

COUNTYWIDE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE **January 19, 2005** MEETING

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 739
Los Angeles, California 90012

MEMBERS PRESENT

Leroy Baca, Acting Chair
Janice Fukai
Dave Lambertson
Lakshmanan Sathyavagiswaran
David Singer

ALTERNATES

Earl Bradley for John Fullinwider
Ed Brekke for Jack Clarke
Ed Brekke Alice Hill*
Ed Brekke for William MacLaughlin*
Marcus Castro for Dennis Tafoya
Brian Center for Gloria Molina
David Davies for Paul Higa
Gus Frias for Diane Robles*
Joe Jackson for James Hahn
Robert Kalunian for Michael Judge
Tom Kelly for Stephen Delgado*
Lamar Lafave for Margaret York*
Larry Mason for Steve Cooley
Sally Meloch for Debra Yang
Patrick Ogawa for Thomas Garthwaite
Ray Regalado for Robin Toma*
Buren Simmons for Roy Romer
Peter Shutan for Rockard Delgadillo*
Debbie Smith for Joyce Streater
Sylvia Wells for Michael Nash*
Bernard Zapor for John Torres

*Not a designated alternate

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT OR REPRESENTED

Cynthia Banks, Community and Senior Services
William Bratton, Chief, Los Angeles Police Department
Michael Brown, California Highway Patrol
Ray Fortner, County Counsel
William Fujioka, Administrative and Research Services
Richard Garcia, Federal Bureau of Investigations
Thomas Garthwaite, Department of Health Services
Anthony Hernandez, Department of Coroner
Jaclyn Tilley Hill, Quality and Productivity Commission
David Hinig, San Gabriel Police Chiefs' Association
Mary Thornton House, Los Angeles Superior Court
Jack Hunt, Superior Court
Ronald Iden, Federal Bureau of Investigations
Jay Imperial, League of California Cities
Thomas Jackson, California Contract Cities

David Janssen, Chief Administrative Officer
Andrew Kauffman, Superior Court
Bill Lockyer, Attorney General
Cindy Miscikowski, Los Angeles City Council
Manny Ortega, Southeast Police Chiefs' Association
Stephen Port, South Bay Chiefs' Association
Richard Propster, Peace Officers' Association of Los Angeles County
David Sanders, Department of Children and Family Services
Thomas Schiltgen, Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Marvin Southard, Department of Mental Health
Maria Stratton, Federal Public Defender
Michael Tynan, Los Angeles Superior Court
David Wesley, Los Angeles Superior Court

STAFF

Peggy Shuttleworth, Executive Director
Vincent Holmes
Cynthia Machen
Craig Marin
Pat Zabaro

GUESTS/OTHERS

Joseph Charney, Justice Deputy, Third District Board of Supervisors
Scott Edson, Sheriff's Department & Information Systems Advisory Body
Ali Farahani, Probation Department
Tut Hayes, Private Citizen
Karl Henry, Indigent Criminal Defense Appointment Program
Jack Leonard, Los Angeles Times
Anna Pembedjian, Justice Deputy, Fifth District Board of Supervisors
Maria Ramirez, District Attorney's Office
John Ruegg, Information Systems Advisory Body
Devallis Rutledge, District Attorney's Office
Alison Shackelford, Copley News Service
Mary Weaver, Friends Outside

I. CONVENE / INTRODUCTIONS – Leroy Baca

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 p.m. by Los Angeles County Sheriff Leroy Baca, Vice Chair of this Committee, and Acting Chair of this meeting. Self-introductions of members and guests followed.

II. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Leroy Baca

There were no requests for revisions to the Minutes of the meeting on November 17, 2004. A Motion was made to approve the Minutes.

ACTION: The Motion to approve the Minutes of the November 17, 2004 meeting was seconded and approved without objection.

**III. JAILHOUSE WITNESS PROTECTION TASK FORCE FINAL REPORT –
Maria Ramirez**

Maria Ramirez is a Special Assistant with the County District Attorney's Specialized Prosecutions and Fraud and Corruption Bureaus. She appeared before this committee to present the Final Report of the Jailhouse Witness Protection Task Force (Task Force).

The Task Force was created last summer by District Attorney Steve Cooley, and it was given the task of making recommendations for improving safety for witnesses that are being held at the County Jail. Eight prominent members of the community were invited to participate, along with eight members of the District Attorney's Office.

