

2024-2025 RIVERSIDE COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT

In-Custody Homicide at Site-B Blamed on Prisoner Identification Errors

SUMMARY

The Riverside County Sheriff is responsible for the safety and security of inmates, staff, and the community. The Sheriff's Department and Riverside County Board members may hear from citizens who believe the system fails to assure protection. In a recent gathering, protesters were seen carrying signs: "**Under Bianco: Record In-Custody Deaths!**"¹

Various media reports since 2022 have highlighted the numbers and problems with in-custody deaths in Riverside County jails. Therefore the California Attorney General has an ongoing civil rights investigation.² According to one report, an inmate death in Riverside County, which occurred at the Larry D. Smith facility in Banning, California, while in the custody of the Riverside County Sheriff's Department, brought the total in-custody deaths to six (6) during 2024.³

Riverside County's Sheriff said in a recent interview, "RSO (Riverside Sheriff's Office) personnel.... do a commendable job taking care of our inmates and protecting them from themselves. *We do an industry-leading fantastic job in our corrections division and are not responsible for any of these deaths.*"⁴

On the contrary, the Riverside County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) became aware of an incident that resulted in an in-custody homicide, which could have been prevented if the Sheriff's Correctional staff at the Robert Presley Detention Center had been more diligent in performing their duties and had followed the applicable policies and procedures.

This report will explain what mistakes were committed during the booking and processing of a certain arrestee. That person later caused fatal injuries to another inmate at the SITE-B⁵ facility and has since been charged with murder. The investigation of that murder is "on-going."

The Grand Jury's investigation was limited to the booking and processing procedures at the Robert Presley Detention Center (RPDC), specifically how arrestees are identified and classified for housing. Subsequently, the Grand Jury also reviewed the clearance and enrollment process at SITE-B, which apparently relied on the identification and classification information completed at RPDC.

¹ Riverside County Sheriff Chad Bianco Announces Run For Governor; February 18, 2025; <https://riversiderecord.org/chad-bianco-california-governor/>; Accessed Apr 8, 2025

² State launches investigation into death rate in Riverside County Jails; <https://www.pressenterprise.com/2023/02/23/state-launches-investigation-into-death-rate-in-riverside-county-jails/>; Accessed Apr 8, 2025

³ Man dies in Banning jail after deputies pepper spray combatant; <https://www.pressenterprise.com/2024/12/26/man-dies-in-banning-jail-after-deputies-pepper-spray-combatants/>; Accessed Apr 8, 2025

⁴ *ibid*

⁵ Site-B: Sheriff's Inmate Training & Education Bureau, Banning, Ca

The Grand Jury's investigation discovered 10 significant deficiencies in the booking, business office, and classification process at RPDC, and in the clearance and enrollment process at SITE-B in Banning. These deficiencies are listed in the FINDINGS section of this report.

Recommendations for improvement to help prevent similar mistakes in the future will be highlighted in this report. In summary, the recommendations are:

1. Institute clear instructions and a procedure for validation of the Livescan report, including cross-referencing arrestee aliases in the Jail Information Management System (JIMS).
2. Either eliminate the requirement to complete a COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling) Assessment, as required by the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP #3), at Site-B, or implement it as intended for inmates prior to being cleared and enrolled in SITE-B programs.
3. Organize and implement mandatory training programs, including annual re-certification for SITE-B staff responsible for clearance and enrollment procedures to include familiarization with booking, business office, and classification procedures.
4. Organize and implement mandatory training programs, including annual re-certification, at the Ben Clark Training Center for staff members involved in the booking, business office, and classification procedures.
5. To reduce "fluidity" and subjectivity in the classification process, include in the Intake and Release Policy (#504.10), written procedures to require classification staff to review the Livescan report, probable cause statement and the criminal history report of an arrestee.
6. Perform a detailed review of the policies and procedures for the Booking and Business Office, specifically Intake & Release [#504.10], and Fingerprinting/Booking & Photographs [#504.26] to replace vaguely worded instructions with clear directives.
7. Repair and require use of the current Integrated Biometric Information System (IBIS), or acquire a different system to accurately identify an arrestee at the onset of the booking process.
8. Develop and implement an electronic database to record all booking and processing errors identified by the Breakdown Workstation in the Business Office (RPDC). The tracking system is to help identify the root causes and to lead to the implementation of preventive measures (i.e., continuous improvement program).
9. Finalize the negotiations with selected vendor(s) and initiate contracts to implement jail management systems upgrades.



BACKGROUND

On September 5, 2024, deputies were summoned to the Sheriff's Inmate Training and Education Bureau (SITE-B) within the Larry D Smith Correctional Facility. An inmate working in the Greybar Printing (print shop) was assaulted with a deadly weapon. The victim was transported to a local hospital with life-threatening injuries. He later succumbed to his injuries.

The Riverside Sheriff's Corrections Central Investigations Unit, along with the Riverside Sheriff's Central Homicide Unit, responded and assumed responsibility for the investigation. The suspect in that incident, who reportedly was in custody for "*making criminal threats and brandishing a firearm*", was detained. He remains in custody, pending murder charges. The Sheriff's Media Information Bureau listed this as an **In-Custody Homicide**.⁶

The Grand Jury opened an investigation of the procedures and criteria for the clearance and enrollment of inmates into the SITE-B program. After a preliminary review, it was determined that inmate classification, starting with an arrestee's identification at the Robert Presley Detention Center (RPDC), where the subject inmate (suspect) was originally processed, would be the focal point of the investigation.

