

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

181



FROM: Executive Office

SUBMITTAL DATE:
March 17, 2016

SUBJECT: Receive and file the Criminal Justice System Review and Approve Amendment No. 1 with KPMG, LLP for two years [All Districts]; [Total \$15,730,000]; 100% General Fund

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Receive and file the Criminal Justice System Review;
2. Approve and authorize the Chairman to sign Amendment No. 1 to the professional services agreement with KPMG, LLP, for FY2015/16 to 2017/18 in a not to exceed amount of \$15,730,000; and,
3. Authorize the Purchasing Agent, in accordance with Ordinance No. 459, based on the availability of fiscal funding and as approved by County Counsel, to sign amendments that do not change the substantive terms of the agreement and sign amendments to the compensation provisions that do not exceed 10%.

BACKGROUND:

Summary

Continued on Page 2

Alex Gann

Alex Gann
Deputy County Executive Officer

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost:	POLICY/CONSENT (per Exec. Office)
COST	\$ 497,400	\$ 8,866,400	\$ 15,730,000	\$ 0	Consent <input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NET COUNTY COST	\$	\$	\$	\$	

SOURCE OF FUNDS: General Fund

Budget Adjustment:

For Fiscal Year: 15/16-17/18

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

County Executive Office Signature

Jan E. O.

Jan E. O.

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Bendit, seconded by Supervisor Washington and duly carried by unanimous vote, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended.

Ayes: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Washington, Benoit and Ashley
 Nays: None
 Absent: None
 Date: March 29, 2016
 xc: E.O., Purchasing

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board
By: *Kecia Harper-Ihem*

Deputy

Prev. Agn. Ref.: 3-53 10/06/15

District: All

Agenda Number:

16-3

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL 3/24/16
BY: *Gregory P. Priamos*
GREGORY P. PRIAMOS DATE

PURCHASING & FLEET SERVICES: Lisa Brandi, Director
Lisa Brandi
Departmental Concurrence

- Positions Added
- Change Order
- A-30
- 4/5 Vote

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FORM 11: Receive and file the Criminal Justice System Review and Approve Amendment No. 1 with KPMG, LLP for two years [All Districts]; [Total \$15,730,000]; 100% General Fund

DATE: March 17, 2016

PAGE: 2 of 3

BACKGROUND:

Summary

The Board of Supervisors approved an agreement with KPMG, LLP on October 6, 2015, to conduct an assessment of the criminal justice system, its organizational and operational performance, financial review; and review of the law-enforcement contract city rate.

The criminal justice system has seen an array of changes (e.g., AB 109, Prop. 47) within the last decade that necessitated the need for data driven processes to better inform departments and policymakers of best practices to be implemented within the system.

Given that public safety expenditures have neared two-thirds of the Board's discretionary spending authority, a detailed analysis by KPMG was needed in order to better chart a course toward a financially sustainable future. Their report provides a high-level assessment and recommendations that provide opportunities to improve and enhance the robust and capable system that is already in place. The report provides a roadmap for a more sustainable future for the county and criminal justice agencies, while adding technological and collaborative processes needed to meet the challenges for the future.

The project scope included the Office of the District Attorney, the Office of the Sheriff, Probation Department and the Office of the Public Defender. The key objectives of the review were to evaluate department operations, analyze cost methodologies and provide the Board with recommendations. KPMG conducted numerous interviews and analyses over 22 weeks. The team from KPMG interviewed department management and staff; conducted site visits where applicable; participated in ride-alongs for law enforcement and Probation operations; researched comparative county operational and financial information and reviewed relevant documentation provided by departments. The team also interviewed other county departments that are in some way involved in justice system operations, including Human Resources, Information Technology, Correctional Health, and collective bargaining units. The team from KPMG conducted over 100 meetings and interviews, reviewed thousands of pages of documentation and conducted over 20 site visits as part of the process.

KPMG has concluded its review and issued their report which includes numerous commendations for innovation by the departments and several opportunities for improvement.

Departments were commended for their innovative approach:

- Probation incorporating evidence-based practices in to their daily operations;
- District Attorney for its efforts to moving to a new case management system and working collaboratively with other criminal justice partners
- Public Defender for providing quality client services despite facility and resource challenges;
- Sheriff for their flexibility of operations and consistent effort to anticipate changing strategic needs and opportunities within the county

The departments have been briefed on the contents of the report and have participated in the editing and finalization of the report. Overall, 51 recommendations were identified across the county, four agencies, and contract cities focus areas. Recommendations have the potential to lead to cost savings and performance enhancements to help the county better collaborate across its departments to better achieve its goals and outcomes of safer, healthier, more sustainable communities. Implementation of the report's recommendations has the potential to provide future cost-savings in the tens of millions of dollars annually, if fully implemented. Cost containment, cost-avoidance, investment in technology, improved strategies toward efficiency/effectiveness will be necessary in order to ensure these recommendations are not only **implemented but** incorporated long-term into the criminal justice system. They also would promote additional collaboration between the partners and the county.

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FORM 11: Receive and file the Criminal Justice System Review and Approve Amendment No. 1 with KPMG, LLP for two years [All Districts]; [Total \$15,730,000]; 100% General Fund

DATE: March 17, 2016

PAGE: 3 of 3

Recommendations:

For the county to successfully implement the recommendations unique to the criminal justice agencies, it is important to establish a foundation of countywide collaboration and coordination to support the implementation. As part of its report, KPMG's numerous recommendations involve: countywide issues to enhance collaboration and communication at the criminal justice level; Office of the Sheriff (Field Operations, Corrections, Administration and Contract Policing); Probation; (continue/encourage current approach); Office of the District Attorney (new case management system); Office of Public Defender (strategy/management tools).

At the conclusion of today's workshop, staff recommends that the Board approve an amendment to the agreement with KPMG (\$15,730,000) in order to commence the project's implementation phase. The Executive Office recommends that the implementation begin immediately in order to capitalize on the progress made to date. The KPMG recommendations will strengthen the criminal justice system and build additional efficiency and effectiveness and prepare the County for new challenges ahead.

Impact on Residents and Businesses

Engaging the consultant will improve the county's efficiency and effectiveness.

SUPPLEMENTAL:

Additional Fiscal Information

The services performed for Amendment No. 1 are for a not-to-exceed amount of \$15,730,000. The General Fund will be utilized to fund the implementation phase. A budget adjustment will be processed in the Third Quarter Report.

