



Board of State and Community Corrections
600 Bercut Drive, Sacramento, CA 95811

916.445.5073 PHONE

916.327.3317 FAX

bscc.ca.gov

GOVERNOR **Edmund G. Brown Jr.**
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (A) **Curtis J. Hill**

May 28, 2013

Phil Wowak, Sheriff-Coroner
Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Office
701 Ocean Street Room 340
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Sheriff Wowak:

2012-2014 BIENNIAL INSPECTION – PENAL CODE SECTION 6031

On March 12-13, 2013 staff of the Board of State and Community Corrections¹ (BSCC) conducted the 2012-2014 biennial inspection of the following facilities:

Santa Cruz County Jail
Blaine Women's Facility
Rountree Medium Security Facility
Santa Cruz County Superior Court Holding
Watsonville Superior Court Holding

The facilities were inspected pursuant to Penal Code Section 6031 for compliance with the Minimum Standards for Local Detention Facilities as outlined in Titles 15 and 24, California Code of Regulations (CCR). In addition, BSCC staff conducted compliance monitoring pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Section 209(f) for the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) for the separation requirements of juveniles from incarcerated adults.

The inspection was preceded by a desk audit of applicable policies and procedures governing the operation of the facility², wherein policy content was reconciled against relevant regulations to ensure that each subject required by regulation was addressed in policy. The results of that audit were provided at a pre-inspection briefing held on January 16, 2013 and attended by administrators from each facility.

¹ Formerly known as the Corrections Standards Authority, effective July 1, 2012, the Board of State and Community Corrections was established independent of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

² BSCC does not review all of your policies and procedures. We only review those policies related specifically to the applicable regulations included in Title 15, Minimum Standards for Local Detention Facilities for issues of non-compliance. We do not "approve" your policies nor do we review them for constitutional or legal issues. We recommend agencies seek policy review through their legal advisor, risk manager, and other persons deemed appropriate.

The on-site inspections began March 12, 2013 with a review of documentation to verify that practices follow written procedures and regulation, and concluded on March 13 with a walk-through of the physical plants. Examination of additional safety check documentation occurred on May 13, 2013

Lieutenant Greg Lansdowne was our point of contact and was present during the entire inspection. He, along with Chief Deputy Jeremy Verinsky and Lieutenants Shea Johnson, Fred Plageman, and James Skillicorn and Supervising Correctional Officer Michele Taylor assisted by answering questions and clarifying procedural issues. Their involvement along with that of all staff interviewed during the inspection process was extremely valuable. The professionalism and courtesy extended during the visit was appreciated.

The complete BSCC inspection report is enclosed and consists of:

- This transmittal letter;
- Separate consolidated Procedures Checklists for the jails and court holdings outlining applicable Title 15 sections;
- Physical Plant Evaluations outlining Title 24 requirements for design;³
- Living Area Space Evaluations summarizing each facilities' physical plant configurations; and,
- Attachment A summarizing local health and fire inspections.

We encourage the practice of maintaining a permanent file for historical copies of all inspections. This file should be the first point of reference when preparing for all future inspections.

Local Inspections

In addition to a biennial inspection by the BSCC, inspections are also required annually by the County Health Officer and biennially by the State Fire Marshal or an authorized representative (Health and Safety Code Sections 101045 and 13146.1). The local health authority is required to conduct inspections of all detention facilities and includes evaluation of medical and mental health services, nutritional requirements and environmental health standards. The dates of the latest health and fire/life safety inspections, along with any issues of non-compliance, and corrective action taken are listed on Attachment A. Please consider our report in conjunction with the reports from the County Health Officer and the respective fire authorities for a comprehensive perspective of your facilities.

As noted above, local health inspections are statutorily required by the County Health Officer. During the course of the inspection we learned that the environmental health report is the only evaluation actually completed by the County Health Officer. The nutritional evaluation is completed by a private consultant and the medical/mental health evaluation has not been completed for a number of years. We are pleased to inform you that after contact with Jodel

³ Facilities are assessed against Title 24 requirements in place at the time of design or significant remodel to the jail area.

Jencks, Medical Services Manager and local health department, the medical/mental health evaluations will resume in June of this year.

BSCC Inspection

Physical Plant:

Santa Cruz County Jail

Completed in 1981, the Santa Cruz County Jail is inspected and evaluated using the 1976, 1980, 1988, 1994 and 2001 Title 24, CCR, Physical Plant Standards. With a rated capacity of 311, at the time of the inspection, there were 330 males and 38 females in custody. Minors are not detained or housed in the facility. The jail was relatively clean but cluttered with inmate property in the cells. No issues of deferred maintenance were obviously apparent. The following issues of non-compliance related to crowding were noted: Title 24, CCR, Sections 1231.2.9 Dayroom Space and 1231.17 Dining Area. In addition, Section 1231.2.22 Audio or Video Monitoring System, is non-compliant as there is no audio monitoring capability in West Housing or safety cells.

