated that the Napa County Jail lacks appropriate holding cells for the isolation of combative and intoxicated detainees and for individuals exhibiting self-destructive behavior.

Indoor/Outdoor Recreation

Inmates in the Napa County Jail are provided indoor recreational opportunities within housing unit dayrooms and multipurpose spaces. Active outdoor recreational opportunities are made available on secure recreation decks throughout the jail. In some instances, recreation decks are accessed directly from the housing units, in other cases, inmates must be moved from the housing unit to recreation decks on the same floor of the facility. Often times the need to move inmates from a number of housing units to non-adjacent outdoor recreation decks is staff intensive and presents conflicts with optimal security objectives. The construction of the parking garage creates some potential security problems with the recreational areas that will be addressed before the garage is completed.

Building Maintenance and Storage

On-site maintenance personnel that fall under the budget of the Department of Corrections provide the majority of the on-going preventive and response-based building maintenance, including janitorial services. On an as-required basis, other maintenance and repair requirements are

addressed by County Public Work's staff and by outside vendors. Shop space in support of maintenance operations is provided on the basement level of the Jail Addition. Also on this level is the primary on-site storage space for both maintenance and operational supplies. Other storage areas of a smaller scale are distributed throughout the jail.

III. Operational Description of the Jail

Jail Staffing

The operational component of the Jail is staffed at any given time with one Correctional Sergeant, one Correctional Corporal, ten Correctional Officers and two Correctional Technicians. Shift changes occur at 6:00a.m. and 6:00p.m for those on 12-hour work schedules. On weekdays, between the hours of 8:00a.m. and 5:00p.m. the Criminal Court building is staffed with two Correctional Officers and one Correctional Technician. The administrative division of the Department of Corrections is staffed with one Director, one Assistant Director (vacant), one Correctional Lieutenant, one Correctional Sergeant, one Correctional Corporal, three Correctional Officers and the equivalent of five and a half clerical staff. Five individuals are assigned in various roles to the food and laundry functions of the jail and four individuals are assigned to the maintenance functions of the Hall of Justice and Jail Addition.

Central Control Operations

Central control functions within the Napa County Jail serve as the pivotal point for normal and emergency movement, communications, the coordination of response to incidents and the provision of remote surveillance of select interior areas throughout the jail. Central control is also responsible for remote control of access points within the building security perimeter, elevator movement and internal doors and sally ports throughout both the Hall of Justice third floor and the Jail Addition. Space supporting central control operations is located on the third floor of the Hall of Justice and is staffed by one Correctional Technician, 24 hours a day.

Medical and Mental Health Services

Medical services are provided to the inmate population by a contracted vendor at several locations within the Napa County Jail, as well as by means of off-site service providers. At the point of initial booking, arrestees are screened, classified and evaluated for future medical or mental health needs. The contracted vendor provides psychiatric services via teleconferencing primarily for medication management purposes. The Mental Health Division of Napa County's Health and Human Services Agency is responsible for other mental health services including crisis intervention. One Forensic Mental Health Counselor is responsible for providing mental health services to all inmates from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday to Friday. After hour emergency care is provided by Mental Health's crisis unit.

Inmates housed within the jail receive prescribed medication, minor treatment and triage services by medical and mental health staff at their housing unit. Further diagnostics, treatment and 24-hour monitored care is provided at a central clinic and in-patient unit located on the third floor of the Hall of Justice. Emergency medical services exceeding the capabilities of the medical staff are provided off-site at Queen of the Valley Hospital.

The Omni Report noted several deficiencies related to the medical services provided in the Napa County Jail. The majority of these deficiencies are related to the lack of adequate space for staff work activities including the examination and treatment functions, the appropriate storage of

equipment, supplies and medication and lack of properly configured and equipped medical isolation rooms to accommodate individuals suffering from contagious diseases. The spatial configuration of the clinic does not provide appropriate separation from floor-wide circulation and adjacent housing units in order to maintain patient confidentiality. Finally, there is an insufficient quantity of in-patient beds available to meet the present demand. On any given day, all six medical beds are full and several inmates are held in an overflow medical evaluation cell.

Napa State Hospital Patients

The Napa County Jail is responsible for holding inmates who are awaiting disposition for crimes allegedly committed at Napa State Hospital. Over the last few years there have been four to six Napa State Hospital patients incarcerated at any given time and often times, several more inmates that have been returned to the Napa County Jail from various state hospitals for determination of whether competency has been restored. These inmates are often housed in medical beds and can be very unpredictable and unstable. They are typically very staff-intensive requiring duplicate staffing when handling these inmates. The Mental Health Counselors spend a substantial amount of time with these inmates, limiting their ability to address the mental health needs of other inmates.

Inmate Programs

A limited number of programs are made available to the population of the Napa County Jail. Given the nature of the population in the jail, with different offenders circulating in and out on a daily basis, it is difficult to establish consistent and continual programming groups. It is also difficult to provide an adequate number of bilingual programs. The programs currently offered include:

- **Napa County Adult School-** Inmates submit a request for education services by identifying their interests. Instructors from the Napa County Adult School review these requests and provide the inmates with recommended reading that may be completed through independent study.
- **Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous-** Group meetings are held weekly in the jail.
- **Substance Abuse and Anger Management Counseling-** The Department of Corrections contracts with Alternatives 4 Better Living for the provision of weekly group meetings.
- **Parenting Classes-** Parenting classes are provided twice a week and paid for by the Inmate Welfare Trust Fund. These classes are voluntary and do not meet court ordered program criteria.
- **Small Group Religious/Bible Study Classes-**Local churches and religious groups provide Bible study classes to interested inmates several days a week at no charge.
- **Library Services-**Library materials are available to the inmate population by means of a library book cart on a weekly basis.

The Napa County Jail lacks adequate and properly located space to allow access to programming for inmates of all classification levels. The cost associated with providing these programs is funded by the Inmate Welfare Trust Fund. However, the programs available do not meet the evidence-

based practices criteria and are therefore not effective in addressing criminogenic needs and reducing recidivism. This will be further discussed in Section IV.

Commissary Services

The inmate population of the Napa County Jail is provided access to a limited range of food products and personal items, ordered on a weekly basis at the housing unit and delivered by cart. The processing of commissary orders and the storage of commissary supplies occurs at a central location on the basement level of the Jail Addition. Inmates may also purchase phone cards from the commissary. The cost associated with providing this service is funded by the Inmate Welfare Trust Fund.

Food Preparation and Dining

Daily meals are provided to the inmate population at each housing unit by means of a cart-based tray delivery operation. Meals are also provided to staff over each shift at a staff dining room located adjacent to the central kitchen on the basement level of the Jail Addition. The jail kitchen prepares approximately 850 meals per day in support of inmate and staff dining. As part of a revenue generating agreement, an additional 450 meals per day are prepared in support of the senior citizens "Meals on Wheels" program. The kitchen has the ability to produce up to 1,500 meals per day without physical expansion; however, a lack of adequate space exists with respect to dry, refrigerated and freezer storage requirements. The jail currently relies on inmate workers for food preparation and dining functions.

Laundry Services

The cleaning and storage of jail clothing and bedding items is supported by a central laundry facility operation located on the basement level of the Jail Addition. The exchange of clothing and bedding occurs at each housing unit by means of cart pick up and delivery. Laundry operations within the Napa County Jail accommodate the needs of the adult inmate population through the use of inmate workers.

Personal Property Storage

The storage of inmate personal property occurs as an adjunct to the initial booking operations within the Napa County Jail. At the conclusion of the admissions process, inmate clothing and personal property is stored on a mechanized rack system that spans the first floor and basement level of the Jail Addition. Large-sized bulk property items are stored in property bins in the booking vault.

Continuum of Sanctions

The Napa County Department of Corrections offers the following programs at present:

- **Work Furlough-** The Work Furlough program allows inmates who are able to maintain employment while in custody, the ability to leave the Jail in order to go to work. Non-working hours are spent in custody. Inmates eligible for Work Furlough are typically low-risk and either have verified, approved employment at the beginning of their sentence or have earned the privilege of participating in this program through the STEP program where they start as inmate workers, and if successful, are assisted in seeking employment. Work Furlough inmates pay one hours worth of wages per day for program participation to assist

in covering administrative fees. There are approximately 15-20 inmates in the Work Furlough Program at any on time.

- **Corrections Conservation Corp (CCC)**- This is an alternative to incarceration under Penal Code section 4024.2 for offenders sentenced to jail that the Department of Corrections deems eligible. The program operates weekly on Saturday and Sunday. This program provides supervised community services to the Napa Valley Unified School District, the California Department of Transportation and Napa County's Public Works Department. Offenders that participate in this program are usually sentenced to 10 days or less. There are approximately 30 offenders participating in this program at any given time at the cost of \$50 per day.
- **Inmate Worker Program**- Lower risk, sentenced inmates are eligible to participate in the inmate worker program by working in the kitchen, laundry facilities, as a janitor in the jail building or with Public Works. These inmates reside in the basement with Work Furlough inmates when not working. There are approximately 30 offenders participating in this program at any time.
- **Electronic Monitoring**- Electronic Monitoring is an alternative to incarceration for eligible low risk inmates either at the beginning of their sentence or toward the end of their sentence—if their custody behavior has been satisfactory. Currently, participants pay \$18 per day for the electronic monitoring service. This program has not been utilized extensively in the past two years due to one prior incident. The Department of Corrections is currently researching whether it can reduce fees and other costs and increase public safety by monitoring the program in-house instead of using a private provider.

