



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

Napa County Adult Correctional System Master Plan

Update- April 13, 2010



Board of Supervisors

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

County Executive Office

Nancy Watt, County Executive Officer

Criminal Justice Committee

Mark Luce, County Supervisor
Steve Kroyer, Presiding Judge
Francisca Tisher, Judge
Diane Price, Judge
Ray Guadagni, Judge
Rodney Stone, Judge
Mark Boessenecker, Judge
Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney
Doug Koford, Sheriff
Rich Melton, 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
Lenard Vare, Director of Corrections
Randy Snowden, Director of Health and Human Services
Jon Gjestvang, Chief Information Officer
Ron Abernethy, Chief Deputy Public Defender

Committee Staff

Connie Moreno-Peraza, Administrator of Alcohol and Drug Programs
Jaye Vanderhurst, Mental Health Director
Molly Rattigan, Senior Management Analyst
Suzanne Kaasa, Criminal Justice Analyst

Section 1: Introduction

This report will provide the Board of Supervisors with an update on the progress made by the Criminal Justice Committee and County staff on the implementation of the Adult Correctional System Master Plan and the recommendations made over the last three years. This report will also recap the history of the Master Plan, findings and recommendations. Staff is not seeking approval on new recommendations and will continue to work on those recommendations previously approved.

Introduction and Background

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 occurred 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 acknowledged the limitations of the existing facility and 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 policies, 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

¹ Subsequently, the rated capacity was increased to 264.

could be made, including better communication and coordination among the various agencies that would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system. This group has committed to meet monthly, or as needed, as the Napa County Criminal Justice Committee (CJC).

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

- Board of Supervisors: Supervisor Mark Luce
- County Executive Office: Nancy Watt, County Executive Officer; Britt Ferguson, Assistant County Executive Officer; Helene Franchi, Principal Management Analyst; Molly Rattigan, Senior Management Analyst and Suzanne Kaasa, Criminal Justice Analyst
- Department of Corrections: Directors: Dan Cunningham (2004-05); John Alexander (2005-06); John Pearson (2006-07) and Julie Hutchens (2007-2008); D.J. Johnson (Acting, 2008) Lenard Vare (2008-)
- Probation Department: Mary Butler, Chief Probation Officer
- District Attorney's Office: Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney; Lee Philipson, Assistant District Attorney ; John Goold, Chief Deputy District Attorney (2008-2009); Mike O'Reilly, Chief Deputy District Attorney (2009-)
- 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: Judges Francisca Tisher, Diane Price, Ray Guadagni, Steve Kroyer, Rodney Stone and Mark Bossenecker; and Stephen Bouch, Court Executive Officer
- Sheriff's Department: Gary Simpson, Sheriff (2004-2007); Doug Koford, Sheriff (2007-); Michael Loughran, Undersheriff (2004-2009); John Robertson, Undersheriff (2009-)
- City of Napa Police Department: Rich Melton, Chief of Police
- Information Technology Services: Jon Gjestvang, Chief Information Officer

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 three 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 operational limitations 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.

Phase III was to focus on implementing the recommendations made in the Phase I and Phase II reports and further the implementation of evidence-based practices and programs in the Probation Department, Department of Corrections and Health and Human Services Agency. The anticipated objectives of Phase III included:

- Negotiate a Community Corrections Services provider contract and return to the Board of Supervisors for contract and budget approval.
- Complete renovations necessary in the Hall of Justice to open the Community Corrections Service Center.
- Bring in technical assistance as provided for in the contract with The Carey Group to 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.
- Continue to develop and expand the quality assurance and outcome capabilities of the criminal justice system including hiring a Criminal Justice Analyst.
- Discuss the potential jail renovation and its impacts with the City of Napa.
- Continue to evaluate Options 1 and 2 to determine whether partial renovation or an entirely new jail facility in the preferable option with the goal of returning to the Board of Supervisors with more information by the end of the year.
- Identify and evaluate financing options for the construction or renovation of a jail facility.

Adult Correctional System Master Plan – Phase I

On November 20, 2007, the Criminal Justice Committee presented a Final Phase I Report to the Board of Supervisors. Included in that report were the following conclusions and recommendations that were approved by 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. 2A: Without implementing evidence-based practices or other policy changes, it is estimated that an additional 163 rated jail beds may be needed by 2025, with an additional 36 beds needed by as early as 2010, 78 by 2015 and 120 by 2020. 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.

Adult Correctional System Master Plan – Phase II

On October 13, 2008, the Criminal Justice Committee presented a Final Phase II Report to the Board of Supervisors. Included in that report were the following recommendations that were approved by the Board of Supervisors:

Recommendation 1- The Probation Department, working with the Corrections and Health & Human Services Departments, should implement a program that serves up to 50 jail inmates and 50 out-of-custody clients using evidence-based practices that reduce recidivism. Services for out-of-custody clients should be provided through a Community Corrections Services Center. Jail inmates who participate successfully in the program should have the ability to “graduate” to the Community Corrections Service Center.

Recommendation 2- The Community Corrections Services Center should operate 12 hours a day Monday through Friday and 5 hours a day on Saturday and Sunday. Initially, the Center should be located in the Hall of Justice. Prior to opening the Center, County staff should advise the City of Napa and the City’s Hope Center Task Force of this decision and address any questions or concerns they have.

Recommendation 3 – Initially, the Community Corrections Service Center should be operated by a contractor with significant expertise and experience in operating these types of centers.

Recommendation 4 – The Community Corrections Service Center should operate in accordance with the Logic Model, eligibility criteria and other guidelines recommended by the Criminal Justice Committee.

Recommendation 5- The County should continue to support the Probation Department’s ongoing efforts to implement evidence-based practices.

Recommendation 6- The County should continue to 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 7- The County should continue 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.

Recommendation 8- The Board of Supervisors should affirm the Criminal Justice Committee’s recommendation to build a jail facility to meet the 2025 bed projection numbers of 360 beds with central services built to serve up to 500 inmates.

Recommendation 9- The site for a new or renovated jail should have adequate land space available to expand up to 500 beds to meet needs beyond 2025.

Recommendation 10- The County should continue to pursue the design of a new or renovated facility constructed under the Podular Direct Supervision model.

Recommendation 11- The County should continue to pursue the design of a new or renovated facility to include video visitation in lieu of contact visits.

Recommendation 12- The Board of Supervisors should consider the close proximity or availability of public transit to Probation, Court, the Public Defender and District Attorney’s Office, Health and Human Services and other social services an important factor when making a final decision about the site of the jail.

Recommendation 13- The Phase II planning process should continue based on the premise that the County jail will remain at its current downtown Napa site. Staff is directed to: (1) advise the City of Napa of this decision and discuss any concerns the City may have; (2) continue to evaluate Options 1 and 2 to determine whether partial renovation and expansion of the current jail annex or totally new construction is the preferred option; and (3) identify and evaluate financing options for the construction of the new jail.

Adult Correctional System Master Plan – Phase III

Based on the direction of the Board of Supervisors in November 2007 and October 2008, the Criminal Justice Committee began work on Phase III of the Adult Correctional System Master Plan in January 2009. The purpose of this report is to update the Board of Supervisors on the progress made since January 2009 in the following areas:

- Community Corrections Service Center
- Department of Corrections
- Probation Department
- Health and Human Services Agency
- Jail Remodel or Replacement Project
- Criminal Justice Information Management System Replacement Project

Section 2: Community Corrections Service Center

Based on the recommendations made by the Criminal Justice Committee and approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 20, 2007 and October 13, 2008, the Community Corrections Service Center (CCSC) opened on March 2, 2009. The following recommendations from October 2008 will be discussed in this section of the report:

Recommendation 1- The Probation Department, working with the Corrections and Health & Human Services Departments, should implement a program that serves up to 50 jail inmates and 50 out-of-custody clients using evidence-based practices that reduce recidivism. Services for out-of-custody clients should be provided through a Community Corrections Services Center. Jail inmates who participate successfully in the program should have the ability to “graduate” to the Community Corrections Service Center.

