

August 17, 1981

Sacramento City Council 915 I Street Sacramento, California 95814

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter will advise you that at least ten members of the Ex-Offender Committee would like to address the need for additional work furlough/halfway house programs in the Sacramento area.

We will be present at your next meeting, Tuesday, August 18, 1981, at 7:30 P.M., and will state our views from the audience as concerned citizens.

Suncerely,

Shirley A. Dangerfield

441-7800

APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

SEP 291981

OFFICE OF THE





CITY OF SACRAMENTO

AUG 1 1 1981

Hogan 5224

JOHN P. KEARNS CHIEF OF POLICE

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE

HALL OF JUSTICE 813 - 8TH STREET SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814 TELEPHONE (916) 449-5121

MEMORANDUM

By the City the oil office of the City State

Cont Yo

11 August 1981 REF: 8-17

Walter Slipe, City Manager City Hall 915 I Street

Sacramento, California UG 1 1 1981

Dear Mr. Slipe:

On 3 August 1981 Mr. Jack Allen, District Administrator, Department of Corrections provided information to the members of the Council alleging that the statistics on parolees which I previously submitted were correct, but presented a "distorted picture".

Apparently, Mr. Allen felt this was because the information I provided included parolees from the California Youth Authority as well as the Department of Corrections.

In order to clarify this situation I had my staff compile statistical information for CDC parolees only from 1977 to the present. All of the statistical information we have on parolees released to Sacramento is obtained from Department of Justice form 107. All arrest figures quoted are those arrests made by this department and do not include any made by the Sacramento Sheriff's Department or any other law enforcement jurisdiction.

I would like to point out that no program for capturing statistical information on parolees was developed by this department until November 1978. Prior to that date, no information was provided to this agency, but when I learned 1,512 adult parolees were released to Sacramento between January 1977 through July 1978, I implemented programs to capture statistical information on parolees.

The statistical information for parolees is provided through a verbal agreement with the Department of Justice and is not always timely or complete. This results in delays or incomplete information on the monthly reports, but the annual report is complete and reflects the information we have been provided.

	SACRAMENTO CO.	SACRAMENTO CO.	OUTSIDE CO.	TOTAL PAROLEE	SPD
YEAR_	COMMITTMENTS	PAROLEE RELEASES	PAROLEES	RELEASES	ARRESTS Not
1/77-7/78	3 760	731	781	1512	Available
1979	395	200	247	447	146
1980	381	278	168	506	242
	Not	Not	Not		
1/81-6/81	l Available	Available	Available	227	168

It should be noted that we do have annual information for the years of 1979 and 1980 and it does not include the number of parolees that were originally paroled to another county and subsequently transferred to Sacramento. Information on the number of parolee transfers is tardy at best and the difficulty in compiling any information regarding parolees was a major reason for the development of SB-503 (Parolee Registration).

I have no explanation for the differences in the statistical information provided by Mr. Allen and those compiled by my staff from information received from the Department of Justice.

I can only point out that Mr. Allen himself states that the information I have submitted is correct, but somehow distorts the situation regarding parolees. If SB-503 was in effect at this time, I would be able to immediately respond to any question regarding the number of parolees in the Sacramento area and would not be forced to wait while the Department of Corrections submits information to the Department of Justice and they in turn submit the information to this agency.

Sincerely.

Join P. Kearns, HIEF OF POLICE

JPK:HH:al



DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

PAROLE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION 7000 Franklin Blvd., Suite 190 Sacramento, California 95823 (916) 445-8925



August 3, 1981

By the City Council
Office of the City Clerk

CITY COUNCIL 915 "I" Street Sacramento, CA 95814

Alic .

AUG 4 1981

Members in Session:

On Tuesday, July 28, 1981, you were presented some statistics by Police Chief John Kearns concerning the efforts of the State Department of Corrections to open a community correctional center in Sacramento.

The statistics, while I believe them to be accurate, represent a somewhat distorted picture of the adult parolee population in Sacramento. I would also like to point out that our efforts to respond to community concerns over parolees in this area are not favorably represented in these statistics.