According to records provided by the Correctional staff at RPDC, the suspect was originally classified as level 3 (Medium) for housing purposes at RPDC. Although the subject inmate was arrested for "*making criminal threats and brandishing a firearm*", his rating classification assessment form indicated 'Non-Violent'.

Immediately following the stabbing incident at SITE-B it was learned that the suspect was processed through the prison's booking and business office under an alias that disguised his true criminal history. Otherwise, the suspect would have been classified in a higher risk category.

The suspect was reclassified to level 5 (Maximum), which is the second most violent classification designation. That level, according to sources interviewed, would have made him ineligible for enrollment in the SITE-B program.

The classification of the subject inmate should have been well documented at RPDC. Therefore, the specific areas of interest for this investigation involved the fingerprinting and classification procedures at that location.

⁶ Media Information Bureau [Press Releases]: <https://www.riversidesheriff.org/CivicAlerts.aspx?AID=5823>; Accessed Apr 8, 2025



METHODOLOGY

The Grand Jury's investigation focused on the inmate processing procedures at the Robert Presley Detention Center (RPDC), specifically how arrestees are identified and classified for housing. Subsequently, the Grand Jury also reviewed the clearance and enrollment process at SITE-B, which apparently relied on the identification and classification information completed at RPDC.

The Grand Jury investigation included the following:

1. Interviewed correctional deputies, correctional sergeants, lieutenants, captains and subject matter experts from Robert Presley Detention Center, Larry D. Smith Correctional Facility, and Technology Services Bureau.
2. Reviewed the Riverside Sheriff's Department Corrections Division Policies and Procedures. The Grand Jury focused on six (6) specific Corrections Division Policies:
 - 504.02: Classification
 - 504.02 Att. 2: Classification Training Manual
 - 504.10: Intake and Release
 - 504.26: Fingerprinting/Booking & Photographs
 - 506.05: California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)
 - 506.12: Jail Information Management System (JIMS)
3. Reviewed the SITE-B Program Enrollment Standard Operating Procedures (SOP):
 - SOP 3: Program Enrollment Process
 - SOP 4: Program Clearance and Classification
 - SOP 5: Program Classification Deputy
4. Reviewed documents made available by the Sheriff's Professional Standards Bureau for subject inmates⁷, including the following:
 - SITE-B Program Enrollment process and related documents for subject inmates
 - Jail Information Management System (JIMS) for subject inmates
 - Classification Assessment Form (Housing) for subject inmates
 - Criminal History & Criminal Complaint (Criminal Case Print- RIVCO Superior Courts)
 - Criminal Identification Index (CII)
 - Livescan (Cal-ID)
 - Receiving Sheet (Defendant Information)
 - Probable Cause for Warrantless Arrest for subject inmate
 - In-Custody Behavior Report

⁷ Specifically, the inmates involved in the SITE-B incident on September 5, 2024

- Classification and Mental Health Assessments
 - SITE-B Program Clearance & Enrollment documents
5. Presentations by Riverside County Sheriff's Correctional Deputies & staff:
- Booking and Business Office [Onsite at RPDC]
 - Booking and Business Office Training Program [Presented by Subject Matter Expert]
6. Bibliography: The Civil Grand Jury also accessed published reports and pertinent articles listed here.
- Tools COMPAS; <https://criminaljustice.tooltrack.org/tool/16627>
[\[criminaljustice.tooltrack.org\]](https://criminaljustice.tooltrack.org/)
 - Booking and Processing Procedures; <https://criminal-justice.iresearchnet.com/criminal-justice-process/arrest-and-charging/booking-and-processing-procedures/>
 - Classification of Arrestees Upon Entry Into a Jail;
https://www.llrmi.com/articles/legal_update/jail_classification/
 - Demystifying 7 Myths About Jail Classification Systems;
<https://www.samuelsgroup.net/blog/jail-classification-systems>; Accessed
 - Relationship of Offender Classification to the Problems of Prison Overcrowding;
<https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/relationship-offender-classification-problems-prison-overcrowding>
 - Objective Jail Classification Systems: A Guide for Jail Administrators;
<https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/objective-jail-classification-systems-guide-jail-administrators>
 - Improving California's Prison Inmate Classification System;
<https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2019/4023/inmate-classification-050219.pdf>
 - Critical Issues and Developments in Prison Classification; http://jfa-associates.com/_static/4ae29d0652f2c8aa1107d55ee974dcc1/09_critical_issues2001.pdf?dl=1
 - 2013-2014 Civil Grand Jury Report: "Riverside County Sheriff's Department Corrections Division"; <https://rivco.org/civil-grand-jury>
 - 2023-2024 Riverside County Civil Grand Jury Report: "Sheriff's Inmate Training & Education Bureau (SITE-B)"; <https://rivco.org/civil-grand-jury>

~

DISCUSSION

The Grand Jury conducted interviews in order to learn about the policies, procedures, and actual practices related to booking, classification, and business office processes as it pertains to the verification of inmate identities.