B. Adult Probation

The Napa County Probation Department is an arm of the Court that provides protection to the community through accountability and re-socialization of offenders and restoration of victims. The Probation Department consists of both Juvenile and Adult Probation, as well as Juvenile Hall, has an annually operating budget of \$11,998,374 with a Net County Cost of \$7,707,807. Proposition 172 Public Safety Sales Tax is a significant source of revenue for the Department. The Department is supported by a total of 107.25 positions, with 70.50 full time equivalent positions assigned to the Adult and Juvenile Probation Divisions.

The Adult Probation Division is divided into a court unit and two supervision units. The court unit is responsible for completing pre-sentence reports to the Superior Court to provide information in making sentencing decisions. The court unit consists of one Supervising Probation Officer and five Probation Officers. The supervision unit provides supervision to adult offenders ordered to Probation. During that time, the offender reports to their Probation Officer to assure they are meeting the terms of their Probation. The Officer may do home visits, conduct searches, do urine screenings to detect drug and alcohol use and monitor the payment of restitution. When a Probationer is in violation of the terms of their Probation, the Probation Officer may arrest the individual and return to court for further options and sanctions. The supervision unit consists of two Supervising Probation Officers, 14 Probation Officers and two Probation Assistants.

Offender Assessment and Caseload

The Adult Supervision unit of the Probation Department has recently begun classifying caseloads in order to best meet the needs of the offender population. Caseloads might be specialized and targeted to a certain group of offenders like gang members, or might be generalized based on risk assessment. Caseload sizes are determined based on standards developed by the American Parole and Probation Association and the needs of the Department. The Department uses the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI) tool to assess the needs of the offender population.

The LS/CMI consists of a series of questions completed from a semi-structured interview with the offender. The tool identifies the following areas in the offenders' backgrounds and current situations that put them at greatest risk for reoffense: criminal history, leisure/recreation, alcohol and drug abuses, employment and education, companions, procriminal attitude or orientation, family or marital status and antisocial patterns. The tool ultimately provides a summary of risks and needs and allows the Probation Officer to make appropriate program and classification decisions that indicate what treatment the offender needs to reduce the overall risk levels. The Probation Department participated in a three day Evidence Based Practices and LS/CMI training as well as a two day Motivational Interviewing training.

On October 22, 2007, the total Adult Probation caseload was 2,105 with the offenders' classified as shown in the chart below Each caseload is staffed by one Probation Officer with the exception of Proposition 36 and the Low Risk caseloads which are staffed by one Probation Officer and one Probation Assistant.

Table 2.4 Adult Probation Caseloads

Caseload Type	# of Offenders	APPA Caseload Standard
Proposition 36	295	N/A
Medium/High Risk	141	50
Residential Treatment	135	50
Very High Risk 1	19	20
Very High Risk 2	26	20
Sex Offender (High Risk)	149	20-50
Gang/High Risk	149	20-50
Domestic Violence 1	131	50
Drug Court	48	N/A
Domestic Violence 2	140	50
Low Risk 1	140	200
Extreme Low Risk	468	No Limit
Domestic Violence 3	150	50
NSIB	20	20
Waiting Assignment	71	N/A
Total	2,105	
Average Caseload per PO	150	

Probation Programming

Similar to the Department of Corrections, the Probation Department offers very little programming in addition to the Mental Health and Alcohol and Drug services provided at Health and Human

Services to address the needs of the offender population. The following programs are currently offered:

- **Residential Treatment-** Residential Treatment is available to offenders who have been ordered by the court to participate in a residential program. Some offenders are ordered to remain incarcerated until enrolled in a treatment program while others are allowed to remain out of custody. Napa County contracts with and funds Project 90 for 21 beds as the primary provider of residential treatment services. The County also maintains a contract with Turning Points and may refer other offenders to self-pay programs dependent on need and availability.
- **Drug Court-** To be eligible for Drug Court, an offender must have specific criminal charges and meet the criteria established by the assessment team. The offender must be willing to seek the treatment provided by Health and Human Services and may be placed in jail for short periods of time based on non-compliance at the discretion of the Probation Officer. The Drug Court program typically lasts at least one year and offenders may be reassigned to a different caseload upon completion of the program.
- **Proposition 36-** Proposition 36, also known as STOP, is a diversion program in which offenders with certain charges are automatically eligible for. This is a collaborative effort with staff from both Probation and the Substance Abuse Division of Health and Human Services. The program is voluntary and offers treatment options and case management.
- **Alternatives 4 Better Living-** Alternatives 4 Better Living provides court ordered domestic violence and sex offender classes at the expense of the offender. The Probation Department certifies the completion of these programs.
- **Crossroads-** The Probation Department, Alternatives 4 Better Living and staff from the Department of Corrections participated in this five day facilitator training by the National Corrections Training Institute. Crossroads provides the curriculum and workbooks for staff to facilitate treatment classes targeting criminogenic needs.

SECTION III- OFFENDER POPULATION AND PROFILES

A. Jail Population Profile: Changes between 2005 and 2007 in Length of Stay and Bed Days

As part of their scope of work, The Carey Group was asked to look at the current population and trends within the Napa County Criminal Justice System in order to determine what policy and program changes could be implemented to reduce recidivism in Napa County. This section discusses key data for Napa County Jail inmates released from custody from January 1 through August 8, 2007 compared to the same data in a similar timeframe in 2005.

The daily jail population is driven primarily by two factors: The number of bookings and the length of stay. Multiplied together they equal the number of bed days. System processing time and length of sentence control the length of stay.

The table below recaps these two data samples in terms of the sample size, average and median length of stays.

Table 3.1 2005 and 2007 Data Sample Sizes, Average and Median Length of Stay

	January 1-September 8, 2005	January 1-August 8, 2007
Sample Size	3,344	3,530
Average Length of Stay	15.33 Days	16.17 Days
Median Length of Stay	1.0 Days	2.00 Days

Misdemeanor Versus Felony Charges

As indicated in the following table, The Carey Group found the percentage of offenders by felony and misdemeanor charges remained stable between 2005 and 2007, but that the average stay for felonies rose by approximately one day and the average stay for misdemeanors rose almost four days. Overall, the percentage of bed days used by felony offenders dropped by 5%, and those used by misdemeanors increased by almost 80%. The report recommended that the County evaluate this difference for misdemeanor inmates, as some of them may hold the best opportunity for alternatives to secure custody.

Table 3.2 2005 and 2007 Misdemeanor and Felony Jail Bed Usage

Offense Severity	Frequency by Percent		Average Length of Stay		Total Bed Days By %	
	2005 (n=3,344)	2007 (n=3,530)	2005 (n=3,344)	2007 (n=3,530)	2005 (n=3,344)	2007 (n=3,530)
Felony	41%	38%	24.51	25.65	65%	60%
Misdemeanor	56%	61%	4.97	8.44	18%	32%
Infraction	<1%	<1%	2.33	1.14	<1%	<1%
Unknown	3%	<1%	75.67	183.03	17%	8%
Total	100%	100%	15.33	16.17	100%	100%

Specific Offense Categories

The following table describes the length of stay by types of offenses. This information indicates several significant changes between 2005 and 2007. The percentage of assaults and drug offense

increased significantly, the percentage of sex offenses dropped sharply. The average length of stay increased by a significant margin for homicides, assaults, sex offenses, other non traffic misdemeanors and violations of probation. The proportion of bed days used by most of these offenses also increased with the exception of sex offenses because the frequency of sex offender bookings dropped significantly. Conversely, the average length of stay decreased for drug offenses, weapons and property offenses, other felonies, DUIs and infractions.

Table 3.3 2005 and 2007 Offense Categories

Offense Type	Frequency by Percent		Average Length of Stay		Total Bed Days By %	
	2005 (n=3,344)	2007 (n=3,530)	2005 (n=3,344)	2007 (n=3,530)	2005 (n=3,344)	2007 (n=3,530)
Homicide	<1%	<1%	23.13	383.64	<1%	7%
Assault	11%	14%	20.75	30.36	15%	26%
Sex Offense	10%	1%	8.75	41.25	6%	4%
Drug Offense	18%	25%	16.59	8.2	19%	13%
Weapons	2%	2%	36.78	21.84	5%	2%
Property Offense	10%	9%	23.42	15.5	15%	9%
Other Felony	2%	3%	59.91	22.97	9%	4%
DUI	18%	20%	8.55	5.27	10%	7%
Other Traffic Misdemeanor	10%	11%	7.71	7.88	5%	5%
Other non-traffic misdemeanor	4%	3%	3.65	15.38	1%	2%
Violation of Probation	14%	12%	15.44	20.84	14%	16%
Infraction	1%	<1%	3.71	1.14	<1%	<1%
Other	1%	<1%	10.94	234.43	<1%	6%
Total	100%	100%	15.33	16.17	100%	100%

Presentenced Versus Sentenced Inmates

Although the percentages of sentenced and presentenced offenders stayed roughly the same, the average length of stay and total bed days changed a great deal. The average length of stay for presentenced offenders increased by about three days between 2005 and 2007, raising the percentage of total bed days by 14%. The average stay of sentenced offenders dropped by about 12 days, decreasing the total percentage of bed days from 31% to 17%. This data shows that there has been a very dramatic shift in the makeup of the jail population. Typically, there are more options for dealing with sentenced inmates in terms of length of stay than for those who are presentenced—especially those who are facing very serious felony charges.