Extensive research was conducted, which included reviewing past Grand Jury Reports, conducting interviews, hearing presentations from representatives of criminal justice agencies, and taking a tour of the County Jail. Ms. Ramirez thanked Sheriff Baca on behalf of the Task Force for the cooperation and helpfulness of the Sheriff's Department in addressing this issue and in providing information for the Final Report.

Focus Areas

In making its recommendations, the Task Force focused on the following seven areas:

1) Jailhouse Telephone Recording and Monitoring Systems

Over 3,500 public telephones are available to the inmates in the county jails, but there is no recording or monitoring system in place to record the inmates' telephone conversations. Currently, the Sheriff's Department requires a Court order before recording or listening to the calls, and there are a limited number of ports available for monitoring.

The Task Force reported that the telephone contract may be negotiated so that recording and monitoring systems can be provided at no extra cost.

The report also found that there are no modern technologies available in the telephone system at the jail. That is, there are no ways to do call blocking, block three-way calling, or have inmates enter an identification number to determine who is using a telephone at a particular time.

2) Inmate Mobility within the Jail

The report found that there is extensive unescorted movement of inmates within the County Jail, and also an underutilization of the wristband scanner system. During the on-site visit to the facility, there were only two scanners available for use.

3) Inmate Worker Issues

The report states that there is a disparate system of selection between general inmate workers and the housing module workers.

General inmate workers are selected by the prisoner personnel office. There are specified criteria used for selecting these workers, and they are required to wear different uniforms so that they are easily identified. They are also housed in a different area of the jail.

In contrast, housing module workers are selected by the Deputy Sheriff who is in charge of the module. There are no uniform selection criteria for these workers, and it is alleged that sometimes the inmates will recommend a person to the Deputy.

The Task Force also noted that housing module workers were being used as messengers for delivering paperwork. That practice has since been stopped.

4) Classification Requests and Processing Issues

The report states that the County Jail has an outmoded paper system. In order to request a keep away order, a card must be filled out by the individual at the Court who is making the request. The card is then sent to the County Jail.

The problem with this process is that the card may not reach the jail until many hours after at the inmate has arrived.

There is also no up-to-date computer system that connects the Courts and the County Jail system. Instead, a paper process is used for this communication.

Furthermore, when a person is put on keep away status, the two Deputy Sheriffs in the jail liaison team may decide to change the inmate's status without first informing the individual in the criminal justice system that initially made the request.

5) Alternative Housing and Transportation Issues

The Task Force found that individuals on keep away status were sometimes commingled with other inmates in the Inmate Reception Center area or in places where inmates were preparing to be transferred to Court. On occasion, a witness may be placed on the same bus with the defendant, but kept in a back area.

6) California Witness Protection Program Issues

The California Witness Protection Program can provide assistance for witnesses both in and out of custody. However, the fund is very limited, with about three million dollars allotted annually. In addition to seeking a 20% increase in their funds, those in charge of this program also wish to have a member of law enforcement become a part of their training team.

7) Training Issues

While a number of criminal justice agencies have received training on witness protection issues, they are not trained universally.

Recommendations

The Task Force's Final Report includes numerous recommendations for improvement, and the Sheriff's Department has expressed agreement with many of them. The primary recommendation is the formation of a Witness Protection Unit (WPU) within the Sheriff's Department that would have the sole responsibility and accountability within the Department for the protection, classification, housing, and transportation of inmate witnesses.

The secondary recommendation is the creation of a standing multi-agency subcommittee under the Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee (CCJCC) that will address the issues of witness protection throughout Los Angeles County.

Public Comments

Tut Hayes, private citizen, expressed support for efforts to improve protection for witnesses in the County Jail. Mr. Hayes stated that, when he was in a similar situation, he felt that there was inadequate protection for him while in jail.

Motion

A Motion was made to create a multi-agency standing subcommittee of CCJCC to address the issues of witness protection throughout Los Angeles County.

ACTION: The Motion to create a multi-agency standing subcommittee of CCJCC to address the issues of witness protection was seconded and approved without opposition.

IV. INFORMATION SYSTEMS ADVISORY BODY – John Ruegg

John Ruegg, Executive Director of the Information Systems Advisory Body (ISAB), appeared before this committee to present the ISAB's Semi-Annual Report.

ISAB Charter

The ISAB Charter has recently been updated. One change involves the number of votes the Superior Court has. Previously, the Court had two votes, one for the Superior Court and one for the Los Angeles Municipal Court. However, since all of the County Municipal Courts merged with the Superior Court in 2000, only the Superior Court exists. Therefore, the member's list now provides one vote for the Superior Court, and they have reduced their funding commitment to ISAB accordingly.