In addition, interviews were conducted to gain an understanding of inmate clearance and enrollment in SITE-B programs. The investigation focused on identifying possible system failures.

Specifically, the areas of concern were: a) adherence to applicable policies and procedures for administering the booking and processing of an arrestee, b) misidentification of an arrestee at the Robert Presley Detention Center, c) misclassification of that inmate for housing at that facility and d) the inmate's improper clearance for enrollment in a SITE-B program at the Larry D Smith Correctional Facility.

SECTION I: RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF'S CORRECTIONAL POLICES & PROCEDURES

A detailed review of Policies and Procedures for the Sheriff's Correctional and Classification areas revealed a few troubling deficiencies and applicability of several procedural instructions.

- 504.10 Intake & Release
- 504.26 Fingerprinting/Booking & Photographs

The following are examples of some of the confusing, vague, or contradictory instructional language contained within the policies the Grand Jury discovered during this investigation:

Policy 504.10: Intake and Release states that "custody staff assigned to intake '*can*' utilize the Integrated Biometric Information System (IBIS) as a tool to help identify arrestees at the onset of the booking process." The word "*can*" appears to make the use of the IBIS system optional, as opposed to mandatory. During the Grand Jury's investigation, it was discovered that there are no biometric devices in use at RPDC at the onset of the booking process.

Policy 504.26: Fingerprinting/Booking & Photographs states that a "request for arrestee identity confirmation '*can*' be initiated by the arresting agency or the booking officer."

Given the importance of positively identifying an arrestee in the booking process, it's concerning that the policy leaves the request for identity an option as opposed to a mandate.

The Grand Jury learned through interviews with correctional staff that an oversight in the identification of an inmate in the booking process is what led to that inmate, who was ultimately determined to be a violent felon, gaining admittance to a vocational education program at SITE-B. Otherwise that inmate would not have been cleared or enrolled in the program at all.

The alias the subject inmate used was associated with a second CII# that showed one prior arrest and incarceration for thirty days. The true subject inmate's identity, once discovered, revealed a very different picture. It was discovered that he had a 35-year violent criminal history and over 10 years of state prison time served. With this type of criminal history, the subject inmate should never have been allowed to serve in the vocational program he was in. He assaulted an inmate who died as a result of the injuries he inflicted.

When the Sheriff's Department advised the Grand Jury of the errors that were made, it was assured that changes had been implemented to prevent such errors in the future. During multiple subsequent interviews with correctional staff it was discovered that no changes had been made.

In fact, the Grand Jury was told that the policies and procedure in place were adequate and just needed to be adhered to.

SECTION II: MISIDENTIFICATION OF AN ARRESTEE AT RPDC

Booking and Processing Procedures

Booking Procedures:

Booking is the critical first step performed immediately after an individual is taken into custody. The booking of an arrested individual is to establish an accurate profile and is the fundamental first step of the administrative processes which follow an individual's arrest. The purpose is to provide an organized and reliable record.⁸

Correctional deputies obtain essential information to fully identify the arrested individual, including legal name, aliases, addresses, date of birth, and any other significant details. Criminal charges, and/or allegations against the arrestee are identified and documented during this process.

Biometric data, such as fingerprints and photographs, are also captured during the booking process to assure the accuracy and reliability of the information collected.

Business Office (Processing) Procedures:

Processing involves certain actions that are intended to safeguard the rights of the accused, as well as to assure the safety of staff and the public. The “*fluidity*” of processing allows for the “*seamless transition from the initial arrest to subsequent phases*”.

Meticulous execution of the structured processing procedures facilitates the ‘.... *trajectory of cases and individuals through the legal system*’. “*Understanding the continuum from booking to the various processing steps provides insight into the complexities and challenges.*”⁹

Riverside County Sheriff's Correctional Division at RPDC addresses these challenges in their Business Office at four distinct units:

- Register Workstation handles the inmate property and logs in/catalogues the inmate's belongings, including any monies in their possession when they arrive at the facility.
- CLETS (California Law Enforcement Teletype System) Workstation receives the Livescan report back from Cal ID with the inmate's criminal history and CII (Criminal Index Identification) Number.

⁸ Booking and Processing Procedures: <https://criminal-justice.iresearchnet.com/criminal-justice-process/arrest-and-charging/booking-and-processing-procedures/>; Accessed Apr 8, 2025

⁹ *ibid*

- JIMS (Jail Information Management System) Workstation updates the jail information management system with all of the relevant information obtained in the process up to this point.
- Breakdown Workstation audits the entire booking/inmate file and the work performed in the process.

Through interviews with various Sheriff's Department personnel, the Grand Jury learned that during the booking and processing of subject inmate, the CLETS Workstation did not update the system with the information received from the Cal ID Livescan report. They failed to discover that the arrestee was entering the facility under an alias with a different CII Number than the one assigned under his real name.

The Grand Jury requested a copy of the Livescan report that was received from Cal ID on the subject inmate. The document was received on February 27, 2025. After a review of the document, it was clear that the subject inmate's true identity was listed on the Livescan report, in addition to the alias he used in the booking process. The Livescan report showed that the alias and the true identification of the subject inmate were the same person based on the fingerprints.