Table 3.4 2005 and 2007 Presentenced and Sentenced Inmates

Sentence Status	Frequency by Percent		Average Length of Stay		Total Bed Days By %	
	2005 (n=3,344)	2007 (n=3,530)	2005 (n=3,344)	2007 (n=3,530)	2005 (n=3,344)	2007 (n=3,530)
Presentenced	86%	87%	12.4	15.48	69%	83%
Sentenced	14%	13%	32.8	20.38	31%	17%
Total	100%	100%	15.33	16.14	100%	100%

B. Jail Population Profile: January 1, 2007 to August 8, 2007

Data on presentenced and sentenced offenses revealed that the vast majority of offenders were presentenced. Therefore, even though the average stay was about five days less than sentenced offenders, presentenced offenses used 83% of the total bed days.

Table 3.5 2007 Presentenced and Sentenced Inmates

Sentence Status	Frequency		Length of Stay		Total Bed Days	
	#	%	Average	Median	#	%
Presentenced	3,056	87%	15.48	1	47,307	83%
Sentenced	471	13%	20.38	7	9,599	17%
Total	3,527	100%	16.14	2	56,926	100%

Presentenced Inmates Released from January 1, 2007 to August 8, 2007

Presentenced inmates released during this timeframe made up 87% of the inmates and used 83% of the bed days. The following two charts detail the offense severity and offense type. Again, this shows the impact of length of stay. The Carey Group recommends evaluating the presentenced, misdemeanor population as they account for just over one-fourth of the bed days (approximately 58 average daily population during this 210 day study sample.)

Table 3.6 2007 Presentenced Offenders by Offense Severity

Offense Severity	Frequency		Average Length of Stay	Total Bed Days	
	#	%		#	%
Felony	1,243	41%	24.73	30,739	65%
Misdemeanor	1,785	58%	6.85	12,227	26%
Infraction	6	<1%	1.33	8	<1%
Unknown	22	<1%	197.18	4,338	9%
Total	3,056	100%	15.48	47,307	100%

The table below highlights four categories of serious offenses that combined account for the two-thirds (66%) of the bed days for presentenced releases. (Assault, 27%; Weapons Drug Offenses, 9%; Drug Offenses, 13%; and Violations of Probation, 17%.) The Carey Group recommends further study of violations of probation to determine if any options other than secure custody are feasible

Table 3.7 2007 Presentenced Offenders by Offense Type

Offense Type	Frequency		Average Length of Stay	Total Bed Days	
	#	%		#	%
Homicide	11	<1%	383.64	4,220	9%
Assault	428	14%	29.93	12,810	27%
Sex Offense	45	2%	40.02	1,801	4%
Drug Offense	838	27%	7.07	5,925	13%
Weapons	48	2%	17.02	817	9%
Property Offense	270	9%	15.58	4,207	9%
Other Felony	97	3%	23.03	2,234	5%
DUI	572	19%	2.84	1,624	3%
Other Traffic Misdemeanor	292	10%	4.1	1,197	3%
Other non-traffic misdemeanor	79	3%	16.06	1,269	3%
Violation of Probation	357	12%	22.31	7,965	17%
Infraction	6	<1%	1.33	8	<1%
Other	13	<1%	249.69	3,246	7%
Total	3,056	100%	15.48	47,307	100%

Sentenced Offenders Released from January 1, 2007 to August 8, 2007

Sentenced inmates made up only 13% of the releases and 17% of the bed days used during this period. Misdemeanor inmates account for the vast majority of inmates and bed days used. The following table shows this information and demonstrates the significant impact on length of stay.

Table 3.8 2007 Sentenced Offenders by Offense Severity

Offense Severity	Frequency		Average Length of Stay	Total Bed Days	
	#	%		#	%
Felony	100	21%	36.95	3,695	38%
Misdemeanor	368	78%	15.89	5,848	61%
Infraction	1	<1%	0	0	0
Unknown	2	<1%	28	56	<1%
Total	471	100%	20.38	9,599	100%

The following table shows additional detail by type of offense for the sentenced releases. Of note are five categories of offenses that combined, account for 81% of the bed days used. Three types of offenses account for about half of the bed days. These three offense types also are recommended for further review as to the feasibility of optional sentencing or programs that reduce their length of stay. These offense types are DUI (Driving Under the Influence), 22% of the bed days; Other Traffic Misdemeanors, 18% (These are likely to be mostly driving without a license), and Violation of Probation, 11%.

Table 3.9 2007 Presentenced Offenders by Offense Type

Offense Type	Frequency		Average Length of Stay	Total Bed Days	
	#	%		#	%
Homicide	0	0%	0	0	0%
Assault	51	11%	31.82	1,623	17%
Sex Offense	6	1%	50.5	303	3%
Drug Offense	40	9%	32.1	1,284	13%
Weapons	9	2%	47.46	428	4%
Property Offense	45	10%	15	675	7%
Other Felony	8	2%	22.25	178	2%
DUI	141	30%	15.13	2,133	22%
Other Traffic Misdemeanor	82	17%	21.37	1,752	18%
Other Non-traffic misdemeanor	9	2%	9.33	84	1%
Violation of Probation	78	17%	14.12	1,101	11%
Infraction	1	<1%	0	0	0
Other	1	<1%	36	36	<1
Total	471	100%	20.38	9,599	100%

SECTION IV-BASELINE PROJECTIONS

In April 2006, the Napa County Board of Supervisors retained Carter Goble Lee Associates (CGL) to assist the County in completing Phase I of the Adult Correctional Systems Master Plan by developing future caseload capacity projections for the Department of Corrections and Adult Probation. As part of the overall effort to complete Phase I, CGL analyzed county and criminal justice systems trends to develop future population and bed need projections.

County and Criminal Justice Trends

In order to create reliable projections, CGL considered current population growth, crime and arrest rates. County growth trends obtained from the US Bureau of the Census and the Association of Bay Area Governments show that between 1996 and 2005, Napa County experienced an average annual growth of 1.4% or 1,641 people. This trend was expected to slow down to an annual average growth of 0.7% between 2005 and 2025 with a total population estimate of 151,500 in 2025.

Table 4.1 Napa County Historical Population Counts

Year	Total	# Change	% Change
1996	117,996	1,299	1.1%
1997	119,808	1,812	1.5%
1998	121,583	1,775	1.5%
1999	123,026	1,443	1.2%
2000	124,636	1,610	1.3%
2001	127,741	3,105	2.5%
2002	130,015	2,274	1.8%
2003	131,799	1,784	1.4%
2004	132,394	595	0.5%
2005	132,764	370	0.3%
1996-05 Total		14,768	12.5%
Annual Growth Rate		1,641	1.4%

Table 4.2 Projected County Population

Year	Total	# Change	% Change
2010	139,700	6,936	5.2%
2015	144,800	5,100	3.7%
2020	148,100	3,300	2.3%
2025	151,100	3,000	2.0%
2005-25 Total		18,336	13.80%
Annual Growth Rate		917	0.70%

CGL analyzed data from the Uniform Crime Reporting Index between the years of 1995 and 2004. During this time, the County's population increased almost 14% while the total indexed offenses decreased nearly 6.5%. During this period, reported violent crimes decreased nearly 8% and reported property crimes decreased 7%. The reported offenses per 1,000 people decreased 17.5% from 45.4 to 37.5. CGL found these decreases to be consistent with peer counties used for analysis,

including El Dorado, Marin, Placer, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Sonoma, as well as with the statewide average.

Table 4.3 Uniform Crime Reporting Index

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	10-Year Change
Population	116,697	117,996	119,808	121,583	123,026	124,636	127,741	130,015	131,799	132,394	13.50%
Index Crime-Violent											
Murder	2	0	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	3	50.00%
Forcible Rape	24	34	30	32	28	37	26	26	39	50	108.30%
Robbery	61	71	48	62	40	46	52	49	51	58	-4.90%
Aggravated Assault	402	306	305	309	261	236	272	268	288	340	-15.40%
Violent Crime Total	489	411	385	404	331	322	351	345	380	451	-7.80%
Index Crime-Property											
Burglary	823	713	885	833	578	503	482	564	581	596	-27.80%
Larceny-Theft	3,581	4,206	3,327	3,194	2,436	2,095	2,506	2,969	3,390	3,453	-3.60%
Motor Vehicle Theft	361	269	334	258	189	204	163	347	372	436	20.80%
Arson	42	27	41	41	37	55	51	22	22	23	-45.20%
Property Crime Total	4,810	5,215	4,587	4,326	3,240	2,857	3,202	3,902	4,365	4,508	-6.30%
Index Crime Total	5,299	5,626	4,972	4,730	3,571	3,179	3,553	4,247	4,745	4,959	-6.40%
Index Crime Rate	45.4	47.7	41.5	38.9	29	25.5	27.8	32.7	36	37.5	-17.50%

Arrest data from the Uniform Crime Reporting Index was also analyzed. Between 1995 and 2004, total adult arrests within the County increased by 32.2%. Napa County's arrest per 1,000 people was compared to the selected peer counties and the State of California's overall arrest rates. Over the ten-year period, the arrest rate per 1,000 people for Napa County increased almost 17% while the peer county arrest rates per 1,000 people decreased 14% and the statewide average decreased almost 20%. During this time, Napa County went from having one of the lowest arrest rates statewide to having one of the highest reported arrest rates.