Contract History and Price Reasonableness

Purchasing released Request for Proposal EOARC-036 on behalf of the Executive Office, sending solicitations to forty companies and advertising on the County's Internet site, seeking qualified consultants to perform a financial, organizational and operational performance review of the Riverside County criminal justice system to assist the Board of Supervisors in developing its budgetary priorities and allocations.

The County received five proposals that were reviewed by an evaluation team consisting of executives from the Executive Office, Economic Development Agency, Orange County Probation Department and San Bernardino County Purchasing Department. Each bid response was evaluated based on the criteria set forth in the RFP: overall response to the RFP requirements, bidders experience and ability, cost & fees, references, financials, clarification, exceptions, deviations and credentials, resumes, licenses, permits, and certifications.

All five vendors gave presentations to the evaluation team, and based on the interview and presentation, KPMG, LLP provided a comprehensive solution to perform the assessment of the criminal justice system organizational and operational performance, financial review; and review the law enforcement contract city rates. During the contract negotiations, County Purchasing reviewed KPMG cost proposal and negotiated a six percent cost reduction. The KPMG staff has extensive experience in national security, law enforcement and working with justice agencies to be more efficient and proactive.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AMENDMENT NO.1 TO THE AGREEMENT
WITH
KPMG LLP

Original Contract Term: October 6, 2015 through July 31, 2016
Amendment Date: March 29, 2016 through March 31, 2018
Amendment Amount: \$15,730,000
Contract Total: \$16,491,600
Contract ID: EOARC-94620-001-07/16


The Agreement between County of Riverside herein referred to as COUNTY and **KPMG LLP**, herein referred to as CONTRACTOR, entered into as of October 6, 2015, is hereby amended. The COUNTY represents to CONTRACTOR that COUNTY has the authority to issue this amendment to CONTRACTOR in accordance with all applicable law, regulations, rules, policies and requirements. The Agreement is amended as follows:

1. Amend Section 2.1 of the Agreement to add the following sentence at the end: "CONTRACTOR shall complete all services required under Attachment A-1 by March 31, 2018."
2. Section 3.1 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following: "The COUNTY shall pay for services performed, products provided and expenses incurred in accordance with the terms of Exhibit B, Payment provisions. Maximum payments by COUNTY to CONTRACTOR shall not exceed \$16,491,600 including all expenses. The COUNTY is not responsible for any fees or costs incurred above or beyond the contracted amount and shall have no obligation to purchase any specified amount of services or products. Unless otherwise specifically stated in Exhibit B, COUNTY shall not be responsible for payment of any CONTRACTOR'S expenses related to this Agreement."
3. Section 3.3 delete the second sentence and replacing with the following: "CONTRACTOR will be paid in five (5) equal monthly installments of \$126,933, and a final installment of \$126,935 upon receipt of all deliverables by COUNTY, for the scope of services under Exhibit A. CONTRACTOR will be paid in twenty four (24) installments as set forth in Attachment B-1, for the scope of services under Attachment A-1."
4. Exhibit A (Scope of Service) Attachment A-1 to this Amendment is added to Exhibit A.
5. Exhibit B (Payment Provisions) Attachment B-1 to this Amendment is added to Exhibit B.
6. All other terms and conditions of the Agreement not modified herein shall remain unchanged.


COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AMENDMENT NO.1 TO THE AGREEMENT
WITH
KPMG LLP

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have caused their duly authorized representatives to execute this Amendment.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, a political
subdivision of the State of California

By: 
John J. Benoit, Chairman
Board of Supervisors
Dated: MAR 29 2016

KPMG LLP

By: 
Name: MCPHERSON
Title: PRINCIPAL
Dated: 3.29.2016

ATTEST:

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board

By: 
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Gregory P. Priamos
County Counsel

By: 
Deputy County Counsel

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AMENDMENT NO.1 TO THE AGREEMENT
WITH
KPMG LLP

ATTACHMENT A-1 ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF WORK

The CONTRACTOR'S approach to executing this scope of work Exhibit A-1 will be conducted in accordance with the COUNTY'S agreement with CONTRACTOR approved by the COUNTY Board of Supervisors and executed thereby on October 6, 2015 ("Agreement"), and the preceding Request for Proposal #EOARC-036 under which CONTRACTOR was selected in a competitive procurement process.

Exhibit B of the Agreement included an "Optional Services 2" provision for COUNTY to request assistance from CONTRACTOR with "implementation of individual recommendations" as selected by county. For a period of up to twenty-four (24) months from COUNTY approval of this Attachment A-1, CONTRACTOR will provide support and assistance to the COUNTY as it begins efforts to implement individual recommendations to meet the following objectives (collectively "Transformation Support"):

1. Strategy Support: Facilitation of COUNTY strategic planning and development of goals, objectives, and measures against which COUNTY will measure the success of implementing recommendations.
2. Analysis Support: Data and process analysis to obtain a deeper empirical understanding of current COUNTY operations utilizing statistical sampling and lean process analysis techniques as appropriate.
3. Change Support: Facilitation of change impact analysis and communication related to recommendations and operational changes selected by COUNTY for implementation.
4. Program Support: Facilitation of COUNTY program governance and oversight to help ensure adherence to expected timescales and benefits related to recommendations being implemented by COUNTY.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AMENDMENT NO.1 TO THE AGREEMENT
WITH
KPMG LLP

Per section 17 of the Agreement, the COUNTY Executive Officer or designee shall administer this effort on behalf of the COUNTY and serve as liaison to facilitate and/or make all relevant management decisions necessary for the implementation of the recommendations that CONTRACTOR will support.

COUNTY understands that CONTRACTOR is unable to provide public advocacy, lobbying, or interpretation on matters regarding implementation of laws, regulations, or other policies undertaken by COUNTY as part of the recommendations selected for implementation by COUNTY.

Similarly, CONTRACTOR'S services are advisory in nature and will not include decision or direction on behalf of COUNTY regarding the tactical placement (i.e. time, location, quantity) and assignment of personnel resources.