Recommendation 2- The Community Corrections Services Center should operate 12 hours a day Monday through Friday and 5 hours a day on Saturday and Sunday. Initially, the Center should be located in the Hall of Justice. Prior to opening the Center, County staff should advise the City of Napa and the City’s Hope Center Task Force of this decision and address any questions or concerns they have.

Recommendation 3 – Initially, the Community Corrections Service Center should be operated by a contractor with significant expertise and experience in operating these types of centers.

Recommendation 4 – The Community Corrections Service Center should operate in accordance with the Logic Model, eligibility criteria and other guidelines recommended by the Criminal Justice Committee.

Recommendation 7- The County should continue 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.

Though the CCSC is administratively overseen by the Probation Department, the Criminal Justice Committee regularly reviews the operation of the program and collectively approves policy changes related to the operation of the CCSC. The Criminal Justice Analyst in conjunction with the CCSC Oversight Committee has completed an interim evaluation report on the CCSC; a full report will be released in Summer 2010. The highlights of this evaluation report are presented in this section.

Evaluation Process

The interim evaluation of the CCSC includes data from the first year of CCSC operation; in particular, detailed information was obtained from a random sample of 41 (28%) case files from the total 147 population of participants. These case files included individuals who have graduated or been discharged. The evaluation focuses on process outputs of the CCSC and describes how the program is functioning and how well it meets certain expectations set forth by the County. The evaluation does not include an analysis of whether the program has achieved its intended goal of reducing recidivism, as this will require additional time for a sufficient number of participants to graduate and a randomized control study.

The interim evaluation examined six areas of CCSC operation: 1) enrollment; 2) inter-agency coordination; 3) risk and needs assessment; 4) group program schedule; 5) behavior change plans and 6) immediate outcomes. These outcomes were selected based on their importance to meeting basic expectations for program success. The number and type of participants enrolled relates to how well the County is reaching intended participants of the program. As the CCSC targets medium and high risk probationers, some of whom are incarcerated in the jail, it is vital that these agencies coordinate well with each other to provide comprehensive supervision and services to participants. Research has demonstrated that to be effective, programs such as the CCSC should be tailored to meet the individual needs of participants. Therefore, the consistency and accuracy of risk and needs assessments conducted by CCSC staff was evaluated and the level at which identified needs were subsequently addressed through group scheduling and behavior change plans was also measured. Finally, a set of intermediate outcomes was included in the evaluation to measure participant gains in areas that have been shown to relate to the likelihood of reoffending such as overall risk scores and employment status. These are considered intermediate outcomes as they do not measure the main outcome of recidivism, but rather factors related to recidivism. Both strengths and areas for improvement were noted in each area, as well as important areas to be further examined in future evaluations.

Participant Enrollment

The first area of evaluation concerns whether the County is meeting target figures for enrollment and if the correct type of participants are being enrolled. The following were key findings during the first year of CCSC operation:

Strengths

- The out-of-custody portion of the CCSC program has consistently maintained an average rate of 50-60 active participants since the third month of operation, which exceeds initial estimates.
- Only one instance of an inappropriate enrollment was recorded in the last seven months of CCSC operation.
- CCSC participants include a mix of both felony-level and misdemeanor-level probationers.

Areas for Improvement

- The in-custody portion of the CCSC has never met initial estimates for participant enrollment, which has resulted in difficulties for full program implementation.

Areas for Future Evaluation

- The impact of various State and County policy changes on the jail population and referral procedures for CCSC-eligible inmates on the in-custody participant numbers should be evaluated to determine the continuing viability of this portion of the CCSC program.
- Additional verification of criteria fidelity could be included in future evaluation reports through independent comparisons of official records to eligibility criteria. Also, a review of criteria could be conducted to determine if changes may be appropriate.
- Analysis of the referral process could be included in future evaluations to determine if there are eligible participants who are not being enrolled in the program.

Inter-agency Coordination

Napa County has contracted with an independent company, BI, Inc., to run the CCSC. As the criminal justice system in Napa County is collaborative in nature, and the CCSC is the result of a system-wide endeavor, it is important that BI is able to coordinate well with Napa County agencies. Most importantly, BI must coordinate with Probation on several important aspects of the program, including supervision and case management of probationers. Also, BI must coordinate with Jail staff for the in-custody portion of the program. For these reasons, BI, Probation, and Jail staff was interviewed for the evaluation to determine areas where collaboration is strong and potential areas for improvement.

Strengths

- Overall, coordination between BI staff and Napa County Probation and Corrections staff is functioning well. Both formal and informal methods of communication exist, and when issues arise agencies appear able to work together to address them.

Areas for Improvement

- Some potential areas for improvement were suggested by Probation, Corrections and BI staff interviewed. For example, Probation Officers may benefit from first-hand observations of the CCSC group sessions and events to learn more about the content of the program and how it is run. Also, BI staff may be able to increase efforts to report positive information about participants to their Probation Officers in addition to negative issues that arise.

Areas for Future Evaluation

- The current evaluation included interviews from two BI staff, three Corrections staff, and five Probation staff. Future evaluations could include interviews with additional

staff from these agencies and/or staff from other criminal justice agencies that interact with the CCSC.

Risk and Needs Assessment

Research shows that programs should be targeted towards participants' individual criminogenic needs to be effective; all participants should not be receiving the same services in the CCSC. To tailor services, participant needs first must be assessed. The CCSC assesses participants' criminogenic needs by using the Level of Service Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI; Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2004), which focuses on different factors that have been shown to statistically predict an individual's likelihood of recidivism. The LS/CMI gives a total risk score for likelihood of re-offending that fall into risk levels ranging from "Very Low" to "Very High." The assessment also places each of the criminogenic needs shown to affect likelihood of re-offending into similar risk levels; for example, an individual's employment/education need may range from "Very Low" to "Very High." To evaluate the effectiveness of risk and needs assessment in the CCSC, consistency of assessment administration and accuracy of scoring were measured.

Strengths

- BI Staff are regularly utilizing the recommended LS/CMI Interview Guide, which provides a structured interview format and promotes consistency of assessment administration.
- Most (71%) LS/CMI assessments conducted by BI staff were error-free.

Areas for Improvement

- Some errors affected the risk level for a criminogenic need (19% of reviewed LS/CMIs), but none affected the total risk level. However, these numbers suggest that room for improvement exists.

Areas for Future Evaluation

- Future evaluations could include information on inter-rater reliability for scoring the LS/CMI.
- Future evaluations could include information about the quality of information gathered during interviews and about the quality of rating decisions made by staff while filling out the assessment.
- Future evaluations could include information on reliability of administration or validity of LS/CMI assessments used in the CCSC conducted by Probation Officers in addition to BI staff.

Group Program Scheduling

The criminogenic needs identified by the LS/CMI are used to tailor programming services to the individual participant. While some groups are mandatory for all participants in the CCSC due

to their focus on changing overall criminogenic thinking and behavior, other groups are assigned specifically to address certain needs for a subset of participants. In part, the determination for which of these additional groups a participant will be assigned is made by referring to the top four criminogenic needs from the LS/CMI. For the current evaluation, the top four criminogenic needs were compared to group assignments in each phase of the program.