Table 4.4 Uniform Crime Reporting Index-Arrest Data

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	10-Year Change
Population	116,697	117,996	119,808	121,583	123,026	124,636	127,741	130,015	131,799	132,394	13.50%
Index Arrests-Violent											
Murder	0	0	5	4	5	2	1	4	0	1	0.00%
Forcible Rape	8	9	3	3	5	7	4	15	5	11	37.50%
Robbery	22	23	15	21	9	7	18	14	16	17	-22.70%
Aggravated Assault	281	246	272	211	225	239	283	260	297	330	17.40%
Violent Crime Total Arrests	311	278	295	239	244	255	306	293	318	359	15.40%
Burglary	72	55	81	62	85	83	78	101	83	108	50.00%
Larceny-Theft	66	43	76	76	87	81	73	74	85	114	72.70%
Motor Vehicle Theft	25	17	32	23	18	21	17	31	37	35	40.00%
Arson	0	0	2	2	1	1	3	0	1	1	0.00%
Property Crime Total Arrests	163	115	191	163	191	186	171	206	206	258	58.30%
Index Total Arrests	474	393	486	402	435	441	477	499	524	617	30.20%
Non-Index Total Arrests	3,386	3,372	3,449	3,456	3,239	3,749	3,952	4,004	4,382	4,487	32.50%
Total Arrests	3,860	3,765	3,935	3,858	3,674	4,190	4,429	4,503	4,906	5,104	32.20%

Finally, CGL analyzed the change in law enforcement staff as an increase in law enforcement staff can often times impact the population of the jail. Between 1995 and 2004, the County's sworn law enforcement staff increased from 152 officers to 183 officers, a total increase of 20.4%. The Napa County Sheriff's Department saw an increase of 35.9% or 23 officers due to the addition of the Yountville and American Canyon contracts.

Table 4.5 Sworn Personnel

Sworn Personnel	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	10-Year Change
Police Departments	88	NA	94	87	94	95	102	98	97	96	9.10%
Sheriff's Departments	64	72	74	70	78	81	83	84	86	87	35.90%
Total Sworn Officers	152	NA	168	157	172	176	185	182	183	183	20.40%

Jail Trends

A facility's Average Daily Population (ADP) is a factor of persons booked or admitted to the jail (ADM), and the Average Length of Stay (ALOS). The ADP number does not illustrate dips or increases (peaking) above the average, and therefore, does not reflect the degree to which the jail may periodically exceed or fall below the rated capacity.

ADM is a recorded number and refers to all persons booked into a facility because of immediate arrest, probation violations, in-court remands and targeted warrants. Increases in bookings do not necessarily result in a proportional increase in the ADP, as the majority of the people booked into jail are released directly from the booking area within 24 hours. The historical booking trend in Napa County has fluctuated significantly over the past eight years. The rate of growth through 2005 was about 3.4% annually or 180 bookings per year.

The ADP shows the average bed count of persons housed in the jail on a yearly basis. This number is derived from midnight count. The ADP is a recorded number, meaning it is census-based rather than estimated from a formula. According to CGL, a facility is considered operationally full when its inmate count reaches 95% of its rated operational capacity. When 95% capacity is reached, the ability to separate inmates in accordance with classification requirements is compromised. The Napa County Jail has a rated capacity of 264. Between 1996 and 2005, ADP increased 34.4% from 193 to 260, an annual rate of 3.8%. The peaking factor is the percent difference between the three-month high and the average for the entire year. The peaking factor is critical in projecting bed space needs.

ALOS is the average length of stay of all admissions for the year. Unlike ADM and ADP, ALOS is a calculated figure determined by the following formula: $ALOS = (ADP \times 365 \text{ days}) / \text{annual ADM}$. Between 1996 and 2006, the ALOS fluctuated but overall has followed an upward trend since 2000. Factors that can have a major impact on a jail's ALOS include higher versus lower bail setting policies, timely case disposition of pre-trial detainees, timely sentencing completion after a plea or conviction and the number and sentence length of persons sentenced to jail.

CGL found that between 2001 and 2005, Napa County's ADM population has primarily included misdemeanor offenders, averaging approximately 77% of the total population while felony offenders have been close to 23%. In contrast, over the same period, the selected peer counties have averaged 67% felons and 33% misdemeanants, almost directly opposite of Napa County's ratios.

Baseline Jail Bed Projections

CGL was asked to prepare baseline projections for Napa County, meaning bed need projections based on current trends in the criminal justice system without a change in current policies or practices. To project the jail's capacity needs, CGL considered three factors: 1.) future average daily population, 2.) peaking fluctuations, and 3.) classification separations. A jail's peaking factor estimates an average number of additional beds needed for the several times a year when the facility's daily population exceeds the average.

According to the CGL report, a facility's classification factor provides for the beds needed to allow the separation of inmates into different housing units based on normal security and custody separation needs. In addition, some beds must be available to allow for immediate or emergency shifting of inmates when needed due to periodic intakes of a new population with a variety of different custody needs, behavioral management problems, periodic classification changes and temporary maintenance interruptions.

A facility's future operational bed capacity space requirement is determined by adding both peaking and classification factors to the projected number of inmates for any future year. Operational capacity is the number of beds that can be used for a routine or permanent housing assignment, whereas total bed capacity also includes non-operational beds used for temporary special management placements such as administrative or disciplinary segregation, medical observation or recovery, suicide watch or mental and behavioral observation.

CGL utilized a number of alternative projection models to analyze historic jail data from 1995 through 2006. The 2006 ADP of 248 served as the base for models that used annual data points and the March 2007 ADP of 271 was the last data point for the models that used a monthly series. Each model used different independent variables for historical trends for ADP or multiple variables including county population, arrests, bookings, and length of stay. Models 1, 2 and 3 were solely based on trends extracted from the ADP time series. Models 4 and 5 correlated the ADP and County population and projected ahead based on future growth. Model 6 used correlated trends in population, arrests and ADP to project the future ADP. Model 7 projected ADP based on future bookings and length of stay projected trends. The following describes the models:

- **Model 1 ARMINA Model-** ARMINA models use a combination of auto-regressive, integration and moving average terms.
- **Model 2 Growth Curve-**A Growth Curve model fits an exponential growth curve to historic data.
- **Model 3 Historical Percentage Increases-** A Historical Percentage Increase model is derived by calculating the total percentage change from the beginning point to the end point of a historical data series and dividing the total by the number of years in the period. The result is then multiplied by the number of change points covered into the future. One change point is added to that figure and the result is multiplied by the base year.
- **Model 4 Ratio to Population Growth Model-** The Ratio to Population Growth model ties the ADP projection to the County's current incarceration rate plus the historic average annual incarceration rate of growth. The rate is multiplied by the future population projections to estimate future ADP.
- **Model 5- Multiple Regression-**This model projects future ADP population based on a regression analysis of ADP and County population and applies projected County population to the model's coefficients.
- **Model 6- Multiple Regression-**This model projects future ADP population based on a regression analysis of historical ADP, County population and arrests. The Model also uses future projected County population and arrests, thus reflecting the County's historic tendency for both arrests and the use of incarceration in relation to expected total population growth.
- **Model 7- Projected ADM and ALOS -** This model is based on the two main variables of a facility's average daily population, bookings and average length of stay. Bookings were projected using a combination of a multiple regression model and an ARIMA model.

After running these models, CGL recommended the County use Models 5, 6 and 7 in considering future planning options. These models were selected based on their reliability and consistency. The ADP projections are shown in the chart below.

Table 4.6 Baseline Average Daily Population Projections

ADP Projections	2010	2015	2020	2025
Model 5-Low	271	291	303	314
Model 6-Middle	268	306	344	383
Model 7-High	295	336	379	424

The next step in CGL’s projection process was to determine the bed requirement for the projected inmate ADP by adding peaking and classification factors. CGL utilized ADP counts to compute the average ADP over each twelve-month period from 1996 through 2006. Next, CGL computed the average of the three highest months over those twelve-month periods and the percentage difference between the average monthly high and the monthly average was the annual peaking factor. The average peaking factor of 6.7% was applied as the overall peaking factor in converting the ADP count to operational bed capacity need. Using a standard guideline drawn from nationwide experience, CGL added a classification factor of 5% to calculate additional beds needed to assure a safe and efficient classification system. The following table summarizes the projected bed space need to 2025 including the 6.7% peaking and 5% classification factors.

Table 4.7 Baseline Bedspace Projections

Bedspace Projections	2010	2015	2020	2025
Model 5-Low	303	325	339	351
Model 6-Middle	300	342	384	427
Model 7- High	329	375	423	473

The next chart shows the net number of beds the County will need to add assuming no policy or programming changes and that the current 264 beds are maintained.

Table 4.8 Baseline Net Additional Bed Needs

Bedspace Projections	2010	2015	2020	2025
Model 5-Low	39	61	75	87
Model 6-Middle	36	78	120	163
Model 7- High	65	111	159	209

Jail Construction Costs

The average jail bed costs approximately \$105,000 to construct. Using the middle range as the basis for the County’s assumptions, the County will need approximately 163 additional beds by 2025. The construction costs of these beds would be approximately \$17,115,000 in current day dollars. This cost estimate only represents the dollars needed to actually construct a cell and does not account for remodel or new construction costs.

Jail Operational Costs

The Napa County Jail currently has a rated capacity of 264. As indicated previously, this count does not include medical cells, administrative segregation beds, booking and court holding areas and

other specialized beds that are required in addition to the rated capacity beds. In Fiscal Year 2007-2008, each bed costs the County of Napa approximately \$39,650 per year. This cost estimate factors in the salaries and benefits of the staff required to work with the inmate population as well as run the Corrections Department, including costs for clothing, food and jail medical services. Using the Middle Range Model 6, operating costs for 163 new beds in 2025 would cost an additional \$6,462,950 in current day dollars. It is important to note that this cost estimate is based on the current day operational configuration and staffing pattern and is only one way of approximating the operational costs of adding beds. The actual operational costs will depend on the number of beds regularly in use in a given year and the staffing configuration that is needed to support the facility.