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE

CONTRACTOR shall complete the following Transformation Support tasks as directed by COUNTY:

1. Strategy Support: Facilitation of COUNTY strategic planning and development of goals, objectives, and measures against which COUNTY will measure the success of implementing recommendations.
 - a. Facilitate and provide feedback in strategic planning workshops convened by COUNTY related to setting joint goals, objectives, and measures for the COUNTY'S implementation efforts.
 - b. Summarize strategic planning workshop outputs and assist in developing goals matrices with potential Key Performance Indicators ("KPIs") that align with COUNTY'S joint goals.
 - c. Assist COUNTY in developing recommended tracking matrices for on-going monitoring and fulfillment of COUNTY progress against strategic goals, objectives, and KPIs.
 - d. Assist in developing COUNTY-branded strategic planning documents to assist COUNTY in its communication efforts around its strategic direction to COUNTY departments and stakeholders.
 - e. Assist COUNTY in developing business case and scenario analysis documents

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AMENDMENT NO.1 TO THE AGREEMENT
WITH
KPMG LLP

to support COUNTY decision-making regarding potential courses of action.

2. Analysis Support: Data and process analysis to obtain a deeper empirical understanding of current COUNTY operations utilizing statistical sampling and lean process analysis techniques as appropriate.
 - a. Assist COUNTY in identifying data sources and data limitations in existing systems that may require statistical sampling techniques to allow for analysis not easily afforded by COUNTY systems.
 - b. Assist COUNTY in analyzing datasets for improvement opportunities within currently available data from existing COUNTY systems as well as those datasets compiled via statistical sampling efforts.
 - c. Assist COUNTY in charting workflows for existing processes and recommending changes to workflows aimed at improving the speed, cost, throughput, or quality of such processes.
 - d. Assist COUNTY in developing timelines for phased implementation of process changes selected by COUNTY through the process improvement lifecycle of plan, execute, compare, and adjust.
 - e. Assist COUNTY in developing workflow and workload analysis toolsets to allow further application of statistical sampling and lean process analysis techniques in other areas of COUNTY operation.

3. Change Support: Facilitation of change impact analysis and communication related to recommendations and operational changes selected by COUNTY for implementation.
 - a. Assist COUNTY in assessing change readiness related to recommendations selected by COUNTY for implementation to provide insight to those areas where near vs. longer-term benefits may be achieved.
 - b. Assist COUNTY in developing materials to support communication of changes to COUNTY departments that allow for enhanced understanding of changes to multiple layers of management.
 - c. Assist COUNTY in conducting workforce and customer surveys to assess the

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AMENDMENT NO.1 TO THE AGREEMENT
WITH
KPMG LLP

level of understanding of communicated changes and obtain feedback regarding further areas for improvement by COUNTY.

- d. Assist COUNTY in its efforts to provide training to COUNTY employees regarding enhanced use of workflow and workload analysis toolsets as well as statistical sampling and lean process analysis.

 - e. Assist COUNTY in developing measures for qualitative and quantitative impacts of its process improvement efforts with respect to cost, cycle time, work volume, and workforce/customer service.
4. Program Support: Facilitation of COUNTY program governance and oversight to help ensure adherence to expected timescales and benefits related to recommendations being implemented by COUNTY.
- a. Assist COUNTY in developing program and project management toolsets to identify and track the milestones, tasks, activities, resources and dependencies associated with COUNTY efforts.
 - b. Assist COUNTY in identifying program and project management risks and issues related to on-going work efforts to afford COUNTY with opportunities for risk mitigation and issue resolution.
 - c. Assist COUNTY in its efforts to provide training and guidance to COUNTY project or initiative manager resources to allow for enhanced understanding of project management disciplines.
 - d. Assist COUNTY in facilitating its on-going Transformation Program working group meetings to provide updates on work progress, risk/issue status, and expected COUNTY benefits and/or KPIs.
 - e. Assist COUNTY in gathering and monitoring progress updates from COUNTY departments related to those recommendations which COUNTY departments have already begun or initiate separately.

CONTRACTOR acknowledges that the scope of initiatives within the COUNTY'S Transformation Program will initially be based on those recommendations selected by the COUNTY for implementation arising out of CONTRACTOR'S Exhibit A

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AMENDMENT NO.1 TO THE AGREEMENT
WITH
KPMG LLP

work efforts now nearing completion. As such, COUNTY will provide on-going direction to, and prioritization of, the CONTRACTOR'S work efforts up to the overall Not-To-Exceed contract cost as described in Exhibit B as may be amended by COUNTY in the future.

CONTRACTOR will provide written monthly summaries of Transformation Support activities completed that also captures any COUNTY direction or decision-making relevant to CONTRACTOR'S work activities. This series of twenty-four (24) monthly summaries will serve as the CONTRACTOR 'S deliverable to COUNTY that may include progress updates, risks/issues identified, recommended actions for COUNTY decision, and illustrative outputs developed during the course of the applicable month to support COUNTY implementation.

COUNTY will provide CONTRACTOR with the necessary oversight, coordination, and information (as available) to allow CONTRACTOR to fulfill its Transformation Support work activities, including:

- a. Designation of a COUNTY Program Manager by the COUNTY Executive Officer to make all management decisions and provide direction related to CONTRACTOR work efforts.
- b. Documented decisions on those recommendations selected by COUNTY for implementation to allow CONTRACTOR advance notice to mobilize the appropriate resource skills and quantities.
- c. Designation of COUNTY personnel with whom CONTRACTOR can coordinate and will be responsible for discrete work efforts and deliverables to fulfill specific initiatives selected by COUNTY.
- d. Access to COUNTY departments and individual personnel knowledgeable and necessary to involve in CONTRACTOR Strategy Support, Analysis Support, Change Support, and Program Support efforts.
- e. Administrative support by COUNTY personnel for reproduction, meeting coordination, appointment scheduling, and facilitation of information requests to COUNTY departments.
- f. Escalation to appropriate COUNTY executive decision-makers of major risks and/or issues identified by CONTRACTOR as part of its Transformation Support work activities.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
 AMENDMENT NO.1 TO THE AGREEMENT
 WITH
 KPMG LLP

ATTACHMENT B-1 ADDITIONAL PAYMENT PROVISIONS

The CONTRACTOR'S professional fees to complete the Transformation Support scope of work described in Exhibit A-1 over a period of up to twenty-four (24) months are indicated below. CONTRACTOR'S compensation will be structured as an overall Not-To-Exceed amount on an all-inclusive Blended Hourly Rate basis based on monthly hours incurred.