Strengths

- The evidence basis of curriculum used on groups was examined by consultants from the Carey Group before implementation. The consultants determined that the core curriculum, Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT) is evidence-based. Additional curricula lacked evidence supporting their effectiveness; however, there is a general lack of evidence in this area so this did not make the implementation of those groups inappropriate.
- Group scheduling appears to match top four criminogenic needs in most cases (88% in Phase 1, 91% in Phase 2, and 100% in Phase 3).

Areas for Improvement

- Currently, there is no decision-making guide for matching criminogenic needs to group assignments; such a guide may be helpful in ensuring consistent matches between needs and groups.

Areas for Future Evaluation

- Future evaluations could include an analysis of group content to verify that the group assignments for each identified criminogenic need are appropriate.
- Future evaluations could include an analysis of group session implementation, to ensure that facilitators are following the approved format and content of curricula.
- Future evaluations could include an analysis of group facilitator skills at leading group discussions.

Behavior Change Plans

Behavior Change Plans (BCP) are an additional method that BI uses to meet individual needs for participants in the CCSC. These plans include at least four positive goals for participants to achieve during their time in the program, and action items as steps to achieve these goals. To tailor the plans to individual participants, each goal should match a top four criminogenic need as identified on the LS/CMI. The current evaluation compares the match between criminogenic needs and goals on the BCP at each phase of the program, and also describes how many action items are typically created and when they are completed among the sample of participants in the review.

Strengths

- 90% of participants who completed Phase 1 had created a Behavior Change Plan before they were promoted to Phase 2.
- 94% of Behavior Change Plans completed in Phase 1 matched the top four criminogenic needs as determined by the initial LS/CMI assessment.

Areas for Improvement

- Behavior Change Plans do not appear to be updated on a regular basis after new LS/CMI assessments reveal revised top four criminogenic needs. However, the sample size for these cases was small and caution should be used when interpreting findings.
- Clear practices regarding Behavior Change Plan completion were not evident. Overall, it appears that some participants are finishing all their assigned action items early in the program, while others are finishing theirs late in the program. However, the sample size for these cases was small and caution should be used when interpreting findings.
- Official BI company policies or Napa County CCSC program standardized practices regarding several aspects of Behavior Change Plans are lacking. These include:
 - When the plan should be updated to address changes to criminogenic needs
 - Whether high criminogenic needs that are initially over-ridden (i.e. replaced by a lower need) should ever be included in the plan
 - The minimum number of action items required for each goal
 - Whether new action items should be included in the plan once old ones are complete
 - How many action items a participant could be expected to complete in each phase

Areas for Future Evaluation

- Future evaluations could examine the number of days before plans are created. This would require data transfer from the BI computer system Accutrax to appropriately analyze.
- Future evaluations could include assessment of the quality of goals and action items.
- Future evaluations could include target performance measures for action item creation and completion once standardized practices or official policies are set.

Intermediate Outcomes

The ultimate measure of success for the CCSC is the rate at which the program reduces recidivism in participants; however, this outcome is not available at the current time. Instead, intermediate outcomes were included in the evaluation to measure changes in factors that predict recidivism. First, the total risk score from participants' initial LS/CMI was compared to their follow-up scores for those who have been re-assessed. Change in employment status was also included, as underemployment is a risk factor for recidivism.

Strengths

- Risk scores on the LS/CMI appear to be declining an average of 3 points among participants in the CCSC with multiple assessments. Declining scores have resulted in lower risk levels for 30% of these individuals. It is important to note that these individuals were still making progress in the program at the time of re-assessment, so it is possible additional change may occur before graduation.
- Tracking of employment rates for discharged participants indicate that 16% more individuals were employed when they left the program than when they initially started it. It is noteworthy that these rates reflect employment gains for individuals who for the most part have not *graduated* from the program but are being discharged for other reasons, including termination for failing to abide by program rules. As more participants successfully complete the program, comparison of gains in employment of graduated vs. discharged clients will be possible.

Areas for Future Evaluation

- Policy questions remain on the appropriate timing of LS/CMI assessments for CCSC participants. While BI has a policy that participants should be re-assessed every six months, it is not clear how this applies to individuals who have had an assessment conducted by Probation months (but not six months) previous to their enrollment in the program. Ideally, a participant would have an entrance assessment to establish the baseline needs and risk level, a mid-program assessment to check for changes to need that may need to be addressed by changes in programming, and an exit assessment to determine the risk and need levels upon program graduation. Given current program logistics this model does not appear to be feasible; however, it may be beneficial to discuss alternative practices that may make this model possible.
- More in-depth analysis of education and employment skill gains could be included as intermediate outcomes in future evaluations.
- Future evaluations should compare recidivism outcomes when this information becomes available.
- Future evaluations should assess the feasibility of different randomized control group study designs for comparing CCSC participant outcomes to non-participant outcomes.

Conclusion and Next Steps

The interim evaluation identifies areas of both strength and areas for improvement within the CCSC operation. The evaluation aimed to give preliminary answers to the following questions: 1) Is the CCSC providing evidence-based services in an individualized fashion to probationers who may benefit from intensive supervision and programming, and 2) Is the CCSC producing positive changes in participants that may ultimately lead to reductions in recidivism?

Findings from the initial review suggest that the CCSC is indeed providing individualized services to appropriate participants and that many of these participants have shown short term positive gains during their time in the program for factors that are associated with reductions in recidivism. However, initial findings also suggest that improvements could be made in several aspects of the CCSC operation to increase the number of participants served and address changes in participant needs. Also, the initial review identified areas where official policies or standardized practice guidelines could be clarified to promote measurement of performance. Overall, these findings suggest that the CCSC has established a solid foundation for delivering services to at-risk probationers, but as a new program just completing its first year of operation, there remain adjustments to be made to reach certain County expectations.

The Probation Department will continue to work with BI and the Criminal Justice Committee to address some of the areas for improvement identified in the interim evaluation of the CCSC. The Criminal Justice Analyst and CCSC Oversight Committee will continue to work on a full year evaluation, including a larger sample size, which will allow for a more meaningful interpretation. A full report should be available in Summer 2010.

Section 3: Department of Corrections

While there were no specific recommendations made to the Board of Supervisors regarding the implementation of evidence-based practices in the Department of Corrections, the Department has made significant progress in implementing new processes and programs that are worth presenting in this report. It is important to note that evidence-based practices in the Department of Corrections are different than those in the Probation Department and Community Corrections Service Center and are not necessarily intended to reduce recidivism. Practices and programs are deemed “evidence-based” because research has shown that they have been successful in achieving the intended goal. When implementing an evidence-based practice or program, because research has already demonstrated results, we can be reasonably certain that if implemented properly, the program or practice will have the desired outcome. While the Criminal Justice Committee has primarily focused on implementing evidence-based practices and programs that have shown to reduce recidivism, in the case of the Department of Corrections where inmate turnover is high, evidence-based practices efforts are primarily geared towards reducing incidents in the facility as well as reentry efforts.

The Department of Corrections has, over the last year, implemented a Classification Team and started a departmental Evidence-Based Practices Committee to oversee the implementation of evidence-based practices and programs. The Board of Supervisors recently approved an agreement with BI Incorporated and the Department of Corrections is in the process of implementing an education and employment training program. The following will provide a detailed update on each of these items as well as list the next steps for the Department of Corrections.