Probation Trends

The Napa County Probation Department operates adult and juvenile court-related services for offender investigation and supervision. When Probation is ordered, the Department is responsible for the supervision of the probationer and enforcement of the conditions and terms of Probation. Probation caseloads have fluctuated much like other County criminal justice system components, however, the total caseload has steadily increased since January 2000 at an average rate of 11.4% per year.

The total number of defendants added to Probation has grown by over 63% in just five years from 693 in 2000 to 1,130 in 2005. The number of defendants removed from or completing Probation has only grown by 28%, increasing only from 658 in 2000 to 829 in 2005. Of the total number of offenders added, the growth rate has been much higher for misdemeanors with a five-year growth rate of 85.0% compared to felony defendants, which has only grown 39.9% during the same five-year period. The number of felony and misdemeanor defendants removed has grown similarly at 33.6% and 24.4% respectively.

Probation Population Projection Models

Following the same methodology used for the jail population projections, several alternative projection models were used to analyze caseload data from January 2000 through June 2006. The 2005 system caseload of 2,024 was used as a base for models that used annual data. The models were based on either historical caseload data and/or independent variables including county population and jail bookings. Models 1, 2 and 3 were solely based on trends extracted from the Probation caseload time series. Model 4 correlated caseload and County population and projected outward based on future County population growth. Model 5 used correlated trends in caseload and bookings. The following describes the models used:

- **Model 1- ARMINA/Total Caseload-** This model uses a combination of auto-regressive, integration, and moving average computation. Several ARMINA models were run on the total monthly caseload data and tested for reliability performance in comparison to other models.
- **Model 2- ARMINA/Added DEF/Removed DEF-** This model worked similarly to Model 1 except it modeled the two time series for added and removed defendants. The total caseload was then computed by adding the previous year's caseload to the projected net gain in the number of defendants.
- **Model 3- Historical Percentage Increase-** This model was derived by calculating the total percentage change from the beginning point (2000) to the end point (2005) of the historical

data series, and dividing the total by the number of years in the period. The result is then multiplied by the desired number of change points into the future. One change point is added to that figure and the result is multiplied by the case year.

- **Model 4- Multiple Regression-** This model used caseload and populations statistics to project future probation caseloads based on a regression analysis of probation caseload to population and applies the results to the projected County population.
- **Model 5- Multiple Regression-** This model uses caseload and booking number to project future probation caseloads based on a regression analysis of historical caseload and bookings. The Model projected an estimated ratio of 69 probationers per 100 bookings, up from the current 29 probationers per 100 bookings.

CGL recommended the use of Models 4, 1 and 5 as the Low, Middle and High models to forecast the County’s future Probation caseload due to the stability and consistency these models presented. These projections are based on current practices and trends without consideration of program or policy changes that the County may choose to implement in its criminal process. The following table summarizes the total estimated future probationers.

Table 4.9 Projected Probation Caseload Increase

	2010	2015	2020	2025	Annual Rate of Growth
Model 4- Low	2,578	3,270	3,956	4,660	6.5%
Model 1- Middle	3,083	4,039	4,992	5,946	9.7%
Model 5- High	2,936	4,206	5,649	7,306	13.0%

The next chart shows the net number of new probationers the County is projected to have need based on the current caseload of 2,105.

Table 4.10 Projected Probation Caseload Net Increase

	2010	2015	2020	2025
Model 4- Low	473	1,165	1,851	2,555
Model 1- Middle	978	1,934	2,887	3,841
Model 5- High	831	2,101	3,544	5,201

Probation Operational Costs

As discussed in Section II, the average caseload per Probation Officer is 150 probationers. Assuming the Middle Range Model 1 accurately reflects caseload growth, the Probation Department would need approximately seven new Probation Officers by 2010, an additional six Probation Officers by 2015, an additional six Probation Officers by 2020 and an additional six Probation Officers by 2025 for a grand total of 25 new Probation Officers. In Fiscal Year 2007-2008, one Probation Officer cost approximately \$192,870 when salaries, benefits and operational costs including support and supervisory time are factored in. Assuming these costs are linear, an additional 25 Probation Officers would cost the County approximately \$4,821,750 in current day dollars.

SECTION V-PROGRAM EVALUATION AND POTENTIAL POLICY CHANGES

The Criminal Justice Committee requested assistance from The Carey Group in determining what proposed changes might be employed to reduce recidivism, how these changes might impact future projections regarding the size of the jail and what policies or program changes could be put in place to reduce the reliance on the jail to handle the offender population. The Carey Group laid out three objectives to define their work with Napa County:

1. Review existing jail data including the current inmate profile, ways in which individuals enter jail, the risk level of the population and the average length of stay;
2. Identify program and sanction gaps that could reduce the County's reliance on the jail;
3. Assist in the determination of revised jail bed projections if policies are altered and evidence-based programs are expanded.

This section will highlight the many issues and recommendations that The Carey Group identified through data analysis, interviews and a mapping process.

Criminogenic Needs

Criminogenic needs are defined as attributes of offenders that are directly linked to criminal behavior. Effective correctional treatment should target criminogenic needs and when criminogenic needs are treated, recidivism can be reduced. The following chart identifies the eight criminogenic needs, how the justice system can respond to these needs and examples of programs and strategy types to address these needs.

Table 5.1 Criminogenic Needs

Criminogenic Need	Justice System Response	Examples of Programs and Strategy Type
History of anti-social Behavior	Build non-criminal alternative behaviors to risky situations	External structures to limit the amount of free time (day reporting, programming, curfew, electronic monitoring, community service, supervised prosocial outlets)
Anti-social attitudes, beliefs, values and thinking	Reduce anti-social cognition; recognize risk based thinking and feelings; adopt an alternative identity	Structured cognitive behavioral curriculum designed to restructure the offenders thoughts, attitudes and beliefs, Case planning modules
Anti-social companions	Reduce association with criminals, enhance contact with prosocial outlets	Case planning modules, prosocial outlets, structured day activities to break up anti-social network
Temperament personality	Build problem solving, self management and coping skills	Structured cognitive behavioral curriculum designed to provide skills
Family/marital stresses	Reduce conflict; build positive relationships and communication; enhance monitoring/supervision	Case planning modules, structured cognitive behavioral curriculum designed to provide skills
Substance abuse	Reduce usage and supports for abuse behavior, enhance alternatives to abuse	Treatment that combines substance abuse with antisocial intervention, urinalysis, prosocial outlets
School/work	Enhance performance rewards and satisfaction	Referral to school/work assistance programs usually after other criminogenic needs are addressed
Leisure/recreation	Enhance involvement and satisfaction in pro-social activities	Referral to prosocial recreational or hobby programs, often done in concert with treatment or cognitive behavioral programs

Evidence-Based Practices

Evidence-based practices are defined as a progressive, organizational use of direct, current scientific evidence to guide and inform efficient and effective correctional services. Research has indicated that certain programs and intervention strategies, when applied to a variety of offender populations, reliably produce sustained reductions in recidivism. Research has also indicated that certain

programs and intervention strategies do not work. At the March 20, 2007 meeting of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Mark Carey shared the following eight evidence-based principles for effective interventions:

1. **Assess Risk/Needs**- Assessing offenders in a reliable and valid manner is necessary for effective management of offenders. This requires the development and maintenance of a system of on-going risk screening, training and needs assessments.
2. **Enhance Motivations**-Staff should relate to offenders interpersonally using sensitive and constructive ways to enhance motivation to change. The probability that change will occur is strongly influenced by interpersonal relationships.
3. **Target Intervention**-Interventions should be targeted towards risk principles, criminogenic need principles, factors including culture and gender, provide the appropriate “doses” of service and provide treatment, particularly cognitive-behavioral types as part of the sanctions process.
4. **Skill Train**- In order to successfully deliver treatment to offenders, staff must be well trained in cognitive-behavioral strategies and understand social learning and appropriate communication techniques.
5. **Positive Reinforcement**-When offenders are learning new skills and making behavioral changes, applying a much higher ration of positive reinforcements to negative reinforcements can better achieve sustained behavioral change.
6. **Support in Natural Communities**- Realign and actively engage prosocial supports for offenders in their communities by actively recruiting and using family members, spouses and supportive others in the offender’s immediate environment to positively reinforce desired new behaviors.
7. **Measure Process**-Agencies must routinely assess offender change in cognitive and skill development and evaluate offender recidivism if services are to remain effective.
8. **Provide Feedback**-Once a method for measuring relevant processes/practices is in place, the information must be used to monitor process and change. Providing feedback to offenders regarding their progress builds accountability and is associated with enhancing motivation for change and improved outcomes.

Effective Programming in Napa County

Programming for offenders is minimal in Napa County. The Carey Group found that though there are a few in-jail programs for sentenced offenders, the configuration of the jail makes it difficult to differentiate the jail population by risk and/or needs and therefore separate the population for programming purposes. The Carey Group also noted that there is little gender responsive programming for female inmates or other specialized populations like the mentally ill.

Probation is the primary sentencing option utilized by the County. The Carey Group found that the programming continuum is only slightly better for Probation and the number and diversity of the programs offered are inadequate if recidivism reduction is to be accomplished.