Estimated Payment Schedule (Assuming early April 2016 Start):

1. CONTRACTOR'S all-inclusive overall costs shall be limited to the Not-To-Exceed amount of \$15,730,000 for CONTRACTOR'S support over a period of up to twenty-four (24) months.
2. CONTRACTOR shall invoice COUNTY at an all-inclusive Blended Hourly Rate of \$370.56 per hour based on the total actual hours incurred by CONTRACTOR resources in a given month.
3. CONTRACTOR shall provide a monthly invoice to COUNTY showing the total actual hours incurred by CONTRACTOR resources in a given month. Below is an estimated payment schedule, subject to change.

Description	Amount	Invoice Due Date
Payment 1 for services provided in April 2016	\$497,400	June 1, 2016
Payment 2 for services provided in May 2016	\$497,400	July 1, 2016
Payment 3 for services provided in June 2016	\$842,700	August 1, 2016
Payment 4 for services provided in July 2016	\$842,700	September 1, 2016
Payment 5 for services provided in August 2016	\$842,900	October 1, 2016
Payment 6 for services provided in September 2016	\$842,900	November 1, 2016
Payment 7 for services provided in October 2016	\$842,900	December 1, 2016
Payment 8 for services provided in November 2016	\$842,900	January 1, 2017
Payment 9 for services	\$662,400	February 1, 2017

RFP# EOARC-036
 BOS agenda # 3-53 & October 6, 2016
 Form #116-311 Revision Date: 01/13/2016

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
 AMENDMENT NO.1 TO THE AGREEMENT
 WITH
 KPMG LLP

provided in December 2016		
Payment 10 for services provided in January 2017	\$662,400	March 1, 2017
Payment 11 for services provided in February 2017	\$662,400	April 1, 2017
Payment 12 for services provided in March 2017	\$662,400	May 1, 2017
Payment 13 for services provided in April 2017	\$662,400	June 1, 2017
Payment 14 for services provided in May 2017	\$662,400	July 1, 2017
Payment 15 for services provided in June 2017	\$662,400	August 1, 2017
Payment 16 for services provided in July 2017	\$662,400	September 1, 2017
Payment 17 for services provided in August 2017	\$662,400	October 1, 2017
Payment 18 for services provided in September 2017	\$662,400	November 1, 2017
Payment 19 for services provided in October 2017	\$662,400	December 1, 2017
Payment 20 for services provided in November 2017	\$662,400	January 1, 2018
Payment 21 for services provided in December 2017	\$432,400	February 1, 2018
Payment 22 for services provided in January 2018	\$432,400	March 1, 2018
Payment 23 for services provided in February 2018	\$432,300	April 1, 2018
Payment 24 for services provided in March 2018	\$432,300	May 1, 2018
TOTAL		\$15,730,000

Ref.	Recommendation	Potential Timeline																									
		Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16	Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17	Apr-17	May-17	Jun-17	Jul-17	Aug-17	Sep-17	Oct-17	Nov-17	Dec-17	Jan-18	Feb-18	Mar-18		
		S	E	E																							
Countywide																											
C-1	Develop countywide criminal justice coordination and collaboration structure		3	3	1																						
C-2	Create a strategy and performance management process within the criminal justice working group structure		3	3	1																						
C-3	Expand integration of criminal justice department IT systems		2	1	2																						
C-4	Further analyze delineation of duties between agencies and central IT		2	1	2																						
C-5	Identify opportunities to enhance county employee recruitment and hiring process		3	2	1																						
C-6	Identify opportunities to enhance county employee recruitment and hiring process		3	2	1																						
C-7	Conduct detailed leave administration and process analysis		3	2	2																						
C-8	Define and communicate policies related to position freezing and unfreezing		1	2	2																						
C-9	Review roles of the public safety departments in labor negotiation process		3	2	2																						
C-10	Identify opportunities for automated HR processes		3	3	2																						
C-11	Enhance annual budget process for public safety departments		3	3	2																						
Sheriff's Office																											
Field Operations																											
RSO-1	Perform a review and analysis of patrol work demands		1	1	1																						
RSO-2	Perform a review and analysis of patrol supply factors		1	1	1																						
RSO-3	Conduct a review and analysis of investigative work demands		2	1	1																						
RSO-4	Invest in CAD/RMS technology and corresponding management information		2	1	1																						
RSO-5	Develop an activity-based jail staffing model approach		2	1	1																						
RSO-6	Expand jail utilization study and strategic prioritization of inmate population		1	1	1																						
RSO-7	Expand and evaluate inmate programming and incentivization		2	1	1																						
RSO-8	Invest in JIMS jail management system modernization		2	1	1																						
RSO-9	Invest in JIMS jail management system modernization		2	1	1																						
Administration																											
RSO-10	Evaluate expansion and innovation in alternatives to inmate movement		2	2	1																						
RSO-11	Review functional force mix for sworn, non-sworn or civilian resources		2	1	2																						
RSO-12	Enhance employee succession, development, and mentoring programs		2	1	1																						
RSO-13	Accelerate Early Intervention System enhancement efforts		1	2	1																						
Contract Policing																											
RSO-14	Reaffirm service delivery alternatives and cost forecasting approach		2	2	1																						
RSO-15	Propose a resolution for "baseline" and "general overhead" components		2	1	2																						
RSO-16	Establish a common contract performance reporting framework		3	1	1																						
RSO-17	Explore alternatives to existing liability cost allocation model		3	1	1																						
RSO-18	Explore alternatives to existing liability cost allocation model		3	1	1																						
RSO-19	Explore alternatives to existing liability cost allocation model		3	1	1																						
Probation Department																											
PR-1	Continue to enhance internal management reporting		3	2	2																						
PR-2	Expand measurement and evaluation of supervision and programming efforts		3	2	2																						
PR-3	Make protocol decision regarding officer activity scheduling		3	2	2																						
PR-4	Continue to enhance Transitional Re-Entry Unit services		3	1	2																						
PR-5	Conduct review of overtime usage within Institution Services to determine shift pattern effectiveness		3	2	2																						
PR-6	Enhance case management system information capture and reporting capabilities		2	2	2																						
PR-7	Revise departmental policies for personnel schedules		3	2	2																						
PR-8	Revise departmental policies for technical probation violations		3	2	2																						
Office of the District Attorney																											
DA-1	Continue plans for departmental strategic plan		3	3	2																						
DA-2	Continue to enhance internal management reporting		3	2	2																						
DA-3	Conduct detailed workload and staffing analysis		2	2	2																						
DA-4	Improve caseload management through a workflow study		3	2	1																						
DA-5	Define more detailed budget units to align operational and fiscal authorities		3	2	1																						
DA-6	Implement new case management system with structured delivery and quality assurance		1	1	1																						
DA-7	Implement new case management system with structured delivery and quality assurance		3	2	1																						
Office of the Public Defender																											
PD-1	Develop departmental strategic plan with goals, objectives, and measures		3	3	2																						
PD-2	Enhance internal management reporting for enhanced operational visibility		3	3	2																						
PD-3	Improve communication between Sheriff and Public Defender for in-person jail visits		3	3	2																						
PD-4	Improve caseload management through a workflow study		3	3	2																						
PD-5	Define more detailed budget units to align operational and fiscal authorities		3	3	2																						
PD-6	Implement new case management system using structured delivery and quality assurance		3	1	2																						
PD-7	Implement video conferencing within Public Defender offices and county jail sites		3	1	2																						
PD-8	Review and revise policies and procedures as necessary		3	1	2																						