Classification Team

As part of the Fiscal Year 2009-2010 budget, the Board of Supervisors approved the reclassification of one (1) Correctional Sergeant and two (2) Correctional Officers to one (1) Classification Supervisor and two (2) Classification Specialists. The purpose of this reclassification was to create a unit within the Department of Corrections to oversee the alternative sentencing programs and implement evidence-based tools to facilitate the appropriate assessments and housing assignment of each inmate.

The unit was fully operational in September 2009 and over the last six months has accomplished the following:

- Streamlined the alternative sentencing process allowing more inmates to participate in sentencing alternatives such as the Correctional Conservation Corp.
- Diverted 1,380 bed days and provided 11,040 hours of supplemental labor for the community.

- Completed training in the evidence-based LS/CMI tool which is currently used by the Probation Department and Community Corrections Service Center. This tool may be used by the Department of Corrections to make programming decisions in the future.
- Implemented a process for the new sentencing guidelines as governed by Penal Code Section 4019.
- Assisted in the analysis of incidents in the jail that ultimately determined that the Housing Classification assessment was a valid indicator of how likely a given offender was to have at least one incident while in the custody of the Napa County Department of Corrections.

Corrections Evidence-Based Practices Committee

In July 2009, the Department of Corrections implemented an Evidence-Based Practices Committee to provide strategic guidance on the implementation of evidence-based practices within the Department. The committee includes staff from both the Department of Corrections and the County Executive Office. Long term, the goals of the committee are to:

- Develop an annual timeline and action plan that outlines the evidence-based practices focus for the upcoming year to include staffing implications, training planned and the total number of hours of training for staff.
- Develop process and outcome measures for any evidence-based work undertaken.
- Develop staffing plans and goals in congruence with evidence-based principles.
- Develop and implement evidence-based programming that includes: developing pro-social programming and opportunities for positive interactions and activities, re-entry programming, incorporating the validated LS/CMI assessment tool into decision making and to create processes to place the appropriate offenders in programs including the Corrections Conservation Corp and home detention.

Education and Employment Training Program

On February 23, 2010, the Board of Supervisors approved an agreement with BI Incorporated for the provision of education and employment services for inmates housed in the Department of Corrections. The Department of Corrections is in the process of implementing the program and services should begin no later than April 12, 2010. The program is designed to serve up to 32 male inmates and 9 female inmates.

The purpose of the Education and Employment Training Program is to provide:

1. General Education applicable to GED preparation.
2. Job Skills and Life Skills to improve employability potential.
3. Pro-Social Skills to improve the possibility of success in the community.

BI Incorporated will provide a fulltime Education and Employment Coordinator who will assist inmates in completing various computer and classroom learning modules. The Department of Corrections has identified two housing units for the provision of these services and has purchased computers and work stations to facilitate this programming. Curriculum to be used includes:

1. Employment Readiness- Employment Readiness includes classroom time led by the Education and Employment Coordinator as well as individual work and journaling using the evidence-based Tools for Success: Employment Skill workbooks from The Change Companies. In addition to classroom time inmates will receive assessments, training and testing to measure their progress.
2. KeyTrain/WorkKeys- KeyTrain is a complete interactive training system for career readiness skills, based on assessments and certifications completed in the WorkKeys System. Businesses across the United States recognize WorkKeys certifications and various correctional facilities have used KeyTrain and WorkKeys to equip inmates with workplace-based skills that make them more employable upon release. KeyTrain and WorkKeys is a self-paced learning module that is designed to be completed in a short period of time.
3. CIVILWorld- CIVILWorld is an interactive, self-paced program that focuses on teaching pro-social skills using a cognitive behavioral approach. The program is designed to address and modify criminal thinking behaviors.

Programming is designed to be completed in 10-30 days to meet the needs of the rapid turnover the jail often experiences. The Department of Corrections has identified primary and secondary criteria for participation in the program. An analysis performed on the jail population indicates that the Department of Corrections should have no difficulty maintaining the program at 75% capacity on any given day.

Primary Criteria (inmates must meet ALL criteria to be eligible for programming)

- Must not be currently enrolled in the Community Corrections Service Center
- Must have a Proxy score of 4 or higher (medium/high risk for recidivism)
- Must have a Housing Classification score of 15 or lower (low to medium high risk for incidents in the jail)
- Must meet certain housing requirements
- Must not have an ICE hold (immigration hold)
- Post- Sentenced: must have at least 10 days left before final release date.
- Pre-Sentenced: must have been in jail at least 10 days.

Secondary Criteria (to be used at Classification Team's discretion)

- Preference given to inmates living or working in Napa County
- Preference given to inmates without a prison hold.
- Preference given to post-sentenced inmates with 30 days left before release.
- Preference given to inmates with Housing Classification scores of 10 or lower.

While the education and employment program that BI Incorporated will provide is designed using evidence-based practices and principles, the primary purpose is to provide meaningful and productive in-custody programming. Evidence-based practices have shown that to truly impact recidivism, the top four criminogenic needs of a given offender must be addressed. Given that this program only addresses one to two criminogenic needs, it is not anticipated that this program will impact recidivism but may reduce incidents within the jail and help inmates better prepare for reentry into the community. The Department of Corrections and BI Incorporated will work with the Criminal Justice Analyst to capture data for future analysis including:

1. Reduced recidivism compared to similar risk offenders that do not receive programming or do not complete the program.
2. Increased GED completion for similar risk offenders that do not receive programming or do not complete the program.
3. Increased actual employment for similar risk offenders that do not receive programming or do not complete the program.

The education and employment program is funded by the Inmate Welfare Fund at no cost to the County General Fund.

Next Steps

Over the next year, the Department of Corrections intends to address the following:

- Fully implement the education and employment program.
- Implement a validated, evidence-based pre-trial assessment tool and analyze initial results to determine whether the appropriate inmates are being held in the jail on a pre-sentenced basis. This analysis will be brought to the Criminal Justice Committee for a discussion regarding pre-trial release programs and the current bail schedule.
- Revise home detention policies and criteria to incorporate evidence-based and other best practices.
- Provide motivational interviewing training to jail staff to reinforce concepts inmates are learning in program.

Section 4: Probation Department

At the October 13, 2008 meeting, the Board of Supervisors approved the following recommendation related to the Probation Department:

Recommendation 5- The County should continue to support the Probation Department's ongoing efforts to implement evidence-based practices.

Over the past year, the Probation Department has dedicated significant resources towards the implementation of evidence-based practices. The adult Probation staff have completed 321 hours of evidence-based practices training including motivational interviewing (initial and refresher courses), LS/CMI assessments (initial and refresher), Victim Impact Cognitive Behavioral facilitation and Preventing Sexual Misconduct Against Offenders facilitation. This section will discuss the Department's achievements related to offender caseloads, the departmental Evidence-Based Practices and Quality Assurance committees, and cognitive behavioral groups. This section will also present two new projects the Probation Department has assisted in implementing: Mental Health Court and the Risk Assessment Pilot Project.

Offender Caseloads

In 2007, the Adult Supervision Unit of the Probation Department began classifying caseloads in order to best meet the needs of the offender population. Caseloads may either be specialized and targeted to a certain group of offenders like gang members or generalized based on risk assessment. Caseload sizes are determined based on standards developed by the American Probation and Parole Association (as demonstrated by evidence-based practices) and the needs of the Department. The Department uses the LS/CMI tool to assess the needs of and classify each offender appropriately. The Department completes an LS/CMI on all probationers on an annually basis and has arranged caseloads appropriately. The following chart compares the current individual caseloads to those reported to the Board of Supervisors in 2007 and 2008.