As part of their Scope of Work, The Carey Group applied the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) to three of Napa County's substance abuse treatment programs. The CPAI is one of the best-known methods for determining how closely a correctional program meets the known principles of effective intervention. The six primary areas that the CPAI assesses include: program implementation and leadership, client pre-service assessment, characteristics of the program, characteristics and practices of staff, evaluation and quality control and miscellaneous items such as ethical guidelines and levels of community support. Data is collected through structured interviews with selected program staff and through other sources of information including policy and procedure manuals, treatment materials and curriculum, a sample of case files and other selected program materials. Once the information is gathered and reviewed, each of the six components are scored equally and the program's strengths are highlighted along with areas that need improvement and recommendations for each of the six areas.

The three programs evaluated were:

- **Project Ninety-** a non-profit residential treatment program that targets substance abusers. The program includes multiple phases that last over 90 days.
- **Alternatives for Better Living-**a private treatment program that provides a number of treatment services for a diverse offender population including substance abusers, domestic violence, anger management, parenting, group/individual mental health counseling and shoplifting. These services are provided in the jail (under contract) and in the community.
- **Outpatient Day Treatment-**a substance abuse program provided by Health and Human Services designed for individuals recovering from substance abuse or dependency. The program contains five components. Qualified sentenced inmates are taken by Correctional Officers to and from this program on Old Sonoma Road.

The Carey Group found that while each of the programs had significant strengths and may be effective in treating non-offender populations, the alignment with the principles of effective practices was in need of improvement if recidivism reduction is to be achieved. These programs often mix offender and non-offender populations. While an offender based program may have similar objectives to achieve as non offender programs, offender based programs will need treatment in concert with other programming interventions to address criminogenic needs, of which substance abuse is only one.

The Carey Group recommended that the County implement evidence based practices curriculum designed to reduce recidivism in County programs as well as community-based programs. The Carey Group further recommended that the County provide technical assistance to its contractors implementing evidence-based practices programs.

Continuum of Sanctions

The Carey Group report stated that a healthy, vibrant justice system needs to have access to a continuum of intermediate sanctions and programs. Establishing a continuum gives the courts and justice personnel the opportunity to customize the justice response to best meet the needs of the offender, victim and public. The lack of a full continuum means that the system bases responses on what is available, not what is needed. The lack of choices often leads to an over-reliance on the jail for low risk offenders and an underutilization of the jail for the more dangerous offenders due to lack of space and a waste of taxpayers resources. It can even make offenders more likely to

recidivate because jail can have a negative effect on recidivism, especially the lower risk offenders. Napa County has very few sanctions in its continuum. Napa County offers Probation and jail, with little in between. The following defines the types of sanctions commonly used:

- **Day Reporting Center-** A Day reporting Center is a place where select offenders must report while under correctional supervision. The offender receives an array of services depending on his/her risk level and the type of programs offered. Day reporting centers may include educational services, vocational training, treatment, recreation and other services. The offender must report to the Day Reporting Center in person daily and sometimes repeatedly throughout a 24-hour period, provide an itinerary of their day's activities and may be placed on electronic monitoring.
- **Supervised Work Crews-** Supervised Work Crews are alternative sentencing programs designed to reduce jail overcrowding by providing lower risk offenders a work option to meet their court obligations. In addition to providing a jail alternative, these programs also benefit the community. Napa County currently offers this type of program through the Corrections Conservation Corp.
- **Halfway Houses-** Halfway Houses are rehabilitation centers or residences where offenders who have left jail are assisted in adjusting to the community.
- **Work Release Facilities-** Work Release Facilities are detention facilities or other secure or non-secure facilities that house offenders whom have been granted the privilege of leaving the facility for specified amounts of time to work at paid employment or to attend an education or vocational training program. Napa County currently offers this type of program through the Work Furlough Program. Inmates in this program are housed in a minimum security dormitory in the basement of the Hall of Justice.
- **Shock Incarceration-** Shock incarceration is designed for younger, nonviolent first-time offenders. It may include a boot camp that provides strict discipline, job training and counseling and is followed by time in a community halfway house and home confinement. This type of program is *not recommended* due to the cost and lack of evidence that it actually reduces recidivism in the adult offender population.
- **Boot Camps** –Boot camps can either be in-jail or community based programs that resemble military basic training. The camps emphasize vigorous physical training; drill and exercise, manual labor and other activities that ensure participants have little free time. Strict rules govern all aspects of conduct and appearance and correctional officers act as drill instructors. This type of program is *not recommended* due to the cost and lack of evidence that it actually reduces recidivism.
- **Correctional Centers-** Correctional centers are secure facilities that receive, house and train inmates. Correctional Centers generally provide meaningful work, training and educational programs for the inmates including academic and vocational trade programming, facility maintenance jobs, foodservice positions and other facility assignments. Programming can include positive leisure time activities and self-help programs.

The following table shows commonly used sanctions available to the justice system by inmate risk level:

Table 5.2 Continuum of Sanctions

Inmate Risk Level	Sanctions in Napa County	Potential Sanctions
Extreme High		
High		Correctional Center
Medium High		Boot Camp Shock Incarceration Halfway House Day Reporting Center Plus
Medium		Day Reporting Electronic Monitoring
Low Medium		Supervised Work Crews
Low	Corrections Conservation Corp	

Given the size and needs of Napa County, The Carey Group recommends that the County expand the continuum of sanctions available to reduce reliance on the jail and implement programs designed to reduce recidivism. Specifically, The Carey Group recommends that the County create a Community Corrections Service Center that combines day reporting and electronic monitoring services. The County would need to establish an array of services including cognitive-behavioral programming, substance abuse treatment, drug testing and case management.

The Carey Group report noted Napa County’s under utilization of electronic monitoring due to an incident that occurred several years ago. The report states that when used correctly, electronic monitoring (including global positioning) can be 94% effective. The report recommends that the County pursue the use of electronic monitoring more regularly, especially in conjunction with the Community Corrections Service Center.

Pre-Trial Programs

The Carey Group report noted that pre-sentenced inmates utilize approximately 83% of the bed space used during a sample period in 2007. Since a formal pretrial release program does not exist in the County currently, there are few other pretrial release options that could be used, including supervised release on recognizance (OR). The Carey Group recommends that the proposed Community Corrections Service Center program include pretrial supervision for those the court determines could be released from custody pending court processing under certain conditions. This would not only effect the jail population, it would provide the court additional assurance that a defendant would be monitored, appear in court and not reoffend.

Managing the “Risk Principle” in the Jail

As mentioned earlier in this report, the risk principle states that high and low-risk offenders should not be mixed in the same programming or location when there is significant interaction time. Classification tools are critical to the operation of the jail and offender programming. Classification tools determine the level of security for each type of offender and are designed to reclassify offenders as needed based on behavior in the institution.

The booking process in the Jail includes proper identification of the individual including criminal history and emergency medical/mental health and suicide risks are assessed. At the same time, eligibility for pretrial release is also reviewed where the jail can issue a promise to appear citation for misdemeanor offenses

The Carey Group recommends that the jail use a more modernized jail classification tool and begin utilizing a series of other actuarial tools to assist with decision-making. The use of these tools will assist the jail staff in making critical decisions about the movement and placement of offenders. Research has shown that actuarial tools get better prediction results than professional judgment alone. The Carey Group recommends the following tools for use in the Jail.

Table 5.3 Assessment Tool

Type of Assessment	Primary Purpose	Recommended Tool
Jail Classification	To place and separate the inmate population based on offender profile and behavior	Northpointe COMPAS
Pretrial	To determine who is a good risk to release on pretrial status based on failure to appear and new offense	Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Inventory (VPRAI)
Risk Screening	To determine future risk to reoffend, to separate high/low risk inmates, and to determine whether to do a full risk/need assessment	Proxy
Risk/Need	To determine the inmate's criminogenic needs for programming placement	LS/CMI
Behavioral Health	To determine substance abuse and mental health needs	ASUS, ASAM Individual

A pretrial assessment, such as the Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment instrument, can assist the courts in determining bail and release decisions and whether an individual should be placed on pretrial supervision. The tool identifies projected levels of failure to appear and reoffense rates based on the scoring.

The Department of Corrections is currently administering the Proxy tool and VPRAI on all new bookings, and is evaluating the Northpointe system. The Proxy tool is significantly correlated with the LS/CMI in predicting risk to re-offend. The Proxy tool, however, does not indicate the needs of an individual to address their criminogenic needs. The Probation Department is using the LS/CMI and Corrections may conduct this assessment for those inmates that are not on probation, and where it is needed for in-custody programming assessment. A recent review of 235 unduplicated Proxy scores in 2007 indicates that the average Proxy score is 4.39 out of a total 8 points. The Carey Group recommends that the LS/CMI be completed for any offenders scoring "5" or more on the Proxy or are likely to remain in jail for 60 days or more and therefore have time to begin programming. By assessing at this level, the jail can increase its understanding of those offenders who are most likely to be at high risk for re-offending. The LS/CMI tool is also effective in deciding on the services necessary to address criminogenic risk factors and offender needs. This

tool will identify the specific criminogenic needs that must be addressed in future programming. It should be noted that it is not necessary, nor appropriate, to use the LS/CMI tool for every booking into the jail. Many are presentenced misdemeanors who stay only a few hours, maybe days; others who are sentenced to very short times would not be in custody long enough to participate meaningfully in any programming. If programming for the latter group is needed, it can be accomplished better in the community, thus focusing in-custody services where they can do the most good.