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
CALIFORNIA

Criminal Justice System Review

**An Assessment of the County of Riverside's Criminal Justice System
Organizational, Operational, and Financial Performance, and the Law
Enforcement Contract City Rates**

March 2016

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Executive Summary	3
Report Overview	16
Countywide Recommendations	19
Office of the Sheriff	39
Probation Department	79
Office of the District Attorney	95
Office of the Public Defender	111
Appendix I: Service Inventory	126
Part A: Office of the Sheriff	126
Part B: Probation Department	135
Part C: Office of the District Attorney	147
Part D: Office of the Public Defender	160

Executive Summary

Scope, objectives, approach, and recommendations

Project Objectives


In October 2015, the County of Riverside (County) Board of Supervisors (Board) engaged KPMG to conduct a review of the Criminal Justice System, focusing on an organizational, operational, and financial review of the Office of the District Attorney, Probation Department, Office of the Public Defender, and Office of the Sheriff (collectively “the agencies;” “public safety departments;” or individually “agency”) as well as a law enforcement contract city rate review.

The key objectives of the review were as follows:

<p>1. Evaluate Department Operations</p>	<p>Evaluating public safety department expenditures and procedures, including the budgets, administrative overhead, and regular and special program administration.</p>
<p>2. Analyze Cost Methodologies</p>	<p>Review of subordinate contractual agreements, specifically the methodology used to establish contract rates and the degree of actual cost recovery from city contracts for all law enforcement services, including liability costs.</p>
<p>3. Provide Recommendations</p>	<p>Provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors where duplication of effort or other opportunities for improved efficiencies or options to maximize the County’s return on investment can be identified.</p>

Scope and Approach


The project scope included the Office of the Sheriff (Sheriff’s Office or RSO), Probation Department (Probation), Office of the Public Defender (Public Defender), and Office of the District Attorney (District Attorney, Office of the DA, or ODA), with a specific focus on the contract law enforcement rate model. The project began in late October 2015 and extended through the end of March 2016 to accommodate the necessary time for information gathering and confirmation.



Scope and Approach (continued)

KPMG conducted numerous project activities to fulfill engagement objectives across the 22-week timeline. To analyze department operations, the team conducted interviews with department management and staff; conducted site visits where applicable; participated in ride-alongs for law enforcement and Probation operations; researched comparative county operational and financial information; and reviewed relevant documentation provided by Departments. The team also conducted interviews with other County departments with a stake in the criminal justice system operations as relevant, including Riverside County Human Resources, Information Technology, Correctional Health, and collective bargaining units. Over 130 meetings and interviews were conducted, more than 4,500 pages of documentation reviewed, and more than 25 different facilities were visited as a part of this process.

An illustration of the interconnected County Criminal Justice System is provided below, with the major activity types of each system node captured for overview purposes. This system is a complex network of independent departments that interacts with other Federal, State, County, City, and non-profit agencies to perform efficiently and effectively.



KPMG's approach also took into consideration the constitutional authority under which each Department under review operates, and through this report acknowledges that only the California Office of the Attorney General can direct the elected offices of the Sheriff and District Attorney relative to matters of law enforcement.

Methodology

When conducting the review and identifying recommendations across the county and each department, KPMG considered the following five dimensions at departmental and functional levels as required by the County's request for proposals and subsequent statement of work:

<p>Strategy & Governance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Departmental Strategy: How is a cohesive strategy set in terms of goals, objectives, outcomes, and investments at department and functional levels? ▪ Performance Management: How does performance in fulfillment of goals, objectives, outcomes, and investments get measured, monitored, and improved? ▪ Stakeholders and Partners: How does engagement with stakeholders and partner agency/organizations take place to allow for joint strategy, performance, and resourcing considerations?
<p>Organization & Resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organization Structure: How is the department structure organized in light of departmental strategy and operational functions or services? ▪ Workload Management: How does the department measure and manage quantity, quality, duration, and intensity of workload in its key functional areas? ▪ Resource Management: How does the department measure and manage availability, utilization, capability, and performance of its resources in key functional areas?
<p>Budgets & Spending</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Functions and Services: How are department structure and resources allocated to the functions and services provided to internal, external, or administrative audiences? ▪ Budget Management: How does the department develop, validate, monitor, and manage the budget at the department level for its key functional areas? ▪ Financial Management: How does the department delegate, approve, monitor, and manage spending decisions at the department level and for key functional areas?
<p>Assets & Enablers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilities and Fleet Management: How does the department manage its fleet and facilities in terms of capital strategy, asset condition/cost, and asset performance? ▪ Technology Management: How does the department manage its technology/systems in terms of strategy, technology cost, and performance? ▪ Support Services Management: How does the department manage its support functions in terms of service strategy, cost/scale, and performance?
<p>Policies & Practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy Management: How does the department develop, maintain, and govern its portfolio of policies and procedures at a department level and in key functional areas? ▪ Training and Evaluation: How does the department develop, deliver, and audit its training programs at a department level and in key functional areas? ▪ Risk Management: How does the department identify and mitigate operational and financial risks at a department level and in key functional areas?