It was also discovered that the date of birth for the alias had been changed by one day and five years. The CLETS Workstation missed both the use of an alias, and the fact that the CII number on the Livescan report did not match the CII number on the booking sheet.

In addition to the error made at the CLETS Workstation, the Breakdown Workstation, which audits the entire process, missed the fact that the Livescan CII and the Booking CII numbers did not match. The Grand Jury learned that these types of mistakes are not tracked by the Sheriff's Department, and there is no way of knowing how frequently this may be occurring. Furthermore, there is no continuous improvement process in place within the department to track and correct these types of mistakes to prevent them from occurring in the future.

The Grand Jury inquired about the type of training which staff in the Business Office receive in order to perform their duties. It was learned that there was approximately two weeks of on-the-job training at each of the four workstations in the Business Office prior to assuming the duties of any of the four workstations.

There is also a class taught at the Ben Clark Training Center on the various Business Office functions. The class is a four-hour class, and is not mandatory, but is voluntary.

Technology in Booking and Processing:

Electronic fingerprinting, use of biometrics, and computerized criminal history databases, have been developed and implemented to enhance the efficiency and the accuracy in the booking phase of an individual taken into custody.¹⁰

¹⁰ Booking and Processing Procedures: <https://criminal-justice.iresearchnet.com/criminal-justice-process/arrest-and-charging/booking-and-processing-procedures/>; Accessed Apr 9, 2025

Electronic fingerprinting is designed to provide rapid and accurate identification. The current technology is capable of capturing and digitizing “unique fingerprint patterns”. Biometric data includes “facial recognition and iris scans”, which is designed to deliver “precision of identification”. The implementation of this technology is to prevent, or at least reduce, the errors typically caused by manual data entry, and to expedite the booking process.

The last update to the systems used by the Sheriff’s Department was approximately 30 years ago. The Grand Jury was told that requests for systems upgrades have been implemented, and vendor selection is in progress. At the July 11, 2023 meeting, the Board of Supervisors approved a consulting agreement with the National Public Safety Group for their consultation on and for the Computer Aided Dispatch, Record Management System, and Jail Management System. The agreement is for four (4) years [Total Cost - \$1,181,500; up to \$354,450 in additional compensation]. This expense is “100% Sheriff’s Budget.”¹¹

The Grand Jury was informed that the Sheriff’s office is currently evaluating recommendations for new technology. As of the date of this report, the project is reportedly in phase 2 of the 5 phases of a project timeline. Based on information provided in interviews, project implementation will be approximately two years, beginning with contract negotiation to commence shortly. This project involves extensive enhancements to the Sheriff Department’s technological capabilities, especially the Jail Information Systems. Importantly, the new systems will involve more than upgrading current technology. It will be a complete replacement of outdated and obsolete operating systems “from a different era”.

To summarize, an arrestee’s “*journey through the criminal justice system*” begins with the completion of the formal procedures during booking and processing in accordance with established policies. The significance of the booking process, as the “*foundational step*”, is that it establishes the critical record that controls the “*trajectory of an individual’s interaction with the criminal justice system*”.¹² The integration of technology in the booking and processing procedures by law enforcement is to ensure the accuracy of the recorded information.

Riverside County Sheriff’s Department policies and procedures outline the use of an Integrated Biometric Information System (IBIS) to do a quick ID check using an iris scan or a thumb print. During its tour of the RPDC, the Grand Jury inquired about this and requested to see it. The Grand Jury was told that it wasn’t currently working, was frequently broken down and multiple work orders had been submitted over the years to fix it.

The Grand Jury made an official document request for the work orders that had been submitted. In response to its request, the Sheriff’s Department only produced one work order that had been submitted in the prior two years, and it was for the IBIS system at the John J. Benoit Detention Center in Indio.

¹¹ Statement of Proceedings of the Board of Supervisors Riverside County [July 11, 2023 Policy Calendar 3.38]: https://media.rivcocob.org/proceeds/2023/p2023_07_11.htm; Accessed Apr 8, 2025

¹² Booking and Processing Procedures: <https://criminal-justice.iresearchnet.com/criminal-justice-process/arrest-and-charging/booking-and-processing-procedures/>; Accessed Apr 8, 2025

SECTION III: MISCLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT INMATE FOR HOUSING AT RPDC

Classification of Arrestees Upon Entry into a Jail

The classification of arrestees upon entry into a jail can impact the safety and security of the jail, its staff, and other prisoners.

Cases of “inmate-on-inmate assaults” have been attributed to issues related to classification.¹³

The policies and practices of jails for inmate classification and housing have been under scrutiny as a result of several cases before the United States Supreme Court.¹⁴ For example, with prison “overcrowding,” classification decisions can be made in a “*haphazard manner*” and/or more restrictive (prisoners are “*overclassified*”).¹⁵ In addition to limited resources and space, as well as increased stress on the system, errors in classification can and do occur.

Errors can result in assigning inmates based only on what space is available, or assigning the inmates with special needs to a more “secure” facility.

Objective Classification Systems

Objective prison classification systems were adopted by the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the California Department of Corrections in the late 1970s¹⁶. It changed how inmates are to be classified and managed and is still in use today.