Caseload Type	APPA Caseload Standard	October 22, 2007	August 11, 2008	March 2, 2010
Proposition 36 1	N/A	295	159	137
Proposition 36- 2	N/A	Did Not Exist	42	Converted to Medium/High Risk Caseload
Residential Treatment	50	135	87	88
Very High Risk 1	20	19	53	75
Sex Offender/Medium-High Risk	20-50	149	63	48/36
Gang/High Risk/Medium-High Risk	20-50	149	73	68/57
Domestic Violence 1	50	131	125	87
Domestic Violence 2	50	140	168	92
Domestic Violence 3	50	150	111	97
Low Risk	200	140	602	390
Drug Court	N/A	48	45	54
NSIB	N/A	20	15	18
Medium/High Risk 1	50	141	149	119
Medium/High Risk 2	50	Did Not Exist	149	98
Medium/High Risk 3	50	Did Not Exist	156	93
Restitution Only/Medium/High Risk 4	50	Did Not Exist	Did Not Exist	76/105
Waiting Assignment/Other	N/A	94	57	111
Total		2,105	2,054	1,849
Average Caseload per PO		150	128	98

The overall caseload of the Adult Probation Officers has decreased, allowing officers to devote more time to each offender as appropriate per evidence-based standards. Probation Officers will have more time to use motivational interviewing and other best practices to start giving their clients the skills to change their behavior. The Probation Department recently requested the addition of one (1) Limited-Term Probation Officer funded by the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act. This position will provide intensive supervision and case management services to

high risk, transitional aged (18-25) offenders, with the goal of reducing recidivism and decreasing the likelihood that these offenders will be sentenced to prison. Funding for this position is only guaranteed through June 30, 2012. While the California Community Corrections Performance Incentive Act of 2009 (SB678) established the intent of the State of California to continue to provide funding for this project, it is subject to appropriation in future budget years. Funding would be based on savings achieved by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation due to a reduction in the number of adult probationers who fail probation and are subsequently sentenced to prison. It is unclear at this time how much funding Napa County will be eligible to receive and whether this funding source will survive future budget cuts.

Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Groups

Thirty three Probation staff have been trained and certified to facilitate the National Curriculum and Training Institute's Crossroads Curriculum. The Crossroads Curriculum is an evidence-based program recommended by the American Probation and Parole Association. The purpose of the curriculum is to reduce recidivism by offering educational and cognitive behavior classes to offenders. Courses within the Crossroads Curriculum include substance use, anger management, life skills, parenting and job preparation. Courses may also be geared towards specific criminal offenses including felonies, domestic violence, larceny and assault.

Since March 2009, the Probation Department has facilitated five (5) Cognitive Behavioral Groups. The following chart depicts the groups offered, the number of offenders participating, the total number of dosage hours offered (total hours of each group multiplied by the total number of offenders originally enrolled in the program), dosage hours completed and the completion rate of each group. Research from a meta analysis of more than 200 programs conducted by the National Institute of Corrections indicates that a 50% completion rate (6% margin of error rate) is considered to be realistic and an indication of a good program. It is important to note that the data below only shows completion rates and does not measure the impact the groups have on recidivism.

Group	Offenders Completing Group	Offenders Terminated from Group	Offender Completion Rate	Dosage Hours Possible	Dosage Hours Completed	Dosage Hour Completion Rate
Felony Offender-Very High Risk Group	7	1	87.5%	192	168	87.5%
Parenting Group-Prop 36 and Drug Court Clients	6	4	60%	160	110	68.75%
Felony Offender-Gang Group	5	4	55.55%	216	156	72.22%
Parenting-Domestic Violence Offenders	9	2	81.81%	176	150	85.23%
Felony Offender-Medium/High Risk General	13	3	81.25%	384	328	85.41%
Total	40	14	74.07%	1,128	912	80.85%

Probation Quality Assurance Committee

In 2007, the Probation Department developed a Quality Assurance Committee to ensure that the Probation Department was effectively implementing evidence-based programs and strategies. The committee is comprised of one Probation Services Manager, one Staff Services Analyst and five Probation Officers. The Quality Assurance Committee initially monitored the completion of LS/CMI assessments on all Probation clients. The Probation Quality Assurance Committee is currently focusing on the following efforts:

- Alternative Interventions-** Developing an additional alternative sanction for probationers struggling with traditional probation services. This sanction involves weekly attendance at an accountability session hosted by the Probation Department targeting the offenders' top criminogenic need. The Probation Department will use the appropriate Carey Guide to facilitate this process. The addition of this alternative sanction will further alleviate the reliance on jail as the only option for those struggling with traditional probation services.

- **LS/CMI Reviews**-The Committee is preparing to launch an assessment review process by reviewing a percentage of cases on each caseload. The goal is to increase inter-rater reliability.
- **Adult Case Reviews**-Incorporate a systematic case review process for adult probation cases to ensure officers are complying with caseload management standards.
- **Motivational Interviewing Observations**- Implement a system to review the motivational interviewing techniques of Probation Officers. A tool is being developed to uniformly assess each officer's adherence to principles of motivational interviewing. Motivational interviewing is a tool used by the Probation Department to help increase an offender's motivation to comply with supervision requirements, participate in treatment and address criminogenic needs. Learning and implementing motivational interviewing is challenging, therefore ongoing support and feedback are needed to ensure successful incorporation of the skills.

Probation Evidence Based Practices Committee

The Probation Department initially established an Evidence-Based Practices Committee to explore and implement programmatic changes when the Department first decided to implement evidence-based practices. The Department has reconvened the Evidence-Based Practices Committee in order to determine how to proceed on the recommendation made to the Board of Supervisors regarding on-going efforts to implement new practices and programs. The committee has determined that the overall goal is to implement practices within the Department that reduce recidivism. The committee will focus their efforts in the coming year on the following:

- **Positive Reinforcement (Increase Positive Reinforcements)**-Begin modeling behavior in the Department by focusing on recognizing Probation Officers on what they are doing well as theory supports four positive reinforcements to every negative reinforcement. The intent is to focus on non-monetary rewards and incentives and allow Probation Officers the opportunity to model behavior for the clients.
- **Criminogenic Needs Training (Target Intervention)**- Focus on defining the eight criminogenic needs to help Probation Officers better understand the assessing process and results of the LS/CMI assessment tool. In-house training will include case studies based on actual probation clients.
- **Partnership Networking Event (Engage Ongoing Support in Natural Communities)**- Host a networking event for providers that offer services to probation clients and the community. Allow Probation Officers to conduct surveys to find out what services specific providers offer for probation clients to ensure that accurate referrals are made to the appropriate programs.

- **E-Tool/Survey (Engage Ongoing Support in Natural Communities, Target Interventions)**- Create an online resource for Probation Officers to have quick reference to understanding criminogenic needs and access to appropriate referrals and programs.
- **Adult Case Planning (Target Interventions)**- Funds received under the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act grant require case planning. Develop a case planning process to focus offender treatment on the top four criminogenic needs and outline the steps to meet each goal.

Mental Health Court

In collaboration with the Mental Health Division of the Health and Human Services Agency, District Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office and the Napa Superior Court, the Probation Department began a pilot Mental Health Court in June 2009. Mental Health Court links offenders who would ordinarily be prison-bound to long-term community based treatment. The program relies on mental health assessments, individualized treatment plans and ongoing judicial monitoring to address both the mental health needs of offenders and public safety concerns of communities. This pilot project and initial evaluation will continue into the next year.