Recommendations Overview

Overall, 51 recommendations were identified across the county, four agencies, and contract cities focus areas. Recommendations have the potential to lead to cost savings and performance enhancements to help the County better collaborate across its departments to better achieve its goals and outcomes of safer, healthier, more sustainable communities. For details on the recommendation priority definitions, see page 17.

Recommendation Priority Area	Priority Level		
	1	2	3
Countywide	6	16	11
Savings	2	2	7
Efficiency	1	7	3
Effectiveness	3	7	1
Sheriff's Office	28	18	5
Savings	3	12	2
Efficiency	11	4	2
Effectiveness	14	2	1
Probation Department	1	9	14
Savings	0	1	7
Efficiency	1	3	4
Effectiveness	0	5	3
Office of the District Attorney	4	8	9
Savings	1	1	5
Efficiency	1	3	3
Effectiveness	2	4	1
Office of the Public Defender	2	8	14
Savings	0	0	8
Efficiency	2	2	4
Effectiveness	0	6	2
Overall Totals	41	59	53
Savings	6	16	29
Efficiency	16	19	16
Effectiveness	19	24	8


Recommendations by Agency

Each agency under review provides distinct services that ultimately support the provision of Criminal Justice services to the residents of the County. Key information pertaining to the agencies is below:

Agency	FY15-16 Revenues	FY15-16 Expenditures	Net County Cost	Full-Time Equivalents	Leadership
Sheriff	\$391,780,441	\$646,108,530	\$254,328,089	4,070	Elected
District Attorney	\$46,040,786	\$106,027,602	\$59,986,816	677	Elected
Probation	\$88,843,850	\$126,312,318	\$37,468,738	971	Appointed
Public Defender	\$2,067,285	\$36,247,522	\$34,180,237	220	Appointed

County Information


The County of Riverside operates with a budget of more than \$5 billion annually, of which the Sheriff, Probation, District Attorney, and Public Defender budgets account for approximately 17%. The overall County budget for the last five fiscal years is shown below (dollars are shown in millions). The County budget and departmental budgets shown on the following pages do not include additional appropriations that may have been, or will be, allocated during the remainder of the FY15-16 fiscal year to account for unfunded labor, cost of living, or step increase deficits.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

County Information (continued)

Of the more than \$5 billion budgeted annually, \$3.1 billion are general fund appropriations for basic operations, as shown below:




Due to the overall budget picture in the County, opportunities for efficiency and improvement in operations should not be limited to the departments within this review; the central County functions must look to identify opportunities as well. As such, recommendations pertinent to the County and its role as a central service provider are included as a part of this review.

Reference	Recommendation	Sav.	Effc.	Efft.
Countywide				
C-1	Develop countywide criminal justice coordination and collaboration structure	3	3	1
C-2	Create a strategy and performance management process within the criminal justice working group structure	3	3	1
C-3	Expand integration of criminal justice department IT systems	2	1	2
C-4	Further analyze delineation of duties between agencies and central IT	2	2	2
C-5	Further analyze training offerings and impact to risk management	1	2	2
C-6	Identify opportunities to enhance County employee recruitment and hiring process	3	2	3
C-7	Conduct detailed leave administration and process analysis	3	2	2
C-8	Define and communicate policies related to position freezing and unfreezing	3	2	2
C-9	Review roles of the public safety departments in labor negotiation process	1	2	2
C-10	Identify opportunities for automated HR processes	3	2	2
C-11	Enhance annual budget process for public safety departments	3	3	1

Note: "Sav.," "Effc.," and "Efft." refer to Savings, Efficiency, and Effectiveness (respectively), and definitions can be found on page 17.

Sheriff's Office

RSO operates with more than 4,000 personnel to provide a range of services across the County. Key operational responsibilities include emergency response, law enforcement, correctional services, coroner services, and police services via contract cities. The department provides these services, among others, with an adopted budget of \$646 million in FY15/16. The past five fiscal years' adopted budgets are shown below, with the prior four years being actual figures and the most recent being adopted figures (shown in millions, with total budget specified above each bar). Note that "adopted budget" figures represent those approved by the Board and Executive Office, which typically vary from the higher projected annual budgets provided by RSO.



In the chart above, "Other" includes fixed assets and other charges; intrafund transfers are excluded from the chart (included in total budget) but averaged \$1,584,000 over the last five fiscal years.

Also note that for FY15/16 budget figures, RSO had provided an original projection of \$711 million. RSO had revised this original projected budget figure downward by \$17 million due to slowing ECDC hiring and maintaining the 1.04 per 1,000 unincorporated staffing ratio per agreements with the Board. As a result, the RSO revised budget submission was decreased to \$694 million and results in a structural deficit of \$48 million relative to the adopted FY15/16 budget.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sheriff's Office (continued)


17 recommendations were identified for the RSO relating to the fiscal impacts of both RSO operations and its cost recovery methodology for contract cities.

Reference	Recommendation	Sav.	Effc.	Efft.
Field Operations				
RSO-1	Conduct a review and analysis of patrol work demands	1	1	1
RSO-2	Perform a review and analysis of patrol supply factors	1	1	1
RSO-3	Conduct a review and analysis of investigative work demands	2	1	1
RSO-4	Invest in CAD/RMS technology and corresponding management information	2	1	1
Corrections				
RSO-5	Develop an activity-based jails staffing model approach	2	1	1
RSO-6	Expand jail utilization study and strategic prioritization of inmate population	1	1	1
RSO-7	Expand and evaluate inmate programming and incentivization	2	2	1
RSO-8	Invest in JIMS jail management system modernization	2	1	1
RSO-9	Evaluate expansion and innovation in alternatives to inmate movement	3	2	1
Administration				
RSO-10	Review functional force mix for sworn, non-sworn or civilian resources	2	1	2
RSO-11	Enhance employee succession, development, and mentoring programs	2	1	2
RSO-12	Accelerate Early Intervention System enhancement efforts	2	2	1
Contract Law Enforcement				
RSO-13	Reaffirm service delivery alternatives and cost forecasting approach	2	2	1
RSO-14	Propose a resolution for "baseline" and "general overhead" components	2	1	2
RSO-15	Establish a common contract performance reporting framework	3	1	1
RSO-16	Explore alternatives to existing liability cost allocation model	2	3	1
RSO-17	Perform an activity analysis to confirm "unsupported" rate allocations	2	3	3

Note: "Sav.," "Effc.," and "Efft." refer to Savings, Efficiency, and Effectiveness (respectively), and definitions can be found on page 17.