Classification procedures are purported to be objective and indisputable. But according to those interviewed, certain sections of a classification document allowed for “fluidity” in determining what was selected on the form. This implied the deputies could use some discretion and often was based on their subjective judgement, which could be influenced by a review of the arresting officer’s statement of the facts (probable cause statement).

Inmate misconduct is one criterion used in objective classification systems. Correctional policies are written to determine the appropriate custody level consistent with an inmate’s threat to the safety and security of the public, other inmates, correctional staff, and to self.

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), and many jail systems, rely on an objective “inmate classification system.” The system determines how inmates should be assigned to different housing security levels and what level of supervision is required for their

¹³ Classification of Arrestees Upon Entry Into a Jail: https://www.llrmi.com/articles/legal_update/jail_classification/; Accessed Apr 9, 2025

¹⁴ *ibid*

¹⁵ Relationship of Offender Classification to the Problems of Prison Overcrowding <https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/relationship-offender-classification-problems-prison-overcrowding>; Accessed Apr 9, 2025

¹⁶ Critical Issues and Developments in Prison Classification: http://jfa-associates.com/_static/4ae29d0652f2c8aa1107d55ee974dce1/09_critical_issues2001.pdf?dl=1; Accessed Apr 9, 2025

daily activities. A housing security level is based on an inmate's risk of misconduct and is recorded as a "housing score."¹⁷

The effective use of an inmate classification system can ensure the safety of staff, the inmates and the public. It can also affect the inmate's daily experiences and access to rehabilitation opportunities, such as SITE-B programs and other educational opportunities.

An inmate's true identity is a critical piece of information in the classification process. The one piece of information that contains an inmate or arrestee's true identity is the Livescan fingerprint report.

During the Grand Jury's tour of RPDC, it was discovered that, due to delays in receiving Livescan reports back from Cal ID, it is possible that an inmate could be classified and housed prior to the report being received. Although this didn't occur in this case, it could provide a set of circumstances wherein an inmate's true identity and the extent of their violent history may remain hidden. That exposes staff, inmates, and the public working in vocational programs to significant risks.

The Grand Jury inquired of the Sheriff's office how frequently this occurs within the County's jails. The response the Grand Jury received was that this information was not tracked, and therefore they did not know and could not provide an answer.

Purpose of Inmate Classification

*"California was the first state in the nation to use a standardized inmate classification system based on objective criteria. This system was first evaluated in the 1980s. It subsequently underwent a significant overhaul and evaluation in the early 2000s, which formed the basis of the system that is still in place today."*¹⁸

Inmates booked into a county jail must be assigned appropriate housing to ensure their safety and the safety of others. Objective classification is based on different criteria, not just their alleged crime.¹⁹ For example, the inmates' past behaviors, gender, mental health, illnesses, security risks, and other factors are "objectively" considered.

Inmates may be reclassified if their behavior or their circumstances change during their incarceration. Classification deputies may have some flexibility, but not without risk due to the potential for legal and/or civil litigation if an inmate or staff member is harmed. Classification is required by state statute.²⁰ Correctional and classification staff must be trained and authorized to perform the required functions accurately to ensure the safety of staff, the inmates, and the public.

¹⁷ Improving California's Prison Inmate Classification System [Executive Summary]; <https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/4023> Accessed March 25, 2025

¹⁸ Ibid, page 3

¹⁹ Demystifying 7 Myths About Jail Classification Systems: <https://www.samuelsgroup.net/blog/jail-classification-systems>; Accessed Apr 9, 2029

²⁰ New Classification Regulations; <https://prisonlaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/ClassificationattachOct2012.pdf>; Accessed March 25, 2025

With reference to the sample Classification Assessment form shown at Exhibit A, the following decisions were made for the subject inmate, based on an unverified alias that led to a classification score of Level 3 (Medium).

The highlighted sections are the most relevant sections from the form, as completed for subject inmate:

Current Charges: 417-Brandishing Firearm; 422-Making Criminal Threats; 11364-Possessing Drug Paraphernalia

4. Previous Arrest: **Yes in 2024** Charges: **DUI** Age of First Arrest: **20**
 5. Prior Custody: **County Jail** Total Time in County Jail: **1 month**
 State/Federal (when/where): **None**

8. Gang Affiliation: **No**

13. Objective Assessment:

CURRENT OFFENSE	
Narcotic, Property	Persons, Weapons
Non-Violent	3056, VOP, 2800 VC
Vehicular Homicide	Arson, 1551
DUI, 311/314/647/653PC	DV/Stalking

CII Verified – a CII number listed

PC Statement Reviewed- (not checked)

Class Notes/IDAS Points- (checked)

CDCR/BOP Contacted- (not checked)

Any Prior Felony Arrests (separate case) - **YES**

7 or More Cumulative Years -in and/or Any Gang Affiliations State or County, or Federal- **NO**

Behavior Problems, Booked with Holds/Detainers or 4 to 6 Serious Institutional Behavior Problems- **NO**

MINIMUM Level 1	LOW MEDIUM Level 2	MEDIUM Level 3	HIGH MEDIUM Level 4	MAXIMUM Level 5	Ad-Hsg. Level 6
--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	--------------------

14. Based on your current/prior criminal history and above objective classification criteria, you have been classified:

Protective Custody, Level 3

Comments/Override Justification: **No**

16. Classification Level Override Requested: **No**

17. Supervisor Approval for Administrative Custody, Protective Custody and Civil/SYP. Approved By: **Not signed**

Comments: The Grand Jury's investigation found that the subject inmate's correct identification revealed a 35-year violent criminal history. If he had been correctly identified, this classification form would have reflected a higher security level of 5, MAXIMUM.