RAPP Pilot Project

Napa County was selected to participate in the Risk Assessment Pilot Project by the Administrative Office of the Courts. This project will provide technical assistance and training to justice system partners in the use of the risk, need and responsivity principles. The goals of this project are to seek ways to use justice system resources more effectively by targeting offenders' sentencing, treatment and supervision needs more accurately and to reduce recidivism among the population of offenders placed on probation. The Probation Department and Superior Court are in the early stages of this pilot program that is expected to continue through 2010.

Next Steps

Over the next year, the Probation Department intends to address the following:

- Continue to participate in the RAPP and Mental Health Court Projects.
- Begin implementing the strategies identified by the Evidence-Based Practices Committee.
- Begin the evaluation phase of the key items identified by the Quality Assurance Committee.
- Offer at least five (5) additional Cognitive Behavioral Therapy groups to at least 50 probationers.

Section 5: Health and Human Services

For many years, many of the addiction treatment services operated by the Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) were primarily directed toward persons with no involvement in the criminal justice system, the thinking being that various resources were available within the criminal justice system and public programs should prioritize services for low income and indigent persons who had not broken the law. While there were some exceptions, the outpatient treatment program gave priority in its admissions to persons not involved in the criminal justice system.

Approximately ten (10) years ago, the agency began moving away from this position toward a public health approach to the provision of services that emphasized the local need and the reduction in community costs. HHSA's outpatient programs began to discontinue screening out candidates on the basis of criminal justice involvement. They subsequently began moving into proactive collaborations with criminal justice partners for the operation of local drug courts, the PC 1000 diversion program, and in 2000, the Proposition 36 program. This evolutionary process continued in 2008 with the restructuring of the programs within HHSA's Alcohol and Drug Services (ADS) Division to create four service units: (a) Prevention and Youth Treatment Services; (b) Assessment; (c) Court Case Management; and (d) Outpatient Treatment. The restructure was developed by the new Administrator of Alcohol and Drug Programs, based on her own assessment and an analysis prepared by consultant Victor Kogler.

Today, persons involved in the criminal justice system account for a majority of adults served in the Assessment and Outpatient Treatment programs and all of the persons served in the Court Case Management Program. On October 13, 2008, the Board of Supervisors approved the following recommendation regarding HHSA:

Recommendation 6- The County should continue to support the Health & Human Services Agency'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.

This section will address the progress made by the Health and Human Services Agency over the last year and plans to continue to implement the recommendation.

Alcohol and Drug Services-Court Case Management Program

The Court Case Management Program is responsible for case managing all clients who are participating in some form of County sponsored treatment as a condition of probation or other criminal justice generated mandate. The Court Case Management Program is an "evidence-informed" model based on research findings related to drug court programs, where it has been

shown that the delivery of an integrated service package through a collaboration among the Court, District Attorney, Public Defender, Probation, and addiction treatment provider will result in better long term outcomes than the delivery of services which are only coordinated or delivered through separate efforts by the different agencies. The core of the evidence basis of the drug court model is expressed in the “Ten Key Components of Drug Court Programs,” which inform these court programs in Napa County. The Court Case Management Program serves Adult Drug Court participants, as well as Proposition 36 clients.

The staffing, configuration, and capability of the Court Case Management Program has been affected by drastic cuts in state funding for addiction services, particularly in the past two years, during which time the state has virtually eliminated such funding. The unit has been relocated from the old Hall of Justice to HHSA’s Old Sonoma Road campus to allow for more efficient operation through shared staffing with other division programs. The overall staffing level and service intensity of the program have been reduced, but the program’s basic structure and purpose remain intact.

Alcohol and Drug Services-Outpatient Treatment Program Design

The Carey Group recently conducted a review of the criminal justice track within the outpatient treatment program. This resulted in a report summarizing their findings and recommending that the programs adopt service models with stronger evidence-based practices. The division is fully supportive of this goal as it has completed restructuring its programs at a “macro” level in accordance with many of the recommendations in the report prepared by Victor Kogler. A “re-tooling” at the program level to install current, evidence-based models, together with appropriately updated staff training regimes, is an important next step in the program renewal process.

The Carey Group has agreed to facilitate a planning process which will involve:

- The creation of a core planning committee comprised of the division manager, supervisors, and key program staff, plus consultants from the Carey Group and representatives from the CEO’s office.
- The addition of representatives from the agencies most directly interested in the operation of the outpatient treatment program, including Probation, Corrections, the Court, the District Attorney and Public Defender, Child Welfare Services, Mental Health, Public Health, Self Sufficiency and Project 90.
- A national literature review to identify the leading evidence-based treatment models to be considered for each of the treatment tracks within the outpatient program, including the criminal justice track, the perinatal track, and the general population track.
- The selection of an evidence-based model for each track.
- The design of a staff development program to ensure that program staff are appropriately trained to implement the selected program models;
- The development of an implementation plan.

- The development of appropriate monitors to be incorporated into HHSA's Quality Management program to track the effectiveness of the enhanced and improved program.

The timeline calls for completion of the planning process and the commencement of implementation of the selected program models and training regime by the end of calendar year 2010.

Alcohol and Drug Services-Detoxification and Residential Treatment

The contract between the County and the Project 90 program contemplates the program operating in close coordination with the county's Access, treatment authorization, and Outpatient Treatment programs, with clients being "stepped up" to residential services and "stepped down" to outpatient treatment based on accepted level of care indicators. It also contemplates joint utilization management of the contracted beds within Project 90 and the county's outpatient treatment programs as an integrated system. For clients involved in the criminal justice system, the assumption is that Probation representatives and representatives of the Court Case Management and Outpatient Treatment Programs will be a part of the case management collaborative, as well.

The contract also contemplates that law enforcement will be able to deliver persons willing to voluntarily submit to detoxification services to the Project 90 facility at virtually any time. While several hundred admissions occur per year on this basis, questions occasionally arise regarding program screening practices which sometimes result in persons not being accepted for admission.

The ADS Division has been working with the contractor to increase communication and coordination regarding intake, level of care assignments, and lengths of stay. While this has resulted in improvements in the operation of the treatment continuum, additional work remains to be done.

Mental Health Services

The Mental Health Division at HHSA currently supports the Department of Corrections by assigning one full-time mental health professional to the jail to provide assessments of inmates, limited counseling and other direct services. In addition to this staff member, the division provides some supervisor time and makes staff available for conducting emergency assessments to determine whether inmates meet the criteria for detention under section 5150 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

The division has been working with the Department of Corrections to improve the current level of mental health support services available in the jail. This has resulted in the recruitment of a new Forensic Mental Health Counselor who was selected in a process including the Director of

the Department of Corrections and the Chief Probation Officer. The Division and the Department of Corrections have also undertaken to review and update various protocols relating to the role of the forensic mental health counselor which we believe have improved the position's effectiveness.

The Division has also been working with the Department of Corrections, Probation, and representatives of the CEO's office to develop a proposal for the enhancement of mental health support services within the jail as well as facilitate a relationship between the Department of Corrections and Napa State Hospital. These efforts will be discussed in the next section of this report.

Next Steps

Over the next year, the Health and Human Services Agency intends to address the following:

- In collaboration with The Carey Group and the County Executive Office, complete the redesign of the Alcohol and Drug Services Outpatient Treatment program.
- Continue to assist the Department of Corrections with the enhancement of mental health support services within the jail facility.