Finally, The Carey Group recommends that a number of behavioral assessments be conducted based on the needs of the offender. The Carey Group recommends that at a minimum, a mental health screen along with a substance abuse treatment selection tool such as the ASAM or ASUM. This assessment tool, along with the LS/CMI can provide recommendations for various levels of treatment.

Section VI – ADJUSTED BED PROJECTIONS

The Carey Group report estimates that up to 50 inmates could be diverted from the jail if a Community Corrections Service Center was established and adequate precautions around possible net widening are put in place. The Carey Group contends that there are four categories of incarcerated offenders some of which could potentially be handled in a Community Corrections Service Center without significant risk to the public: the sentenced misdemeanor, the pretrial population, those being held on a violation of probation and the low risk offenders. There is potential for additional options to custody dependent on the review of certain policies and procedures, including a review of the bail schedule, the practice of no-bail for violations of probation and the practice of automatically filing a violation of probation on all new offenses.

The Carey Group report also found that a total of 16 additional jail beds could be freed up over time due to a reduction in recidivism, if Napa County successfully implements a proper mix of evidence-based practices programs. The report notes that adopting evidence-based practices requires a long-term commitment. The County’s Departments will need to realign their current personnel, policies and practices and add additional staff and/or contract services to obtain positive results. The report recommends that the County establish a three to five year plan so that future resource and policy issues are committed for sufficient period of time to evaluate the effectiveness of these changes.

Revised Jail Bed Projections

Carter Goble Lee was asked by the County to revise the jail bed projections based on The Carey Group’s assumption that 50 inmates could be diverted from the jail if a Community Corrections Service Center and additional 16 beds could be freed up over time. The following charts show the initial and adjusted average daily population estimates for the low, middle and high range models:

Table 6.1 Revised Average Daily Population-Low Range

ADP	2010	2015	2020	2025
Baseline ADP	271	291	303	314
CCSC Inmates	56	68	73	78
% of Total ADP	21%	23%	24%	25%
Adjusted ADP	215	223	230	236

Table 6.2 Revised Average Daily Population-Middle Range

ADP	2010	2015	2020	2025
Baseline ADP	268	306	344	383
CCSC Inmates	56	70	80	93
% of Total ADP	21%	23%	23%	24%
Adjusted ADP	212	236	264	290

Table 6.3 Revised Average Daily Population-High Range

ADP	2010	2015	2020	2025
Baseline ADP	295	336	379	424
CCSC Inmates	56	71	85	103
% of Total ADP	19%	21%	23%	24%
Adjusted ADP	239	265	293	321

As discussed in Section 4, a peaking factor of 6.7% and a classification factor of 5% were added to the adjusted average daily population to determine the adjusted beds needed given the implementation of a Community Corrections Service Center. The following charts show the revised bed need projections and the net bed reduction due to the implementation of a Community Corrections Service Center.

Table 6.4 Revised Bed Projections-Low Range

Bed Projection	2010	2015	2020	2025
Baseline	303	325	339	351
Adjusted	215	223	230	236
Net Reduction	88	98	109	115

Table 6.5 Revised Bed Projections-Middle Range

Bed Projection	2010	2015	2020	2025
Baseline	300	342	384	427
Adjusted	237	264	295	324
Net Reduction	63	78	89	103

Table 6.6 Revised Bed Projections-High Range

Bed Projection	2010	2015	2020	2025
Baseline	329	375	423	473
Adjusted	267	296	328	359
Net Reduction	62	59	95	114

Using the middle range model as the basis for the bed need assumptions, the County may not need additional jail beds until 2020 if a Community Corrections Service Center is implemented. Data on the number of individuals served through this center and the effectiveness of the program will need to be monitored and the bed space projections adjusted as needed.

Estimated Cost Impact

While the primary reasons to implement evidence-based practices is to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, the County has the potential to limit long-term cost increases due to the implementation of evidence-based practices. The Carey Group reports that the cost of jail bed construction is approximately \$105,000 per cell in current day dollars. Using the adjusted middle range bed projections, a net reduction in the construction of 103 jail beds could help the County avoid approximately \$10,815,000 in construction costs. However, given the fact that the County lacks the appropriate mix of housing types, there may be a need to add some net new beds in order to ensure that there is an appropriate mix of housing types in the jail, which would reduce the amount of cost-avoidance associated with evidence-based practices. Net new beds are likely to be those beds not included in the rated capacity including medical, mental health and administrative segregation beds. The total number of net new non-rated beds needed is not yet known.

Likewise, Section IV stated that each jail bed has an operational cost of approximately \$39,650 per year and the cost of operating 163 new jail beds would cost \$6,462,950 per year or \$129,259,000 over twenty years. The cost of operating a Community Corrections Service Center is not yet fully known, however, preliminary estimates show the cost to be as high as \$1,500,000 per year, or

\$30,000,000 over 20 years. Thus, implementing a Community Corrections Service Center and utilizing evidence-based practices has the potential to achieve an additional net cost avoidance.

In summary, if the County would have needed 163 additional beds without evidence-based practices, it would cost approximately \$129,259,000 in operating costs over a 20-year period and \$17,115,000 in construction costs for a total of \$146,374,000. Assuming that costs are linear and if evidence-based practices programs would reduce the number of beds need by 103 and if the cost of a Community Services Corrections System is approximately \$1,500,000 per year, the net cost avoidance over the same timeframe would be \$62,494,000.

The County could also experience additional criminal justice system cost avoidance, which are difficult to quantify in this report. For example, the following agency costs could be impacted by reduction in offender recidivism: Probation, Public Defender, District Attorney, court processing, and possibly law enforcement.

SECTION VII- CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In August of 2006, the Criminal Justice Committee adopted the following goal for the County's adult corrections system:

Operate an adult corrections system that provides for offender accountability and public health and safety, utilizing evidence-based practices to reduce recidivism and maintain appropriate level of custody and control in the most cost-effective way possible.

Since then, the Committee has gathered a wealth of information and held many productive discussions. While much work in the planning process still needs to be done, including the continuing effort to better understand the dynamics of the adult corrections population and means of managing it, the Committee is now ready to recommend that the County move to Phase II of the Adult Corrections Master Planning process. To that end the Committee is recommending that the Board adopt the following conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusion No. 1: The County currently does not utilize evidence-based practices in a comprehensive way to manage the adult offender population, nor are there many intermediate sanctions available to facilitate the use of evidence-based practices. If evidence-based practices are appropriately implemented, there is an opportunity to manage limited secure custody resources more effectively, and significantly reduce offender recidivism, thus enhancing public safety.

This conclusion is based on the Carey Group's analysis of the jail and probation populations, programs and operations and is the centerpiece of the Committee's recommendations. Evidence-based practices are a system of offender supervision and services that research has shown can reduce the likelihood that an offender will recidivate, or re-offend. With evidence-based practices the supervision level and services provided are tailored to the individual needs and risk of each offender, as determined by a validated risk assessment tool. A key to successfully implementing evidence-based practices while providing for offender accountability is to have available an array of intermediate sanctions (that is, sanctions that fall between the jail and probation and include such things as community work programs, electronic monitoring, day reporting, etc.)

Recommendation No. 1-1: The County should fully commit to implementing evidence-based practices, including the creation of a Community Corrections Services Center and associated intermediate sanctions and programs.

The Community Corrections Service Center and associated intermediate sanctions and programs will provide various options for the supervision, control and programming for adult offenders (both sentenced and pre-sentenced) who might otherwise be housed in the jail. The Community Corrections Service Center will be multi-purpose and multi-disciplinary, with participation from the Departments of Corrections, Probation and Health & Human Services. Programs/services provided through the Center will include day-reporting, drug-screening, electronic monitoring, various substance abuse and mental health treatment services and other classes and training designed to address offenders' criminogenic needs (that is, the needs that have been shown to drive criminal behavior).

A Community Corrections Service Center and other intermediate sanctions can cost considerably less to operate than a jail, however the cost can still be significant. For an adult offender population the size of Napa County's, the cost of a Community Corrections Services Center could be in excess of \$1 million a year.

Part of this concept will include using validated risk assessment tools to help determine which inmates (sentenced or unsentenced) should be held in the jail and moving those inmates who are more appropriately supervised in the community to community-based programs.

National data suggests that, if properly implemented, use of evidence-based practices can reduce offender recidivism by as much as 30%.

Recommendation No. 1-2: The County should support the Probation Department's on-going efforts to implement evidence-based practices.

The Probation Department has begun the process of implementing evidence-based practices with regard to the 2,000 offenders assigned to formal probation. The Department's initial steps have involved conducting risk assessments of all probationers using a validated risk assessment tool and reconfiguring Probation Officer caseloads to provide appropriate supervision levels for different types of offenders. The next steps will include the development and provision of appropriate programs and services for offenders who may not participate in the Community Corrections Service Center, but who have unmet criminogenic needs. In addition, as the Department fully implements evidence-based practices, a further revision of caseload standards may be required. These next steps will likely involve additional staff and program costs.

Recommendation No. 1-3: The County should support the Health & Human Services Department's efforts to enhance the level of mental health and substance abuse services provided to the adult offender population, including working with contract service providers to ensure that those agencies have appropriate knowledge and training about programs that are effective in dealing with the offender population.

As noted in the Carey Group report, programs provided by Napa County's mental health and substance abuse contractors are not consistent with evidence-based practices for reducing offender recidivism. Since the County relies on effective community-based programming to address the substance abuse and mental health needs of offenders, both the County and community providers must put a consistent set of knowledge and practices in place. The County should hold collaborative meetings and training sessions with key service providers to implement this recommendation.