Further, the decision to select "Non-violent" in the applicable classification section, led to a housing level of "MEDIUM", or level 3 which was in error. If the classification staff had closely scrutinized the subject inmate's Livescan report they should have immediately discovered there were two different CII#s and several aliases used by the arrestee.

Importantly, it would have revealed his true identity. The classification staff knew, or should have known, that the arrestee had a significant and violent criminal history, or as it is commonly referred to, "criminal sophistication". Supervisory oversight was negligent, or for expeditious

processing, simply ignored, or deemed not required. Failure to “cross-reference” the subject inmates’ aliases was noted as a procedural deficiency, which has now been corrected, according to a source interviewed by the Grand Jury.

SECTION IV: CLEARANCE AND ENROLLMENT OF SUBJECT INMATE AT THE LARRY D SMITH CORRECTIONAL FACILITY (SITE-B)

SITE-B was founded in 1998 at the Smith Correctional Facility in Banning, California. Funded programs for inmate training and education include the following:²¹

- Greybar Printing; Laser Engraver
- Culinary Arts
- Construction; Landscaping, Welding
- Barista Program
- Other Educational/Self-Development programs

SITE-B provides access to a reliable support system for inmates to augment the chances for successful transitioning into the community. Acceptance into the SITE-B program is handled by Correctional Classification staff, which involves a thorough assessment of the following criteria:

- In-custody behavior
- Health conditions which limit the ability to benefit from specific programs
- Out-of-county felony warrant(s)*
- Escape risk
- Criminal charges
- Status of sentencing

**(Out-of-county felons are often unable to complete a program prior to being transferred)*

The classification staff at Site-B conducts interviews with inmates to assess their suitability for the program. This evaluation involves reviewing the inmate's data in JIMS, their in-custody behavior report, and a mental health assessment. Additionally, prior criminal charges and the associated probable cause statements are crucial factors in the overall decision-making process.

Once the Classification Unit determines that an incarcerated person qualifies and meets the program criteria, the following procedures apply:

- A Classification Deputy confirms the inmate’s interest in the program
- The inmate signs an agreement that explains the rules of the program
- Medical staff examines the inmate to determine if they are medically cleared
- A report is submitted to the SITE-B Classification Sergeant for entry into the program.

²¹ 2023-24 Riverside County Civil Grand Jury Report: “Sheriff’s Inmate Training & Education Bureau (SITE-B)”; <https://rivco.org/civil-grand-jury>; Accessed Apr 9, 2025

The Riverside County Sheriff's Department Policies and Procedures call for an objective assessment tool to be used in the classification process called the COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling) Assessment.

When a copy of this assessment for the subject inmates was requested from the Sheriff's Department, the Grand Jury was told that this tool was only used in therapeutic programs, and not in the classification process. During several interviews with correctional staff, the Grand Jury was told that the Department had never used this tool, or that the staff member had never seen or heard of it.

Inmates participating in these types of programs must have a "non-violent" criminal history and no disqualifying In-custody Behavior reports. The Grand Jury reviewed the completed form for the subject inmate and found several discrepancies:

1. The Clearance form was prepared in a very cursory manner, with several sections left incomplete:
 - a. JIMS End of Sentence date: blank
 - b. Criminal History: blank
 - c. Medically Cleared: blank
 - d. In-Custody Report- blank
2. The Mental Health score indicated on the form was "MILD", which is inconsistent with other information attributed to the subject inmate.

Other issues discovered regarding the clearance process are:

3. Classification staff failed to review the probable cause statement, describing a violent incident and therefore, should have questioned the "non-violent" rating.
4. Classification staff interviewed by the Grand Jury said that the criminal charges for the subject inmate, as recorded in the Classification document, are of a violent nature. A charge of "making criminal threats and brandishing a deadly weapon" would have disqualified the inmate from further consideration for the program.

During interviews, the Grand Jury learned that Site-B Correctional Classification staff relied on information submitted by the RPDC booking and business office. It is generally accepted that the JIMS for an inmate reflects accurate information. Unfortunately, if the JIMS information is faulty, the staff would not otherwise know. Full acceptance of faulty information, without question, can have deadly consequences for staff, other inmates, and the public.

Supervisory review and approval is required for final acceptance of an inmate into the Site-B program. For the subject inmate, the supervisor's signature was a 'rubber stamp' with the name of a supervisor in charge. Although an initial was shown, there is no evidence an actual supervisor review was conducted in this case.

While this investigation did not address overcrowding in jails/prisons, it was discovered during Grand Jury interviews and tours that this issue has a critical impact on vocational/educational programs for inmates and the safety of staff, inmates, and the public.

Due to the lack of space available in the County facilities since California's prison realignment initiatives, most non-violent prisoners are no longer incarcerated. This makes it more difficult to find participants among the inmate population who qualify for these programs.