Section 6: Jail Remodel or Replacement Project

On October 13, 2008, the Board of Supervisors approved the following recommendations related to the remodel or replacement of the current jail facility:

Recommendation 8- The Board of Supervisors should affirm the Criminal Justice Committee's recommendation to build a jail facility to meet the 2025 bed projection numbers of 360 beds with central services built to serve up to 500 inmates.

Recommendation 9- The site for a new or renovated jail should have adequate land space available to expand up to 500 beds to meet needs beyond 2025.

Recommendation 10- The County should continue to pursue the design of a new or renovated facility constructed under the Podular Direct Supervision model.

Recommendation 11- The County should continue to pursue the design of a new or renovated facility to include video visitation in lieu of contact visits.

Recommendation 12- The Board of Supervisors should consider the close proximity or availability of public transit to Probation, Court, the Public Defender and District Attorney's Office, Health and Human Services and other social services an important factor when making a final decision about the site of the jail.

Recommendation 13- The Phase II planning process should continue based on the premise that the County jail will remain at its current downtown Napa site. Staff is directed to: (1) advise the City of Napa of this decision and discuss any concerns the City may have; (2) continue to evaluate Options 1 and 2 to determine whether partial renovation and expansion of the current jail annex or totally new construction is the preferred option; and (3) identify and evaluate financing options for the construction of the new jail.

Since the approval of these recommendations, staff in the County Executive Office and Director of Corrections has worked closely with the Public Works Department to address the recommendations above. Additionally, the County has begun a Facilities Master Planning Process that has prioritized the Health and Human Services Campus replacement project as a more urgent project than the jail facility. Given the shift in priorities and change in the County's fiscal situation, a new jail facility will not be operational for at least five (5) years. This section will address the work completed to date, recent and anticipated changes to the jail population due to changes in good time/work time credits and the State budget proposals and upgrades needed to keep the current jail facility operational.

Jail Remodel or Replacement

The Public Works Department has spent considerable time since October 2008 researching the appropriate project delivery methods for the proposed replacement or remodeled jail facility. The following project delivery methods were considered:

- Traditional Design-Build-Bridge model
- Design Build (Pure)
- Design Build (Bridging)
- Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC)

The Public Works Department is recommending the Design Build (Bridging) method for the delivery of the jail project. The recommendation is based on staff research, conversations with the County's jail facility consultants, Carter Goble Lee, and past experience on the delivery of projects including the Juvenile Justice Center, Sheriff's Office, Animal Shelter, Homeless Shelter and Fifth Street Parking Garage. The Public Works Department is also recommending delaying the decision of whether to newer jail annex should be renovated and included in the new jail facility or replaced completely.

The Design Build (Bridging) method is a hybrid of the traditional Design-Bid-Build and the Design Build (Pure) methods. The Design-Bid-Build method typically consists of hiring an architect to design and prepare construction documents for a specific project and then of putting the project out to bid and hiring a contractor to construct the project. This has been the method used by the County to deliver many of its large facilities such as the Sheriff's Office and the Juvenile Justice Center. A Design Build (Pure) method consists of hiring an architect to prepare a design-build package and then through requests for proposals the County hires a design-build team typically consisting of an architect and contractor to design and construct the project. The Fifth Street Parking Garage was the first project in the County's history to be delivered through the Design Build (Pure) method.

Public Works also looked into the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) project delivery method but concluded that this method is usually recommended for fast-track projects. Staff also concluded that this method has many of the disadvantages of the Design-Bid-Build and the Design Build (Pure) method.

The benefits to the County of the Design Build (Bridging) method for the project delivery of the proposed jail facility include:

- A more enforceable fixed price contract obtained in about half the time and at about half of the cost compared with any other method which truly provides an enforceable price contract.
- Estimated net overall construction cost savings for a fully equal product, typically in the 5% to 10% range; compared to the Design-Bid-Build method.

- Clear & single responsibility for correcting post construction “bugs.”
- Construction goes smoother & faster with engineering and architectural components better coordinated.
- As in Design Build (Pure), utilizes the contractor’s experience in preparing the design by having the designer and contractor work together as a team to develop a better, more constructible, more cost efficient design solution to the County’s program requirements.
- Contracting can be structured to allow construction to begin before completion of the design, which can result in earlier completion of the project. This can especially be applicable to multi-phased projects such as the proposed jail facility.
- County’s Design Build (Bridging) architect would have a major role in the process. The County benefits by having an additional agent that looks after the County’s interests with regards to specific desired design elements.

As part of the recommendations approved in October 2008, County staff was directed to notify the City of Napa of the decision to retain the jail facility in the current location and discuss any concerns the City may have. County staff attended a Downtown Steering Committee meeting in Fall 2009 to discuss plans to maintain the jail in the current location. The County received a list of follow-up questions regarding the proposed jail project and responded in January 2010. As part of this response, the County indicated a willingness to discuss the street facades of the new jail with the City of Napa.

Jail Population

On January 24, 2010, Penal Code Section 4019 changed the credits inmates serving sentences in local jails received for good time and work time. Prior to January 24, 2010, inmates could receive one day of good time credit and one day of work time credit for every six days served on a sentence, potentially reducing a sentence by one-third. After January 24, 2010, inmates without a history of violent felony convictions and not serving time for specific offenses including sex offenses, became eligible to receive one day of good time credit and one day of work time credit for every four days served on a sentence, potentially reducing a sentence by one-half. Upon implementation, the Director of Corrections, after consulting with legal counsel, the District Attorney and the Public Defender, applied the new credit laws on a prospective basis.

The application of these revised credit laws led to the immediate release of over one dozen inmates and has contributed to a significant reduction in the inmate population. The following charts depict the average, low point and high point inmate population, during the month of February from the years 2006-2010.

Jail Population Analysis-February-All			
Year	Average Daily Population	Low Point	High Point
2006	269	248	285
2007	263	241	281
2008	243	220	259
2009	264	242	277
2010	218	204	236

Jail Population Analysis-February-Sentenced Only			
Year	Average Daily Population	Low Point	High Point
2006	129	113	141
2007	91	80	107
2008	97	85	105
2009	77	69	87
2010	65	56	76

While the overall reduction in inmate population cannot be attributed solely to the change in sentencing laws, the change has had an immediate impact. County staff will continue to monitor these changes over time to determine the long-term impact of the change in sentencing laws. The impact of these changes may be short lived due to the State's prison crisis and current proposals to shift certain offenders to local jails instead of prisons. Additionally, the author of SBX13 which amended Penal Code Section 4019 and changed the good time/work time credit laws has introduced legislation to clarify the law and essentially revert the good time/work times credits for those serving local time back to the one day of each credit for every six days served (1/3 sentence reduction.) Staff will continue to monitor the progression of this proposed legislation.

Even if the jail facility continues to operate significantly below the rated capacity of 264, the need for a new jail facility does not go away. As indicated in previous reports, the current jail facility is antiquated and is not designed to operate according to correctional best practices. County staff will continue to proceed with addressing the recommendations previously made regarding the replacement of the current jail facility. In the interim, certain capital improvement and safety and security changes may need to be made in order to continue operating as efficiently as possible in the current space.

Mental Health Services in the Jail

As referenced in the October 2008 report to the Board of Supervisors, the Department of Corrections has faced significant challenges related to the mental health population. The jail currently has only one mental health designated bed and population estimates prepared by

Carter Goble Lee indicate that based on the population, the jail will need a small mental health unit of approximately 32 beds by 2025.

