



A Tradition of Stewardship  
A Commitment to Service

## **STAFF-SECURE RESIDENTIAL FACILITY FOR NAPA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS INMATES TRANSITIONING BACK INTO THE COMMUNITY**

(NAPA STATE HOSPITAL SITE)

### **Overview**

Due to the historic changes in California's criminal justice system as a result of the 2011 Public Safety Realignment Act, the County of Napa has been challenged to address the needs of a changing jail population.

Napa County has long had an innovative, collaborative partnership among criminal justice and health and human services agencies including city and county law enforcement agencies, the District Attorney's Office, the Public Defender's Office, the Probation Department, Napa County Department of Corrections (NCDC), the Napa County Health & Human Services Agency (HHS) and the Napa County Superior Court. The result of this collaboration has meant Napa County was well positioned coming into Realignment 2011. The County has long focused resources on the use of evidence-based, research-tested practices and programs proven to reduce recidivism, improve re-entry outcomes, increase public safety and ultimately reduce the number of jail beds needed in the future – all hallmarks of the 2011 Public Safety Realignment Act. An example of this is the implementation in 2009 of the Community Corrections Center, a seven-day-a-week day reporting and treatment center for up to 100 probationers that provides intensive supervision and evidence-based programs and treatment services.

These goals have resulted in a thoughtful, systematic approach to spending the funding the County receives from the State for Realignment. The County has established a number of new alternative custody and behavioral program opportunities in the last 18-months. In addition to these programmatic elements, the County has identified potential facility needs as it relates to maintaining the jail population and achieving public safety goals, including reducing recidivism. Specifically, we are proposing the creation of a **staff-secure residential facility** that would serve as a transitional step for inmates moving back to the community.

Currently, NCDL releases inmates through various means including county parole, bail, released on own recognizance, court ordered releases, transfers to other agencies, and time-served releases. In FY 11/12, over 2,800 inmates were released back into the local community. Overall, the average length of stay is around 17 days, however depending on how the inmate is released, the time served can vary widely.

The largest group of inmates is released with a “time served” completion of their sentence. Their average length of stay in FY 11/ 12 was almost 21 days. Those being released on 4024.1 ordered releases (5 or 3-day early releases, or “kicks,” due to crowding) had an average length of stay of 35 days. Those receiving County Parole had an average length of stay of almost 92 days.

Depending on the release type and the individual inmate, the level of supervision and the services those inmates receive after release vary. With paroled inmates, some may be supervised by County Probation and/or required to check in with NCDL classification in person or via telephone. Inmates released on parole generally have jobs or are attending some form of programming when they enter the community. Many inmates are denied parole because they do not present sufficient plans, i.e., ability to find jobs, suitable residence requirements, substance abuse issues, and possible victim issues.

By and large, most inmates released from NCDL are not tracked following release into community, though some receive varying degrees of supervision. Some inmates will reoffend and will be brought back into custody within a few weeks of release. This may be related to homelessness, mental health, substance abuse, etc.

A staff-secure residential facility would house inmates, offer cognitive behavior programs and skill development training, and provide an opportunity for individuals to go into the community for approved purposes (i.e. jobs, classes, etc.) in a controlled way helping them learn how to be productive members of their community, with the goal of reducing their chances of re-offending.

### **Facility/Program Administration**

Similar to the administration of programs reviewed in Oregon and Kansas, Napa County’s staff-secure residential facility would be operated and managed by the Probation Department. Unlike a traditional correctional facility, the proposed staff-secure facility should provide an environment that fosters cognitive behavioral change and allow individuals to build a foundation for transition back into the community. With Napa County Probation Department’s recognized history of innovative reform efforts, the sub-committee, including the Chief Probation Officer and the Director of Corrections, believes the new facility will thrive with this type of agency culture behind it.