In order to keep participant inmates from getting into trouble, and ousted from these programs, they are housed in protective custody housing where they are less likely to be influenced by more criminally sophisticated prisoners.

~

CONCLUSION

This report identifies mistakes committed during the booking and processing of a certain arrestee at RPDC. As a consequence, that inmate was cleared and enrolled for program participation at the SITE-B facility in Banning, CA. The subject inmate assaulted and caused the death of another inmate. The Grand Jury's investigation concludes that the subject inmate would not have been eligible for enrollment at Site-B had he been correctly identified and if the classification staff at Site-B had verified the inmate's profile.

~

FINDINGS

F1- The Business Office at the Robert Presley Detention Center (RPDC) failed to update the system with accurate information received from the Cal ID Livescan report for the subject arrestee. The arrestee was booked under an alias name and with a different CII Number than the one assigned under his real name and other aliases he had used in the past.

F2- COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling) Assessment is not used as required by SOP #3 for Site-B. An explanation was given that this tool is only used in therapeutic programs. Department staff responded that the tool had never been used, or had never seen or heard of it.

F3- Training for the clearance and enrollment procedures at SITE-B is done informally and by OJT (on-the-job-training) only.

F4- Training for booking & business office procedures is done by OJT only. Additional training is conducted at Ben Clark Training Center; it is only voluntary and for civilian staff.

F5- Subjectivity or "fluidity" in decision making for housing classification at RPDC resulted in placing subject inmate in the least restrictive environment as opposed to the most restrictive.

F6: Due to delays in receiving Livescan reports, inmates may be classified for housing prior to the Business Office validating their identification and criminal history.

F7- Vaguely worded policies and procedures allow too much discretion in booking and processing. For example, the use of words like “can”, “may”, and “such as” suggest that something could be done, rather than being required.

F8- Policies & procedures indicate the Integrated Biometric Information System (IBIS) can be used as a tool to identify arrestees in the booking process. IBIS was not used in the booking process for subject inmate at RPDC due to its reported malfunctioning. Work orders to repair IBIS at RPDC were not produced, as requested.

F9- The Breakdown Workstation in the Business Office (RPDC) identifies and corrects booking/processing errors. There is no continuous improvement process in place within the department to track and correct these types of mistakes to help prevent them from being made in the future.

F10- Some operating systems at RPDC were reported to be over 30 years old. The Board of Supervisors approved a consulting agreement to provide recommendations for the Computer Aided Dispatch, Record Management System, and Jail Management System. The Sheriff's Technology Services Bureau is currently evaluating recommendations and planning for an extensive implementation of new technology.



RECOMMENDATIONS

R1: By end of year 2025, install clear instructions and a procedure for validation of the Livescan report, including cross-referencing arrestee aliases in JIMS. Procedure to be clearly documented with signature/initial of a supervisor.

Based on Finding: F-1
Financial Impact: Minimal

R2: By end of year 2025, either eliminate the requirement to complete a COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling) Assessment, IAW SOP #3, at Site-B, or implement it as intended for inmates prior to being cleared and enrolled in SITE-B programs.

Based on Finding: F-2
Financial Impact: Minimal

R3: By end of year 2025, organize and implement mandatory training programs, including annual re-certification for SITE-B staff responsible for clearance and enrollment procedures to include familiarization with booking, business office, and classification procedures.

Based on Finding: F-3
Financial Impact: Incremental costs based on salaries and benefits of trainees

R4: By end of year 2025, organize and implement mandatory training programs, including annual re-certification, at the Ben Clark Training Center for staff members involved in the booking, business office, and classification procedures.

Based on Finding: F-4

Financial Impact: Incremental costs based on salaries and benefits of trainees

R5: To reduce “fluidity” and subjectivity in the classification process, include in the Intake and Release policy #504.10, written procedures to require classification staff to review the Livescan report, Probable Cause Statement and the Criminal History report of an arrestee. Complete no later than August 1, 2025.

Based on Finding: F5, F6

Financial Impact: Minimal

R6: Perform a detailed review of the Policies and Procedures for the Booking and Business Office, specifically 504.10 [Intake & Release] and 504.26 [Fingerprinting, Booking, Photos] to replace vaguely worded instructions with clear directives. Complete no later than August 1, 2025.

Based on Finding: F7

Financial Impact: Minimal

R7: Repair and require use of the current IBIS system, or acquire a different system, to accurately identify an arrestee at the onset of the booking process. Complete repairs by the end of year 2025. If the system is to be replaced, acquire by end of year 2026.

Based on Finding: F8

Financial Impact: Moderate

R8: Develop and implement an electronic database to record all booking and processing errors identified by the Breakdown Workstation in the Business Office (RPDC). The tracking system is to identify the root causes and to lead to the implementation of preventive measures (i.e., continuous improvement program). Complete and install by end of year 2025.

Based on Finding: F9

Financial Impact: Minimal

R9: Finalize negotiations with selected vendor(s) and initiate contracts to implement jail management systems upgrades.

Based on Finding: F10

Financial Impact: Currently budgeted

**REQUIRED RESPONSES**

According to California Penal Code §933, governing bodies have 60 days to respond to grand jury report findings and recommendations. The California Penal Code §933.05 outlines the parameters within which governing bodies are permitted to respond.