The Director of Health and Human Services has facilitated an effort over the last year to initiate contact with Napa State Hospital administration to explore strategies to reduce the impact of NSH inmates transferred to county correctional facilities after charged with crimes at NSH. These transfers raise issues regarding the provision of appropriate mental health services while the inmates are housed in local jails and consume a significant amount of local jail capacity. Despite these efforts, talks have not been very successful. While some improvements have been made on the information provided to the Department of Corrections by Napa State Hospital on patients transferred to the facility, we have not been successful in our efforts to persuade Napa State Hospital to continue housing these patients during the court adjudication process.

In addition to the on-going Napa State Hospital issues, the Department of Corrections has seen an increase in the mental health needs of non-Napa State Hospital inmates causing a strain on the current services offered. The Department of Corrections currently has one (1) Forensic Mental Health Counselor on site 40 hours per week and offers four (4) hours of tele-psychiatry time per week. While the Department of Corrections currently meets the standards set forth in Title 15, the demand for mental health services is not always met and the Department is currently unable to meet the California Medical Association Institute for Medical Quality certification with the current staffing levels. Current staffing also does not allow for additional services including coordinated pre-release planning.

The Director of Corrections and staff from the County Executive Office has discussed these concerns with the Mental Health Director who has developed a recommended plan of action. As part of the Fiscal Year 2010-2011 budget, staff will be recommended the addition of one (1) Supervising Mental Health Counselor position. This position will immediately supervise staff responsible for treatment and case coordination of individuals with mental health needs during incarceration and upon discharge. This supervisory position will facilitate coordination and communication with Corrections medical and custody staff and carry an active caseload. Working hours will be staggered to allow for additional coverage.

Capital Improvements in the Existing Jail

As referenced in this report and previous reports, the jail facility is antiquated and it will be at least five (5) years before a new facility will be operational. As part of the County's Facilities Master Planning Project, Jones, Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc. will conduct a facilities condition assessment of various County buildings, including the jail facility, to determine what deficiencies exist and systems in need of replacement. The Director of Corrections has delayed submitting jail facility capital improvement project requests in anticipation of a new jail facility. Given that a new jail facility will not be operational for at least five (5) years, it may be necessary to repair or replace systems within the current jail facility to ensure the safety and security of the facility. The Department of Corrections is currently experiencing issues with the

Master Control Panel. The Director of Corrections is currently researching the most cost effective repair or replacement options. Given that the current panel is an analog panel and the current industry standard is a digital panel, the only option may be to replace the existing panel.

Next Steps

Over the next two years staff will work on the development of a financing plan for a new jail facility, the following will be addressed in future years in regards to the replacement of the existing jail facility:

- If determined to be financially feasible, release a Request for Proposal for services from a Design Build (Bridging) architect who has experience preparing bridging documents for county jail facilities and who has fully designed county jails in the State of California. Services would include preparation of the bridging documents but also model codes, including structural, plan check of the construction documents prepared by the Design Build (Bridging) architect/contractor team and support services during the Design Build phase.
- Work with a the Design Build (Bridging) architect, Carter Goble Lee and the Facility Master Plan consultants to determine whether the newer jail annex should be renovated and included in the new jail facility or replaced completely.
- Continue to monitor the jail population and revise jail bed projections as necessary.

Section 7: Criminal Justice Information Management System Replacement Project

In Spring 2009, the Information Technology Services (ITS) Division of the County Executive Office began the process of reviewing the current Criminal Justice Information Management System (CJIMS). The current CJIMS technology is built on a platform that is no longer supported and ITS identified the opportunity to improve the current system as well as address the deficiencies such as the need to interface with non-County systems and eliminate the need for duplicate data entry. The CJIMS system is used by all County and some non-county criminal justice and public safety agencies and is crucial to the efficient operation of the criminal justice process. The opportunity presented itself to take a bigger picture approach and design a system that meets the County's changing needs. For example, as part of the Adult Correctional System Mater Plan, the County is now interested in statistical data reporting that cannot currently be collected in a simplified way. Additionally, plans to replace the current jail facility will result in the need to expand the use of technology within the jail facility. Working on the CJIMS system now will help make a transition to the new jail facility smooth. The CJIMS Replacement Project was identified as one of the strategic objectives at the Board of Supervisors September 27, 2009 retreat.

Over the last six months, a team of staff from the ITS Division has met with each of the County criminal justice and public safety agencies to develop system requirements and document current business flow processes. These meetings were designed to extensively walk through all processes, identify and understand future needs, brainstorm ideas to improve workflow processes and increase the use of electronic workflow and documentation, therefore reducing the need for paper files. In addition to meeting with County Departments, ITS reached out to key partners including the Napa Police Department and Napa Superior Court.

ITS created a CJIMS Change Management Committee comprised of members from various criminal justice and public safety departments. The purpose of the Change Management Committee is to review any proposed changes to the current CJIMS application and prioritize future changes for the replacement project. The Change Management Committee attended various vendor presentations to explore potential CJIMS replacement options and ITS staff contacted other counties to discuss viable software options. Surprisingly, ITS learned that other counties do not currently have or are not planning for an all encompassing criminal justice information management system. While Sacramento County has identified a need similar to that identified by Napa, Sacramento has decided not to proceed with their efforts at this time. Napa County's collaborative nature and positive partnership with the Napa Police Department and Napa Superior Court make building a fully integrated system possible.

Next Steps and Cost Implications

After careful consideration and research, the Chief Information Officer is recommending to proceed with building, not purchasing, a fully integrated criminal justice system. This is based on the fact that any currently available fully integrated system would require major software

customization in order to meet Napa's needs. That being the case, building a system that meets Napa's needs is the more prudent choice.

The cost to build a new criminal justice information system internally are still being developed. The advantage to building is that there are fewer upfront costs than there would be had the decision been made to purchase a new system. The majority of this cost of building a system will come from the use of existing ITS resources already budgeted within the ITS Division's budget that will be reallocated to the criminal justice departments. The proposed 2010-2011 ITS Division budget will include \$250,000 in new appropriations to cover the cost of equipment and consultant time.

The ITS Department will work with the criminal justice and public safety departments over the next few months to develop an application build and implementation schedule including selecting a department with which to begin building and testing a new system. Final budget numbers will be developed and presented to the Board of Supervisors as part of the regular budget process in future fiscal years.

Section 8: Conclusion

The Criminal Justice Committee and the County Executive Office has made significant progress to date on the recommendations approved by the Board of Supervisors on October 13, 2008. There is still a substantial amount of work to be completed. Key steps to be accomplished over the next year include:

- Complete a process evaluation of the Community Corrections Service Center.
- Implement the education and employment training program in the Department of Corrections.
- Implement a validated, evidence-based pre-trial assessment tool and analyze initial results to determine whether the appropriate inmates are being held in the jail on a pre-sentenced basis. Discuss and possibly recommend pre-trial release programs.
- Continue to implement evidence-based practices within the Probation Department and work on implementing quality assurance review processes to analyze the impact these practices have.
- Redesign the Alcohol and Drug Services Division Outpatient Treatment program to provide services that are both evidence-based in treating drug and alcohol addictions and address criminogenic needs.
- If financially feasible, move forward on plans to replace the current jail facility.
- Begin the process of rebuilding and replacing the current Criminal Justice Information Management System.

County Staff and Continued Use of Professional Consultants

The County Executive Office will continue to provide central staff support and coordination of the Adult Correctional System Master Plan. 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, architects and computer programmers.

The County may also need to utilize additional consultants or increase current contract maximums to assist with this process. This determination will be made on an as needed basis.

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