This arrangement will require a cooperative partnership with the Napa County Department of Corrections to ensure the facility is meeting the goals of proactively maintaining the jail population and providing individuals with appropriate programming opportunities. Both the Chief Probation Officer and the Director of Corrections are committed to ensuring the success of the facility. Historical partnerships between the two departments, including the recent change in electronic monitoring policies which gave Probation the responsibility for the individual while out of custody, have proven that success is likely.

## **Inmate Eligibility**

**Offense:** The sub-committee is proposing that all criminal offense categories be included for entry into the program, with two important exceptions:

1. Sex Offenders; and
2. Domestic Violence Offenders

The sub-committee felt that introducing sex offenders into the facility could potentially create significant problems. Research has shown that sex offenders may not be easily housed in a facility that houses both males and females and such classifications would require additional staffing.

In addition, the sub-committee considered that domestic violence offenders often require very specialized programming needs. In addition, there was concern with including high risk domestic violence offenders in a co-ed facility. Experience has shown that often these individuals will pursue new aggressor/victim relationships. In order to protect all individuals in the facility, the sub-committee is recommending against including these individuals.

There will be a process for exceptions to the facility similar to the process used for the Community Corrections Service Center. If the jail or probation believes an inmate who is otherwise excluded from the facility should be considered, a written exception request giving the pertinent information will be completed. This is sent to the Assistant District Attorney, Public Defender, Chief Probation Officer and Director of Corrections. It takes a unanimous vote to allow the exception and for that inmate to be referred to the facility.

**Risk Classification:** The sub-committee is not recommending any specific exclusion as related to risk classifications. The Jail currently uses the NIC assessment tool for housing assignments while in custody. Low and medium risk offenders would be automatically included for eligibility, while high risk offenders would be reviewed on a case by case basis.

In addition to the Jail's tool, Probation would utilize their LSCMI scores. Low, medium, and high offenders would automatically be included, while very high risk offenders would get special consideration. It is understood that these offenders will be returning to the community as well and therefore may be allowed to participate based on space availability, programming needs, and other special considerations.

The two risk assessment scores would be reviewed along with the current offense and the inmates behavior in the jail before a recommendation would be made for program participation. The jail and probation would work together to assure appropriate referrals.

**Minimum Length of Stay:** For the facility to be successful in its goal to improve transition back to the community, providing appropriate behavioral programming and employment related training will be imperative. For that reason, the sub-committee would recommend at least 60

days in the facility and up to 12 months. For optimal programming progression, the majority of offenders should be in the facility for at least 180 days. One wing, or one area of the facility depending on need, may be specifically designated for individuals requiring less intensive programming or training needs and could be made available to individuals with less than 60 days left on their sentence.

***Time Served in Jail:*** The sub-committee is not recommending that individuals be required to spend a minimum amount of their sentence in the Jail. Generally speaking, most individuals will have already been in the Jail for some time awaiting their trial. But more importantly in conversations with other successfully run facilities, requiring a minimum length of the sentence to be served in the jail does not translate into a successful transition back into the community. Retaining the flexibility of the professionals administering the Jail and the staff-secure facility is necessary to achieving the goals of jail population management and ensuring that the residential facility is a cost-effective program. Arbitrarily assigning a minimum time to be served in the Jail could result in suppressing the number of individuals eligible to be moved into the staff secure facility. The efforts of the County Parole Board, which includes both the Chief Probation Officer and the Director of Corrections, show that careful consideration will be given to public safety needs and the legitimate need for an individual to be punished for their crime before consideration for transition to this facility is given.

### **Facility Design**

***Facility Location:*** Staff is in preliminary conversations with Napa State Hospital administrators regarding vacant buildings on their campus that may be easily converted into a staff secure facility. Specifically, the County has identified building “M-6” as a potential location for the facility.

The building is equipped with appropriate kitchen, restroom, office and other ancillary facilities. The design also allows for the housing of three separate groups within the facility in separate wings. As mentioned above, the sub-committee is proposing that this be a co-ed facility. One wing would be used for males, one for females and the third wing could be used for lower risk offenders that had perhaps already have outside jobs or will quickly be employed, are attending school or are participating in other programs. The reasoning of offering a separate wing is to keep this lower risk group apart from higher risk offenders, which as research has shown, can be detrimental to their rehabilitation. Critical to the design is the fact that each wing has separate group rooms that would be available for programs. This would allow for separation as appropriate and it would be possible to do gender specific programming.