Recommendation No. 1-4: The County should establish a quality assurance and outcome evaluation capacity that ensures that evidence-based practices are appropriately designed and implemented and having the desired effect in terms of reducing recidivism. This would likely require a Quality Assurance capability that could provide assistance to all corrections-related agencies involved in programming for the offender population.

The Probation Department has set up a quality assurance committee and is working to establish protocols and activities to ensure that evidence-based practices are being delivered appropriately. This effort should be supported, but completing this process and, in particular, as use of evidence-based practice is expanded to cover the jail population and involves contract service providers, it is likely that this capability will need to include dedicated staff and consultants with specific expertise. The Criminal Justice Committee recommends that the Carey Group be retained to assist in developing and implementing evidence-based practices and to design and implement a quality assurance program.

Conclusion No. 2 A: Without implementing evidence-based practices or other policy changes, it is estimated that an additional 120 rated jail beds may be needed by 2020, with an additional 36 beds needed by as early as 2010 and 78 by 2015. If evidence-based practices are effectively implemented, the need for net additional jail beds could potentially be delayed until 2020 and even then as few as 31 additional rated beds could be needed. However, there are many questions about implementing evidence-based practices and exactly what the impact of these and other changes in policies might be. Consequently, these modified projections must be viewed skeptically. In addition, there are serious limitations in housing options in the current jail.

Conclusion No. 2B: Because the jail lacks the appropriate mix of housing types, risk classification principles are being compromised on a daily basis and the jail faces operational inefficiencies and increasing safety and security concerns. This issue must be addressed independently of whether and when net new beds need to be added and, depending on how this is addressed net additional beds may be required.

As indicated in previous sections of this report, CGL has projected the demand for jail beds to be as follows, assuming no change in current policies and practices.

Table 7.1- Baseline Jail Bed Projections

Bedspace Projections	2010	2015	2020	2025
Model 5-Low Range	303	325	339	351
Model 6-Middle Range	300	342	384	427
Model 7- High Range	329	375	423	473

CGL has recommended, and the Committee has agreed, that the Middle Range Model is the most appropriate projection to use for planning purposes. Thus, these “baseline” projections indicate that, if nothing else changes, the number of rated jail beds needed will increase by approximately 36 (14%) between now and 2010, by approximately 78 (30%) between now and 2015, by approximately (45%) between now and 2020 and by approximately 164 (62%) between now and 2025.

The Carey Group conducted an analysis to estimate the potential impact on the baseline projections if evidence-based practices were fully implemented. This information was provided to CGL who prepared revised projections as follows:

Table 7.2- Adjusted Jail Bed Projections

Bedspace Projections	2010	2015	2020	2025
Model 5-Low Range	241	249	257	264
Model 6-Middle Range	237	264	295	324
Model 7- High Range	267	296	328	359

Again, looking at the Middle Range Model, these projections indicate, with implementation of evidence-based practices, the County may not need a net increase in rated jail beds until 2020. In that year the County could need in the area of 30 additional beds and in 2025 the County could need an additional 60 beds compared to the number of rated beds in the current jail. However, according to the Carey Group’s report the actual impact of implementing evidence-based practices will not be known for at least three to five years. There are also a number of other factors that could impact the demand for jail beds, such as possible changes in Violation of Probation and bail policies.

Further, even if evidence-based practices are implemented, the jail, as currently configured, faces serious problems due to the existing mix of housing types. This relates both to mix of minimum, medium and maximum security cells, to the current configuration of those cells and to the lack of adequate mental health and other specialty housing units, such as administrative segregation and medical units. This has led to a situation where inmates are mixed together who should not be co-located, where jail space is used inefficiently because cells must be underutilized or left vacant due to the need for specialized space, where there is little room for mental health or other services and programs and where individual housing units are over-crowded, though the jail as a whole remains under-capacity.

Recommendation No. 2 -1: The County should proceed to plan for the immediate (within the next three years) reconfiguration and/or replacement of jail beds to change the mix of rated beds in the jail (and potentially add additional rated or specialized beds) so that risk can be appropriately managed and adequate services provided, while creating the capacity to smoothly and expeditiously increase the number of total rated beds by 2020 – or sooner as experience and close monitoring indicate.

The Committee recommends that the Board authorize the CJC to continue to work with consultants in Phase II to identify the cost and feasibility of creating replacement beds, while providing the capacity to expand the net number of jail beds as may be needed. Specifically, Phase II of the Adult Corrections Master Planning process would examine the following options:

1. Renovating the current facilities to create the mix of beds/housing types needed.
2. Adding new units or wings to the current facility.
3. Constructing a new jail facility to replace existing beds and to provide the ability to build future additional beds on the same site.

Each of these options has different implications for addressing the immediate need for a different mix of beds, providing the flexibility to address changing conditions or circumstances and meeting the long-term jail needs of the County. In fact, some of these options may be problematic in terms of achieving the desired mix of rated beds or may require net additional beds to achieve that mix.

Further, since, in addition to the need for a different mix of rated beds, there is also a concern about the lack of adequate specialized beds (such as sobering and observation cells, mental health and medical cells and other temporary holding cells), it is possible that some increase in the total number of jail beds will be needed in the near term under any circumstances.

Given the uncertainties associated with the impact of implementing evidence-based practices, in the Committee's view, there are two keys to the viability of this approach:

- (1) Creating an infrastructure that facilitates the construction of net new bed space as quickly as possible if it is determined that such space is needed. This could involve such things as predetermining the location for the new beds; pre-determining the mix and basic configuration of the new space; completing any regulatory requirements; providing that certain key core services (like kitchen, laundry, intake) are appropriately sized; and, potentially, even building an unfinished shell to accommodate future growth.

- (2) Establishing a mechanism to monitor crime, arrest, booking, recidivism, jail usage and other criminal justice/correction trends on a regular basis to identify any early signs that additional jail beds may be needed and to bring this information to the attention of the CJC and the Board.

Recommendation No. 2-2: Establish a dedicated staff position that will monitor and provide feedback to management and the Criminal Justice Committee on criminal justice/corrections population data and trends to assist in the population and caseload management of the jail and probation functions.

Creation of this criminal justice analyst/planner position is also a key element of the Carey Group's recommendations. While this sort of data gathering and analysis has been underway to some extent in the past year in both Corrections and Probation, the Committee believes it is critical that there be a unified, inter-agency, means of monitoring not only the jail population, but all of the various agencies and information that in some way affect the jail population and probation caseloads. This position will be primarily responsible for identifying early signs that additional jail beds may be needed.

Whether this need can be met with net additional staff or through the realignment of existing staff should be reviewed as part of the Phase II scope of work.

SECTION VIII- NEXT STEPS AND FUTURE POLICY CONCERNS

The Criminal Justice Committee has recommended that the Board of Supervisors accept the recommendations provided in the previous section. If approved, staff will move immediately into Phase II to begin developing a Community Corrections Service Center and designing and implementing evidence-based practices programs, and begin the development of detailed operational and space programming of any new and/or renovated correctional facilities to meet bedspace and program needs. This will start with the assessment of the options for creating the desired mix of beds in the short term and develop plans for the eventual expansion to meet long-term bed space needs projected in Phase I.

Key Steps to be accomplished in Phase II include:

- Determine the precise number of reconfigured or new rated beds needed in the short term and the precise number of additional specialized beds (mental health, health, holding and so forth) needed.
- Determine whether current facilities can be reconfigured, remodeled or expanded, or if it would be preferable to construct a new facility. This will include both creating a new mix of jail beds to meet the classification requirements of the inmates by replacing existing beds, providing for adequate specialized housing units, and preparing for longer term needs for net additional jail beds.
- Create a description of site requirements and objectively evaluate alternative facility locations as necessary.
- Identify the most appropriate facility standards and inmate management approaches to be considered in programming and designing facilities.
- Identify preliminary staffing requirements and operating costs for the desired facility.
- Evaluate alternative construction methods that could be utilized.
- Identify preliminary construction, operation and life-cycle cost estimates for the facility.
- Design and implement a Community Corrections Service Center and associated intermediate sanctions and programs to provide various options for supervision, control and programming for adult offenders. This program will include an evidence-based curriculum and me multi-purpose and multi-disciplinary, with participation from the Department of Corrections, Probation and Health and Human Services.
- Develop and provide appropriate programs and services in the Probation Department designed to address the criminogenic needs of offenders. This may require the addition of staff to adjust caseloads to meet national standards.
- Develop evidence-based programs in Health and Human Services and among community providers to address substance abuse and mental health needs of offender in an effective community-based manner.

- Create a Quality Assurance and outcome evaluation capacity to ensure that evidence-based practices are appropriately designed and implemented and having the desired effect in terms of reducing recidivism.

County Staff and Continued Use of Professional Consultants

The County Executive Office will continue to provide central staff support and coordination for Phase II as it has during Phase I. There is a continuing need for assistance of professional consultants to accomplish the goals stated above. Consultants currently under contract that will be needed include The Carey Group, Carter Goble Lee, Dennis Handis and John Pearson.

The County may also need to utilize additional consultants to assist with this process. This determination will be made as Phase II begins.

Other County departments will be involved as needed including Public Works, Environmental Management, Planning (land use), County Counsel, etc.

California Prison Reform

The recommendations contained in this report do not reflect any of the potential impacts of the State's prison overcrowding situation. At this time, it is unclear how prison overcrowding will impact local jails. Staff will continue to monitor the situation and will integrate any needed actions into the Phase II planning process.