Santa Cruz Rountree Lane Medium Security Facility

Completed in 1993, the Rountree Medium Security Facility is inspected and evaluated using the 1988 Title 24, CCR, Physical Plant Standards. With a rated capacity of 96, at the time of the inspection there were 104 male inmates in custody. Minors are not detained in the facility. The area appeared clean and well maintained. The following issues of non-compliance related to crowding were noted: Title 24, CCR, Sections 1231, 2.8, Dormitories, 1231.2.9 Dayroom Space and 1231.3.4 Showers.

Santa Cruz Blaine Women's Minimum Facility

Completed in 1986, the Blaine Women's Minimum Facility is inspected and evaluated using the 1980 Title 24, CCR, Physical Plant Standards. With a rated capacity of 32, at the time of the inspection there were 15 female inmates in custody.

Santa Cruz Court Holding

Completed in 1963, the Santa Cruz County Court Holding Facility is inspected and evaluated using the 1963 and 1994 Title 24, CCR, Physical Plant Standards. There were no inmates in custody at the time of the inspection. Minors are not detained in the facility. The area appeared clean and well maintained. No issues of non-compliance with applicable physical plant standards were identified.

Watsonville Court Holding

Completed in 2007, the Watsonville Superior Court Holding Facility is inspected and evaluated using the 2001 Title 24, CCR, Physical Plant Standards. There were no inmates in custody at the

time of the inspection. Minors are temporary placed holding cells pending court appearance sight and sound separated from adult inmates. The area appeared clean and well maintained. No issues of non-compliance with applicable physical plant standards were identified.

Title 15 Inspection:

During the inspection, BSCC staff reviewed applicable policy, procedures, practices and supporting documentation where necessary. We recommended revisions to policy to remain compliant with Title 15, an effort that is currently in progress.

During the course of our inspection we interviewed line staff and found them to be knowledgeable on Title 15 and related issues. Interviews with inmates disclosed that they felt safe and that mandated activities such as recreation, visits, clothing exchange, etc., were being met. Inmates assured us that medical staff was responsive to their requests and expressed no complaints about the grievance or disciplinary processes.

We examined documentation on the placement and management of inmates placed in the Sobering Cell. The use of the cell can be a major source of jail litigation, but when operated and managed according to regulation, exposure to litigation is reduced. We provided samples of sobering cell forms that include assessment and tracking of individual inmates for consideration in updating the current assessment process.

We also examined inmate receiving screening for classification and medical issues, along with safety check documentation, monthly fire/life inspections by facility staff, disciplinary records and grievances with corresponding responses.

The examination of safety check documentation at SCCJ revealed two issues. The first being documented checks beyond the hourly requirement. We requested that staff be re-informed of the importance of timely safety checks and that staff provide improved documentation prior to the submission of this report.

The second issue was with the *Guard 1 Plus* itself for recording documented checks. It was noted that in housing area B documentation was absent for significant time periods on the report the Guard 1 Plus provides. When we inquired about the absence of safety checks we were informed that the system was not working in this areas. We learned that when this occurs alternative documentation is not initiated. To mitigate this issue we recommend pen and paper documentation for the housing unit when the system fails.

Prior to the submission of this report documentation was provided and examined and still found to be non-compliant with Title 15, CCR, Section 1027, Number of Personnel. An alternative to missing documentation was not provided.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Compliance Monitoring:

In accordance with the JJDP, BSCC monitors jail facilities for compliance with one of four core requirements of the Act - Separation of Juveniles from Incarcerated Adults. With the

exception of the Watsonville Court Holding minors are not housed at any other facility. No violations of the JJDPa were identified at Watsonville Court Holding.

Corrective Action Plan:

By July 30, 2013, please provide a corrective action plan outlining steps to be taken to correct the safety check deficiency noted. In lieu of the plan, new safety check documentation may be submitted for evaluation at anytime. Once documentation is verified as compliant, our records will be changed to reflect compliance with this Title 15, Section 1027.

This concludes this portion of our inspection report for the 2012-2014 inspection cycle. We would like to thank all staff involved in the inspection process for the hospitality and courtesy extended during the inspection. If you should have any questions, please contact me at (916) 445-1322 or email at ron.bertrand@bscc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

RONALD L. BERTRAND
Field Representative
Facilities Standards and Operations Division

Enclosures

cc: County Administrative Officer, County of Santa Cruz*
Chair, Board of Supervisors, County of Santa Cruz*
Presiding Judge, Superior Court, County of Santa Cruz*
Grand Jury Foreperson, Superior Court, County of Santa Cruz*
Chief Deputy Jeremy Verinsky, Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Department

*Copies of the complete inspection report are available upon request.