Probation Department

Probation provides three key services: intake and investigation, community supervision, and detention. These services are provided through field services and institution services, with the support of additional programs and services to help ensure the success of supervision and detention activities. The Department operates with 971 employees and a most recent budget of \$126.3 million. The past five fiscal years' budgets are shown below, with the prior four years being actual figures and the most recent being adopted figures (shown in millions, with total budget specified above each bar).



"Other" includes fixed assets and other charges; intrafund transfers are excluded from the chart (included in total budget) but averaged \$550,000 over the last five fiscal years.

Probation has made significant progress in moving toward evidence-based practices and dealing with an increased population of offenders in recent years. Many of the recommendations for the department are to continue with work it is already in the process of completing.


Reference	Recommendation	Sav.	Effc.	Efft.
Probation Department				
PR-1	Continue to enhance internal management reporting	3	2	2
PR-2	Expand measurement and evaluation of supervision and programming efforts	3	3	2
PR-3	Make protocol decision regarding officer activity scheduling	3	2	2
PR-4	Continue to enhance Transitional Re-Entry Unit services	3	1	2
PR-5	Conduct review of overtime usage within Institution Services to determine shift pattern effectiveness	3	3	3
PR-6	Enhance case management system information capture and reporting capabilities	2	2	2
PR-7	Revise departmental policies for personnel schedules	3	3	3
PR-8	Continue to reduce usage of technical probation violations	3	3	3

Note: "Sav.," "Effc.," and "Efft." refer to Savings, Efficiency, and Effectiveness (respectively), and definitions can be found on page 17.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Office of the District Attorney

The District Attorney operates under mandates from the State of California, and its mission, as the public prosecutor acting on behalf of the people, is to enforce the law, pursue the truth, and safeguard the rights of all to ensure that justice is done on behalf of the community of the County of Riverside. The ODA employs 677 personnel with an adopted budget of \$106 million. The past five fiscal years' budgets are shown below, with the prior four years being actual figures and the most recent being adopted figures (shown in millions, with total budget specified above each bar).



"Other" includes fixed assets and other charges; intrafund transfers are excluded from the chart (included in total budget) but averaged \$2,794,000 over the last five fiscal years.

The ODA is in the process of making operational and technological improvements that will help drive innovation for the Office. A number of recommendations pertain to these plans already in place; others provide opportunities to drive efficiencies in other ways.

Reference	Recommendation	Sav.	Effc.	Efft.
Office of the District Attorney				
DA-1	Continue plans for departmental strategic plan	3	3	2
DA-2	Continue to enhance internal management reporting	3	2	2
DA-3	Conduct detailed workload and staffing analysis	2	2	2
DA-4	Improve caseload management through a workflow study	3	2	1
DA-5	Define more detailed budget units to align operational and fiscal authorities	3	3	2
DA-6	Implement new case management system with structured delivery and quality assurance	1	1	1
DA-7	Develop training plan and capitalize on collaborative training opportunities	3	3	3


Note: "Sav.," "Effc.," and "Efft." refer to Savings, Efficiency, and Effectiveness (respectively), and definitions can be found on page 17.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Office of the Public Defender

The Public Defender defends and provides legal counsel and advice to any person who is financially unable to provide for their own counsel when charged with a criminal offense. The Public Defender operates and participates in a number of services across the County of Riverside, including misdemeanor and felony departments as well as Collaborative Court efforts focused on the rehabilitation of offenders through their specialized Mental Health, Drug, and Veteran Court programs.

The 220 positions within its department operate with a \$36.2 million adopted budget for FY15-16. The past five fiscal years' budgets are shown below, with the prior four years being actual figures and the most recent being adopted figures (shown in millions, with total budget specified above each bar).



"Other" includes fixed assets and other charges; intrafund transfers are excluded from the chart (included in total budget) but averaged \$34,600 over the last five fiscal years.

Building upon the Office of the Public Defender's recent initiatives to reorganize and operate in a more efficient manner, the recommendations below will help drive management effectiveness and innovation for the Office.

Reference	Recommendation	Sav.	Effc.	Eff.
Office of the Public Defender				
PD-1	Develop departmental strategic plan with goals, objectives, and measures	3	3	2
PD-2	Enhance internal management reporting for enhanced operational visibility	3	3	2
PD-3	Improve communication between Sheriff and Public Defender for in-person jail visits	3	2	3
PD-4	Improve caseload management through a workflow study	3	2	2
PD-5	Define more detailed budget units to align operational and fiscal authorities	3	3	2
PD-6	Implement new case management system using structured delivery and quality assurance	3	1	2
PD-7	Implement video conferencing within Public Defender offices and county jail sites	3	1	3
PD-8	Review and revise policies and procedures as necessary	3	3	2

Note: "Sav.," "Effc.," and "Eff." refer to Savings, Efficiency, and Effectiveness (respectively), and definitions can be found on page 17.

Acknowledgments

This project would not have been possible without the support and assistance of the County Executive Office, Office of the Sheriff, Probation Department, Office of the District Attorney, and Office of the Public Defender. Numerous individuals were involved in interviews, meetings, and providing documents and materials to support the project team's work. The below list is not exhaustive and is a small thank you to these departments and their teams for their assistance.

Office of the Sheriff

- Sheriff Stan Sniff
- Undersheriff Bill Di Yorio
- Assistant Sheriff Raymond Gregory
- Assistant Sheriff Joe Cleary
- Assistant Sheriff Jerry Gutierrez
- Chief Deputy Director Will Taylor

Office of the District Attorney

- District Attorney Michael Hestrin
- Chief Assistant District Attorney John Aki
- Assistant District Attorney Elaina Bentley
- Supervising Chief Assistant District Attorney Kelli Catlett

Probation Department

- Chief Probation Officer Mark Hake
- Assistant Chief Probation Officer Rosario Rull
- Chief Deputy Doug Moreno
- Chief Deputy Stacy Adams-Metz
- Chief Deputy Bryce Hulstrom
- Chief Deputy Ron Miller

Office of the Public Defender

- Public Defender Steven Harmon
- Assistant Public Defender Brian Boles

Report overview

Structure, limitations, and tips for reading the report


Information and Scope Constraints

The scope of this review was limited to the four agencies (Sheriff, Probation, District Attorney, and Public Defender) and the contract cities law enforcement model. The review began in late October 2015 and was completed in March 2016. Due to the timeframe of the review and the information requested, the following caveats must be noted:

