

PLEASE NOTE THESE RESPONSES HAVE BEEN RE-TYPED IN ORDER TO PLACE ON THE GRAND JURY WEBSITE. COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL RESPONSE CAN BE OBTAINED FROM THE GRAND JURY OFFICE OR THE DEPARTMENT/AGENCY RESPONDING.

**RESPONSE**  
**2001-2002 GRAND JURY REPORT**  
**Riverside County Sheriff's Department**  
**Banning Jail and Booking Facility**

**Date Report Distributed:** 12/13/01  
**Response Due Date:** 03/13/02  
**Date Response Received:** 03/07/02  
**Response Received From:** Executive Office (Board of Supervisors)  
Larry D. Smith, Sheriff  
Signed by William Luna, Director of Administrative Services

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FROM:** EXECUTIVE OFFICE                      **SUBMITTAL DATE:** February 26, 2002

**SUBJECT:** Response to Grand Jury Report: Riverside County Sheriff's Department Banning Jail and Booking Facility

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** That the Board of Supervisors:

- 1) Receive and file the attached response to the Grand Jury's recommendations regarding the Riverside County Sheriff's Department Banning Jail and Booking Facility.
- 2) Direct the Clerk of the Board to immediately forward the Board's finalized response to the Grand Jury, to the Presiding Judge, and to the County Clerk-Recorder (for mandatory filing with the State).

**BACKGROUND:** On January 8, 2002, the Board directed staff to prepare a draft of the Board's response to the Grand Jury's report regarding the Riverside County Sheriff's Department Banning Jail and Booking Facility.

Section 933 ( c ) of the Penal Code requires that the Board of Supervisors comment on the Grand Jury's recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the Board, and that a response be provided to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within 90 days. The Sheriff provided the attached report in which the Executive Office concurs.

The independently elected Sheriff will be transmitting their response to the Grand Jury's findings and recommendations to the Grand Jury as provided for by Section 933.05 of the Penal Code.

TONY CARSTENS  
Deputy County Executive Officer.

**PLEASE NOTE THESE RESPONSES HAVE BEEN RE-TYPED IN ORDER TO PLACE ON THE GRAND JURY WEBSITE. COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL RESPONSE CAN BE OBTAINED FROM THE GRAND JURY OFFICE OR THE DEPARTMENT/AGENCY RESPONDING.**

February 20, 2002

Honorable Board of Supervisors  
County of Riverside  
4080 Lemon Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Riverside, CA 92501

RE: Grand Jury Report-Banning Jail and Booking Facility

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Board:

This is in response to the 2001-2002 Grand Jury Report on the Riverside County Sheriff's Department Banning Jail and Booking Facility.

**Findings A: 1-10: Banning Correctional Facility Booking Area:**

Respondent agrees with the findings.

The Grand Jury's findings 1-10 regarding the "Banning Correctional Facility Booking Area" are substantially accurate, as statements of fact. With the limited amount of booking activity that takes place at the Banning Correctional Facility (BCF), the facilities meet the current needs of the Riverside Sheriff's Department.

**Findings B: 1-8: Former Banning Jail and Booking Facility**

Respondent agrees with the findings.

The Grand Jury's findings on the "Former Banning Jail and Booking Facility" are generally factual, but contain several items that may have been formulated based upon incomplete information. The Banning Jail was rated as a Type I facility. It has been decommissioned by the Board of Corrections (BOC) as a Type I facility. The Riverside Sheriff's Department has approval from the BOC to utilize the jail as court holding cells for the adjacent courtrooms.

If the Riverside Sheriff's Department planned to return the facility to a Type I booking and holding facility, there would be a number of items to consider. While the Banning Jail contains 32 actual beds, the Board of Corrections rating for the jail is actually for 12 beds. This is based upon requirements for square footage, seating areas, and restroom facilities. If the Department requests to expand the number of beds (more than the approved 12), the jail will be held to the current Title 24 standards. This would include construction of a male sobering cell and a female sobering cell (only one sobering cell exists within the facility, at this time).

It would be required that there be a 100 square foot medical examination room and a separate 100 square foot confidential medical consultation room. The County would have to add one or two safety cells. The County would have to add or upgrade security cameras and monitors for

**PLEASE NOTE THESE RESPONSES HAVE BEEN RE-TYPED IN ORDER TO PLACE ON THE GRAND JURY WEBSITE. COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL RESPONSE CAN BE OBTAINED FROM THE GRAND JURY OFFICE OR THE DEPARTMENT/AGENCY RESPONDING.**

the holding cells, safety cells, and the sobering cells. The County would have to add electronic communications equipment for those cells as well. The proposal would involve significant cost.

If the Banning Jail were to reopen as a 24 hour per day, seven day per week operation, the staffing requirements would call for three correctional staff members on duty at all times. This would require new positions and an increase to the Sheriff's budget. Other staffing issues to consider would include the County Detention Health Agency being required to provide nurses and mental health workers to the facility.

Therefore, the Grand Jury proposal to reopen the Banning Jail does not present a cost effective plan.

### **Recommendations:**

Recommendations 1 through 5 of the Report are addressed individually.

1. *Discontinue use of the BCF as a booking and holding facility.*

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not Reasonable.

The Jail Planning Unit assigned to the Corrections Division is currently studying the feasibility of building a new booking and receiving facility at BCF. An architectural firm has been tasked with developing a master plan for BCF and the booking facility will be a part of the master plan.

2. *Reopen the former Banning Jail and Booking Facility as a Type 1 detention facility for use by local arresting agencies.*

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

At the present time, internal studies indicate that it is not economical or efficient to reopen the Banning Jail. Bringing the building up to current Title 24 standards and funding the required personnel to staff the jail makes the project cost prohibitive, at this time. We have no plans to reopen the facility as a Type 1 jail.

3. *Continue to use the jail to temporarily hold inmates who are awaiting court proceedings.*

The recommendation has been implemented.

We agree with the recommendation, as we have no plans to discontinue the current court holding use of the Banning Jail.

4. *Assign management of the Banning Jail and Booking Facility to the Commander of the BCF.*

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

**PLEASE NOTE THESE RESPONSES HAVE BEEN RE-TYPED IN ORDER TO PLACE ON THE GRAND JURY WEBSITE. COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL RESPONSE CAN BE OBTAINED FROM THE GRAND JURY OFFICE OR THE DEPARTMENT/AGENCY RESPONDING.**

If the Banning Jail were recommissioned, this would be the logical choice for introducing a command structure, however, we have no plans to reopen the facility.

5. *Continue the use of BCF deputies to operate the reopened facility, adding more staff when and if necessary.*

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

We have no plans to reopen the facility. Further, the impacts of past personnel adjustments by the County (deletion of unfunded positions) have eliminated flexibility within the Corrections Division that would have previously been available to shift to the Banning Jail. Opening the Banning Jail would require new line level positions, supervisory positions, and support positions, remote from BCF.

The Riverside Sheriff's Department welcomes the observations of the Grand Jury, and appreciates the opportunity to respond.

Sincerely,

LARRY D. SMITH, SHERIFF

(Signature of William Luna)

William Luna  
Director of Administrative Services

(body of report)

## **Findings**

(body of report)

## **Recommendations (List departments)**

- 1.