Riverside County Sheriff's Office

- Findings: F1- F10
- Recommendations: R1- R9

Riverside County Board of Supervisors

- Findings: F10
- Recommendations: R9

[Courtesy copy to California Attorney General]

Report Issued: 4-30-2025

Report Public: 5-5-2025

Response Due: 8-5-2025

EXHIBIT A

RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
Classification Assessment

Name: _____ BOOKING #: _____ DOB: _____ Date: _____

Current Charges: _____

1. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Gender Non-Conforming ☐ Transgender ☐ Intersex Orientation: ☐ Heterosexual ☐ Homosexual ☐ Bisexual

2. Language Fluency: ☐ English ☐ Spanish ☐ Other: _____

3. Victimization Concerns: ☐ No ☐ Yes _____

4. Previous Arrest: ☐ No ☐ Yes (when/where): _____ / _____ Charges: _____ Age of First Arrest: _____

5. Prior Custody: ☐ None ☐ County Jail (when/where): _____ / _____ Total Time in County Jail: _____

☐ General Population ☐ Protective Custody (why) _____ ☐ Administrative Custody (why) _____

☐ Medical Housing (type): _____ ☐ Mental Health Housing (why): _____ ☐ Civil / SVP (why): _____

☐ State/Federal (when/where): _____ / _____ CDCR#/BOP#: _____ Total Time in Prison/BOP: _____

Highest Custody Level (Prison): 1 2 3 4 ☐ "RVR"(why): _____ ☐ "SHU"(why): _____ Term: _____

6. On Parole: ☐ No ☐ Yes Office/Agent _____ On Probation: ☐ No ☐ Summary ☐ Formal, Office Location/Agent: _____

7. Military Service: ☐ Current ☐ Prior (Branch): _____ Discharge: ☐ Honorable ☐ Other (why): _____

8. Gang Affiliation: ☐ No ☐ Member ☐ Associate ☐ Drop-out Gang Name/Set: _____ Location: _____

Gang Moniker(s): _____ Rival Gang(s): _____

Gang Tattoos: _____

9. Enemies in Custody: ☐ No ☐ Yes (Names): _____ Reason: _____

10. Prior Police Informant: ☐ No ☐ Yes Agency(contact): _____ Nature of Assistance: _____

11. Current Medical Issues: ☐ No ☐ Yes Pregnant: ☐ No ☐ Yes Med. Notified @ Booking: ☐ Yes ☐ No, Referred to: _____

12. Current Mental Health Issues: ☐ No ☐ Yes Suicidal: ☐ No ☐ Yes Past Suicide Attempts: ☐ No ☐ Yes (When/How): _____

Prior 4011.6PC/5150PC: ☐ No ☐ Yes (why): _____ Mental Health Notified: ☐ No ☐ Yes (Name): _____

Prior Victim of Sexual Abuse: ☐ No ☐ Yes (When/Where): _____ Incident reported: ☐ No ☐ Yes (Who): _____

13. Objective Assessment:

- ☐ CII Verified
☐ PC Statement Reviewed
☐ Class Notes/IDAS _____ Points
☐ CDCR/BOP Contacted

CURRENT OFFENSE
Narcotic, Property, Persons, Weapons,
Non-Violent, 3056, VOP, 2800 VC
Vehicular Homicide, Arson, 1551 PC,
DUI, 311/314/647/653 PC DV/Stalking

Any Prior Felony Arrests (separate case)
and/or Any Gang Affiliations
NO YES

7 or More Cumulative Years in
State or County, or Federal
NO YES

Sentenced YES NO Sentenced
over three years

Behavior Problems, Booked
with Holds/Detainers or 4 to 6
Cumulative Years in State, County,
or Federal
NO YES

Serious Institutional Behavior Problems
or History/Risk for Escape
NO YES

MINIMUM Level 1	LOW MEDIUM Level 2	MEDIUM Level 3	HIGH MEDIUM Level 4	MAXIMUM Level 5	Ad-Hsg. Level 6
--------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	------------------------	--------------------	--------------------

14. Based on your current/prior criminal history and above objective classification criteria, you have been classified:

☐ General Population, Level ____ ☐ Protective Custody, Level ____ ☐ Administrative Custody, Level ____ ☐ Civil Commitment, Level ____

Comments/Override Justification: _____

15. Classification Deputy Name/ID#: _____ Facility: ☐ RPDC ☐ CBDC ☐ SCF ☐ JBDC ☐ Blythe

16. Classification Level Override Requested: ☐ Yes ☐ No Override: ☐ Denied ☐ Approved By: _____

17. Supervisor Approval for Administrative Custody, Protective Custody and Civil/SVP. Approved By: _____

18. Your classification was based on the security and safety needs for both you and the facility. Your classification may change upon periodic review of your charges, behavior and/or administrative hearings. You may appeal your classification assessment to the facility commander or designee in writing within ten (10) days of the primary classification or reclassification by facility personnel. **I CERTIFY THAT I WAS INTERVIEWED BY THE ABOVE CLASSIFICATION OFFICER AND THAT ALL THE STATEMENTS MADE ARE TRUE. ADDITIONALLY, I HAVE RECEIVED AN ORIENTATION PAMPHLET.**

Signature: _____ Date: _____