The most current data with respect to our effort to control the influx of parolees into Sacramento is as follows:

MALE FELONS RECEIVED FROM SACRAMENTO COUNTY*

<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	1980
370	390	395	381

MALE FELONS PAROLED TO SUPERVISION - SACRAMENTO COUNTY**

<u> 1977</u>	1978	1979	<u>1980</u>
558	493	373	430

* Dept. of Corrections Offender Information Services 5/21/81

** Includes approximately 100 cases supervised in Yolo, Placer, Nevada and Sierra Counties

CITY COUNCIL August 3, 1981 Page 2

These figures indicate that our effort to control the release of other county of commitments to Sacramento have made notable progress. In 1980 we rejected 229 cases for parole to Sacramento County via our screening procedure.

Chief Kearns indicates that 446 parolees were arrested in 1980. It is indicated that this is an increase of 44% in one year. It should be noted that arrests are not always indicative of criminal involvement. This statistic includes both youth and adult parolees and there is no indication as to the number of arrests which are actually adults; however, the statistics on recidivism should certainly give one a clue (Youth Authority 45% - Adult parolees 26%.)

My concern over the number of parolees coming to Sacramento is as great as yours and I have personally been involved in the screening process. However the opening of a re-entry facility in Sacramento will not increase the number of parolees to be supervised here. We are concerned with a group of individuals (inmates) who within 90 days are to be released to the community. The opportunity to prepare for this inevitable release can only be enhanced by release through a community re-entry facility.

Local law enforcement will receive complete cooperation in the identification of all participants, as is the case with our present facility. The establishment of such a facility will give local law enforcement and the Parole Division and opportunity to observe the adjustment of these inmates prior to their parole release and thus to identify potential problem individuals.

I can only urge you to reconsider your position as indicated at the Council meeting of July 29, 1981. I also request that you maintain a neutral position pending our effort to establish such a facility, until a vendor has been identified and a proposed site selected.

Respectfully submitted,

District Administrator

Hug 13, 1981 20 To: The Members the Coly Council in Session I wish to Speak at your session on Argust 18, 1981 regarding the proposal by the Calif Dept. of Corrections to open another Halfway Hurse / With Tourbough Center in the Sacraments alea. Thank you Robert Earl Zawoltow Robertal Tulle J.D., 363-7155





CITY OF SACRAMENTO

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE
HALL OF JUSTICE SAGRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

HALL OF JUSTICE SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814 813 - 6TH STREET TELEPHONE (916) 448-5121 CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

B G G V G V

AUG 28 1981

JOHN P. KEARNS CHIEF OF POLICE

27 August 1981

City Council Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session 9-29-8

SUBJECT: PAROLEE REPORT

4-27-81

By the City Co. 41

Office of the Clary Like

SEP 1 1981

On 3 August 1981, you were presented some statistics by Mr. Jack Allen, District Parole Administrator for the Department of Corrections in support of a parolee re-entry facility.

An analysis of the information submitted by Mr. Allen revealed that it is incomplete and does not accurately reflect the California Department of Corrections parolee population assigned to Parole Supervision in Sacramento County. The statistical information he submitted did not include female parolees or those parolees originally paroled to another area and subsequently transferred to Sacramento.

In order to clarify this very complex situation, I directed my staff to obtain information directly from the Department of Corrections'instead of utilizing information received from the Department of Justice.

This task has been completed and the following summary of Department of Corrections statistical reports on parolee populations vindicates my position that Sacramento receives an inordinate number of parolees and that the creation of additional Community Correctional Centers will only tend to add to the present imbalance.

I have also reviewed the response of the Department of Corrections to your request for a guarantee that the number of parole releases will not exceed the annual Sacramento County commitment total by a maximum of 10%.

Their response indicates a willingness to accept 10% over the commitment total as a goal for Sacramento parole releases, but this step alone will not have a significant impact upon the number of parolees assigned to this area that were originally committed by other counties. This position is documented by the fact that California Department of Corrections parolee statistics show that in excess of 30% of the parolee population in Sacramento over the last four years were transferred here after being paroled to another area.