Another change is that the Alternate Public Defender's Office and the Chief Information Office have been added as non-voting members to ISAB.

Finally, the Charter now specifies that only funding members of ISAB will vote on funding issues.

A Motion was made to ratify the new ISAB Charter.

ACTION: The Motion to ratify the new ISAB Charter was seconded and approved without opposition.

Semi-Annual Report

Mr. Ruegg referred those in attendance to copies of the ISAB Report that were distributed at this meeting. He remarked on ISAB's progress with several ongoing projects, among which include ISAB Marketing, CJIS Wiring, video conferencing, and the ISAB Standards Committee.

The primary focus of the presentation was on the Los Angeles Documents and Objects Exchange (LADOX) program. This employs the ISAB criminal justice Enterprise Document Management Software (EDMS) functions to develop electronic capture, storage, and exchange of criminal justice documents and multi-media objects within and between criminal justice agencies.

In particular, the Probation Enterprise Document Management System (PEDMS) provides electronic storage and routing of probation reports to the Court, Prosecution, and Defense. The Probation Department is now using this system to track all of their investigation reports from the time that the Court orders it until the delivery of the report. This includes the supervisor's review, the dictation step, and all of the edits.

A Motion was made to approve the ISAB Semi-Annual Report for submission to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

ACTION: The Motion to approve the ISAB Semi-Annual Report for submission to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors was seconded and approved without opposition.

Probation Enterprise Document Management System (PEDMS)

Mr. Ruegg introduced Ali Farahani, Chief Information Officer of the Probation Department, to provide a detailed presentation PEDMS.

The Probation Department's existing process for preparing and delivering probation reports to the Court is a manual process that is outdated in terms of preparation of the report, document sharing, and document management and storage.

In total, there are 320,159 Court-ordered probation reports produced each year. These include 80,400 for adult pretrial, 68,400 for adult investigation, 84,000 for adult supervision, 21,632 for juvenile investigation, 48,576 for juvenile supervision, 12,951 for detention-IDC, and 4,200 for camp supervision.

To improve the efficiency of the manner in which the Probation Department processes its Court-ordered reports, PEDMS was conceived as a department-wide centralized document management and workflow system with the following features:

1. Centralized web-based system that will make any Court-ordered report available to the staff from any work location;
2. Workflow feature that will provide automated staff assignment and tracking of all Court-ordered reports;
3. Digital storage of Court-ordered reports and other documents that will generate cost savings and improve overall efficiency and productivity; and
4. The system will be part of the County's LADOX initiative to promote data and document sharing between justice agencies.

The development of PEDMS has the following benefits:

Organizational

1. Improves the quality of the services provided by the Probation Department to the Court and the public;
2. Results in significant operational efficiencies by reducing the total "Time to Court" factor of preparing and submitting reports; and
3. Allows the Probation Department to evaluate staff performance and focus on improving the quality of the Court-ordered reports.

Operational

1. Automatic notification to Court clerks, prosecution, and defense attorneys that contain:
 - A link to the probation report;
 - Notification that the report has been delivered to the appropriate printers;
2. Automatically create a PDF of the final report;
3. Security access to all information based upon a need to know;
4. Ability to view what step in the process a report is at;
5. Audit trails of all activity pertaining to the creation and processing of the report;
6. Electronic library of all reports, including audit trails.

Mr. Farahani noted that the Superior Court still requests that the probation reports be delivered in paper form. However, the Probation Department is currently working with the Court to resolve any concerns regarding copying and distribution so that the paper delivery can be eliminated.

Public Comments

Mr. Hayes expressed concern that, while probation reports are supposed to be kept confidential, he has found that the report is available for viewing in his case file, which in turn is available to the public. He believes that this clerical problem is widespread.

V. OTHER MATTERS / PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Hayes stated that the Court's public information document on filing appeals contains an inaccuracy. Specifically, it correctly states that the Appellant Court will not review questions of fact, only questions of law. However, in describing questions of fact, the document states that those issues were decided by the trial judge. Mr. Hayes noted that if the defendant had a jury trial, then the questions of fact were decided by the jury, not the trial judge.

Another concern that he expressed is that a law library is being closed, and that students will be used to assist individuals instead.

VI. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Sheriff Baca adjourned the meeting at 12:55 p.m. The next CCJCC meeting will be held on **Wednesday, February 16, 2005 at 11:30 a.m. in Room 739 of the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration.**