Additionally, the facility is co-located near the McAllister Institute, the County’s drug and alcohol treatment center, which would expand options to provide substance abuse treatment. The location also allows for access to public transit; inmates would have access to needed social services offered by Health and Human Services or other community based organizations and opportunities for employment located in the City of Napa – the County’s largest urban area. The

facility would also be located near Napa Valley College, a partnership the County could pursue to become a resource for education programming options.

Because of these location amenities and because of a relatively small need for major renovation, the Napa State Hospital site is ideal for the proposed facility.

**Facility Capacity:** Given the facility design, the need for programming space, and the intention to separate residents by gender, the sub-committee estimates that the facility could program could accommodate up to 50 offenders. Females could be located in the smaller wing resulting in a facility breakdown of 10 females and 40 males. Generally, 20% of arrests in the County are females.

**Security Features:** The facility will be equipped with window/door alarms, strategically located cameras, drug/alcohol monitoring systems, re-entry search and testing protocols, random contraband searches, and other policies that will help protect residents and the neighboring community. However, inherent in the mission of a staff secure facility is the ability for inmates to have the flexibility to pursue work, educational, program, and social opportunities in the community to assist them in their transition out of custody. Security staff will be present 24-hours a day and a walk-away would be considered an “escape” and be prosecuted as such, but our review of other facilities has shown that inmates generally realize the incentives in following the rules well outweigh the option to participate in illicit activities while residents of the facility.

### **Facility Staffing**

There are three categories of staffing for the facility:

1. *Security Staff:* Staffing for the facility would not need to be peace officer status. The program could be run by county staff or by contracted staff. Staffing would need to be a minimum of two staff per shift for supervision of the program. Female staff would be available on each shift. There may also be the need to employ a “reception” staff member that could handle the flow of individuals in and out of the facility at certain times of the day/week. Reviews of other facilities shows that the strict testing and search protocols upon return to the facility help to reduce the temptation in engaging in illegal activities while out of the facility or attempting to bring illicit materials into the facility. To maintain coverage, a total of nine security staff members would be required.
2. *Program Staff:* Key to the entire concept of a staff secure facility is the presence of case managers or counselors. These staff members engage the inmates in developing a transition plan that helps address their main criminogenic factors and their practical needs, such as job training and obtaining permanent housing. The sub-committee believes that given the size of the facility, one full time counselor could manage the caseload and assist in running the program groups. It would also be beneficial to have a probation officer co-facilitate the groups in the program. If the majority of offenders are unemployed and therefore in the program more hours (rather than leaving the facility for job/educational opportunities), a second counselor would be needed to be able to run evening groups in addition to the day

time programming. Because of these unknown factors, the sub-committee is estimating two counselors would be required.

3. *Facility Administration:* There would also need to be one manager over the program who would report to the Chief Probation Officer. Current Probation staff could likely absorb some of the administrative needs this facility would generate (i.e. budgeting, clerical). This would have to be reviewed for practicality once more defined roles are established. Staff responsible for the supervision of the program could also monitor any offender out in the community on GPS. The sub-committee is estimating that one facility manager will be required.

### **Programming/Training Opportunities**

The majority of offenders would receive some programs within the facility. As noted above, for this reason, a longer length of stay optimal. The majority of offenders should be sent to the program for at least 180 days. The shortest length of stay should be 60 days.

There are two options for program needs of offenders. One is to provide all programs on site. The second option is for those offenders who qualify, they could attend their program at the Community Corrections Service Center. Offenders who are unemployed would all be required to complete job training services. Offenders that require residential substance abuse treatment could receive their treatment at McAllister, located nearby to the proposed NSH facility, either at the beginning or end of their stay in this program. Offenders that go to residential in the beginning of the program could have as an incentive, if they graduate, that they will not be required to stay in the staff secure program but could be released home sooner.