I am philosophically opposed to the concept of Community Correctional Centers as it is currently being proposed because it is only a device to solve prison over-crowding problems. The program returns felons to the community where they are housed in non-secure facilities, to serve a portion of their prison sentence. I am not satisfied with the custodial security of these facilities and I feel these inmates will pose an additional threat to the citizens in this area.

As the Chief Law Enforcement Officer of the City, I cannot endorse or subscribe to a program that may jeapordize the lives or properties of citizens of this community.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. Kearns

CHIEF OF POLICE

Attachment JPK:HH:al

For City Council Information:

Walter J. Slipe, City Manager

SACRAMENTO CDC PAROLEE POPULATION SACRAMENTO AREA (MALE AND FEMALE)

1980	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Paroled to Sacramento Parole Reinstated in Sacramento Parolees Transferred to Sacramento TOTAL SACRAMENTO PAROLEE POPULATION	500 92 317	18 4 23	518 96 340 954
Sacramento North Sacramento Downtown Sacramento South	336 192 381	13 15 17	349 207 398 954
1979	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Paroled to Sacramento Parole Reinstated in Sacramento Parolees Transferred to Sacramento TOTAL SACRAMENTO PAROLEE POPULATION	464 107 252	24 7 17	488 114 269 871
Sacramento North Sacramento Downtown Sacramento South	280 222 321	20 15 13	300 237 <u>334</u> 871
** <u>1978</u>	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Paroled to Sacramento Parole Reinstated in Sacramento Parolees Transferred to Sacramento TOTAL SACRAMENTO PAROLEE POPULATION	583 122 283	23 4 18	606 126 <u>301</u> 1033
Sacramento North Sacramento Downtown Sacramento South	385 208 395	16 16 13	401 224 408 1033
** <u>1977</u>	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Paroled to Sacramento Parole Reinstated in Sacramento Parolees Transferred to Sacramento TOTAL SACRAMENTO PAROLEE POPULATION	674 74 325	25 4 26	699 75 351 1128
Sacramento North Sacramento Downtown Sacramento South	426 187 460	12 21 22	438 208 482 1128

SOURCE: Department of Corrections Offender Information Services Administrative Services Division

^{**} SB42 - Determinate Sentencing, effective 7/1/77

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

SACRAMENTO

August 17, 1981



The Honorable Phillip Isenberg and City Council Members Sacramento City Council City Hall, Room 205 915 I Street Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mayor Isenberg and
Members of the City Council:

In recent weeks, you have been discussing with Mr. Jack Allen, District Parole Administrator of the Sacramento area, the issue of establishing a re-entry facility in the greater Sacramento area. It is my understanding that your principal concern revolves around the higher ratio of parolee releases, compared to commitments from Sacramento County, and that you are asking for a guaranteed reduction in the ratio.

There is not a direct relationship between our re-entry effort and the number of parole releases to Sacramento. Sacramento County commitments will be paroled directly to Sacramento whether or not a re-entry program exists. Those re-entry inmates having only 120 days remaining until mandatory release on parole are carefully screened and only the least serious offenders will be accepted. Re-entry programs have a direct positive impact on the re-integration of these parolees into your community.

You have been provided statistics for 1977/1980 that demonstrate the efforts of the Parole and Community Services Division to achieve some parity in releasees from other than Sacramento County as indicated by a 35 percent reduction in the number released to the county during that period. Our optimum goal is to move closer to a one-to-one ratio of commitments to releases as suggested by the Council. Our review and evaluation of recent efforts to control parole releases to this area, prompts us to agree that we can further limit releases to no more than 10 percent over the commitment rate. This rate would be determined either on the annual commitment(s) from Sacramento County or the total number of commitments from Sacramento County. Needless to say, our efforts to control releases to the Sacramento area will be consistent with legal limitations.

I trust that these goals meet with your approval and we solicit your support and consultation during our efforts to <u>develop</u> our re-entry programs.

Yours truly,

Director of Corrections

By the City Council Office of the City Clark

Cont 40 8-25-81

AUG 18 1981

cc: Howard D. Miller, Deputy Director, P&CSD Irv Marks, Regional Parole Administrator Jack Allen, District Parole Administrator