Programs that should be offered by the facility include cognitive behavioral groups for anger management, life skills, criminal thinking and low level substance abuse (higher level offenders could attend treatment at the county facility). Additionally, it will be important to offer gender specific curriculum to the females in the program. Programs could be either through NCTI, job skills, Thinking for a Change or MRT (if staff are trained or provided by BI). Medium risk offenders should receive at least 100 hours of cognitive behavioral programming while in the facility. High risk offenders should receive at least 200 hours of program.

Another area of programs that would need to occur is pro-social activities. . Additionally, residents who participate actively in their programs, follow the rules of the facility, and are deemed by their case managers to be progressing on their plan could earn social passes. Again, this is to allow them to build the foundation for a return to the community.

### **General Items**

***Food Service/Laundry:*** The sub-committee believes that the kitchen and on-site food preparation may provide opportunities for inmates to learn a new skill and be required to have a meaningful role in the daily running of the facility. However, the Jail is currently considering a

number of changes to their meal program, one of which is to outsource the program to a contractor. If the decision is made to do this, the sub-committee would recommend that meals for the staff-secure facility also be included on this contract. This would eliminate the need for County staff to supervise food programs at two locations. The kitchen on-site may still be used as a part of skill training or pro-social activities but would not be needed for full meal preparation and delivery.

Laundry facilities are adequate on site, and the sub-committee would recommend that each housing area be equipped with washer/dryers. As each inmate will be allowed to have their own "street" clothes rather than an issued uniform, they could do their own laundry as needed. Policies could be developed for the maintenance of bedding, towel, etc. issued to the individual.

**Transportation:** The proposed location is served by the Napa County Transportation & Planning Agency (NCPTA) VINE bus route system. Individuals should be able to access services and employment throughout the County. Once partnerships with program providers, employers and others are better established it may be beneficial to revisit the concept of having a facility van to transport individuals to and from their activities.

**Visiting:** The facility has ample room to accommodate official visiting areas. Efforts should be made to accommodate a range of visiting times and days, especially for the individuals who are not at the stage of having releases to leave the facility. Strong, pro-social relationships will be an important factor in a successful community transition.

**Medical:** Medical provision remains an unknown factor at this point. As individuals will continue to receive time credits it is unclear whether they would be eligible for programs such as Medi-CAL. In general, because the concept behind this facility is a reduction in the number of inmates housed in the Jail it is reasonable to assume a renegotiation of the County's contract with California Forensic Medical Group (CFMG) would be appropriate. It is likely the County could arrange for services to be provided to residents similar to the manner in which the Juvenile Hall (limited nurse call hours and "pill pass"). However, potential cost impact is unknown. There might also be the potential to use the services the County's Health and Human Services Agency offers such as Clinic Ole. In certain situations, inmates currently have access to these services. This is an area that should be explored in further detail with staff from both County Counsel and Health and Human Services.

**Policies:** A comprehensive set of policies should be developed that range from acceptable clothing and personal item inventories to behavior expectations. Programs reviewed in other counties had detailed sets of policies. In the sub-committee's review, these policies helped to establish the tone of the facility and allowed the residents to fully understand what was expected of them leading to fewer problem incidents.

**Annual Budget Estimate**

The annual operating costs are outlined below:

	<b>Annual Cost</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Security Staff (12 FTE)	\$960,000	Includes salary and benefits (\$80k per year per FTE) 9 FTE for two 24/7 posts 3 FTE for "Reception" needs
Counseling Staff (2 FTE)	\$200,000	Includes salary and benefits (\$100k per year per FTE)
Administrative Staff (1 FTE)	\$125,000	Includes salary and benefits (\$125k per year per FTE)
Program Costs	\$15,000	Includes program workbooks, computers, brochures, etc. associated with programs offered in the facility
Food/Supplies	\$100,000	
<b>Total Estimated Annual Costs:</b>	<b>\$1,400,000</b>	