1. **Data requested was received intermittently / staggered over a five-month period** beginning at the date of initial request, October 19th, 2015, up to and including March 1st, 2016. The data received over this time period included information resulting from the initial request as well as follow-up requests unique to each agency based on additional needs identified and/or clarification required.
2. **Due to the timeframe of this review and the relative amount of time required to provide certain requested information, agencies were unable to provide KPMG with certain pieces of requested information.** This was either because the data was not readily available and/or would take longer than time permitted to collect and issue. In these circumstances KPMG made attempts to request alternative data, reform our approach, or recommend additional studies to recreate or collect the data as may be required.
3. **Data provided by the agencies under review was, overall, received in various formats, fragmented or piece-meal, and of variable quality and depth.** This required additional time to review and evaluate which portions of information were relevant, reliable, valid, and/or to identify what was missing that required further follow-up.

Recommendation Development

KPMG developed recommendations based on our understanding of the state and local criminal justice environment, supplementing our understanding with research and collection of leading practices and interviews with comparable criminal justice systems where available. All recommendations are displayed in a consistent format, with the following elements:



Overview: Provides detail on the recommendation to be implemented; defines required support from other agencies within the criminal justice system; describes anticipated benefit.

Observation and Analysis: Describes information discovered through the review process that supports the recommendation, through observation, interview, data capture, research, comparative analysis, or other methods.

Anticipated Impact: Defines the overall benefit expected through complete implementation of the recommendation.

Priority Area and Level Definition

To aid in the prioritization of each recommendation within the agency level and across the system as a whole, four areas of prioritization and corresponding definitions of the scale of prioritization were developed. Dollar amounts and percentages are offered as directional in nature to aid in prioritization, but are subject to further analysis and evaluation prior to the County's implementation.

Area	Priority Level	Definition
Savings	1	Potential annualized savings in terms of cost avoidance from future increased spending with full implementation are greater than \$2,000,000 over the next 3-5 years.
	2	Potential annualized savings in terms of cost avoidance from future increased spending with full implementation are between \$500,000 - \$1,999,999 over the next 3-5 years.
	3	Potential annualized savings in terms of cost avoidance from future increased spending with full implementation are between \$0 - \$499,999 over the next 3-5 years.
Efficiency	1	Productivity is estimated to be enhanced by 15% or more annually on an individual or collective basis through full implementation of this recommendation.
	2	Productivity is estimated to be enhanced by 2 - 15% annually on an individual or collective basis through full implementation of this recommendation.
	3	Productivity is estimated to be enhanced by 2% or less annually on an individual or collective basis through full implementation of this recommendation.
Effectiveness	1	Effective implementation of this recommendation may help mitigate existing and future risk factors and will allow for enhanced management decision making.
	2	Effective implementation of this recommendation may help mitigate existing or future risk factors or may allow for enhanced management decision making.
	3	Effective implementation of this recommendation will not significantly mitigate risks or influence management decision making abilities.


Countywide Recommendations

Opportunities for enhanced collaboration and communication at a criminal justice system level

Recommendations

For the County of Riverside to successfully implement the recommendations unique to the criminal justice agencies, it is critical to establish a foundation of Countywide and system-wide collaboration and coordination to support the implementation. In addition to recommending enhanced, joint objective setting and performance management of the agencies under review, the following recommendations also suggest reviewing certain County functions that are offered centrally. Doing so may provide further efficiencies and help support the recommended overall collaboration.

Countywide and departmental recommendations were all developed using the same methodology and approach focusing on the following areas:



Recommendations are presented by function (i.e. strategy, information technology, human resources) in the following section to help identify areas of impact.

C-1	Develop countywide criminal justice coordination and collaboration structure					
	Savings	3	Efficiency	3	Effectiveness	1


Overview

The County of Riverside should develop a coordination structure that defines and details the collaboration and decision-making relationship between and among the County offices/departments and the agencies of the criminal justice system. The structure should be rooted with an ad hoc criminal justice working group, composed of the department heads of the Office of the District Attorney, Office of the Public Defender, Probation Department, and Office of the Sheriff, as well as two Board members.

A critical objective of the group should be to identify information sharing needs for each party and establish a process through which that information should be shared. A suggested organization for this working group is shown to the right.

The collaboration structure will delineate roles and responsibilities, and at the core, the group should be responsible for:

- Setting the joint, collective strategy;
- Reporting against the strategy;
- Setting expectations and establishing a course of action;
- Helping to educate the Board on the complexities of the criminal justice system;
- Identifying the communication strategy; and
- Serving as a collective body of criminal justice agencies and the county.



Observations and Analysis

The current coordination structure over all public safety departments includes the County Executive Officer (CEO), the Board of Supervisors, and the leaders of each of the agencies under review (although there are differences in accountability for the two elected leaders versus the two appointed leaders – where the former are accountable to the electorate and the latter are accountable to the Board of Supervisors). Board-level governance of the four agencies is primarily driven by the budget cycle, which involves managing to a mid-year budget report presented in February of each year and then further refined in the budget planning process which begins in March before the start of the upcoming fiscal year in July of each year.

During interviews with management of each agency as well as individual interviews with the Board, it became apparent that stakeholders may desire a higher level of engagement with the Board of Supervisors with regard to appreciation of the operational and fiscal context of budgetary decision-making and system-level coordination. Agency leads expressed concern over the need for enhanced communication and understanding between their respective agencies, the County Executive Office, and the Board. Although stakeholders are open to collaboration, a joint coordination and working group model for criminal justice system-wide initiatives and efforts is not currently in place.

Observations and Analysis (continued)

Certain structural elements help ensure that a working group and ultimately the body it oversees functions effectively and efficiently. Partially due to the difference between appointed and elected leadership, the County does not have any structural elements, beyond budget management, as the foundation for its working group and the agencies of the criminal justice system, and therefore measuring collective performance and prioritizing projects and initiatives is a challenge. As a collective strategy is developed and agreed upon, it will be critical for the agencies to maintain their separate obligations to develop and define their departmental strategic plans and report to their respective audiences.

Anticipated Impact

Defining and communicating a structure for reporting will help establish expectations for evaluating and monitoring collective performance across the criminal justice system for the county. With the development of an overall collaboration model and the creation of the ad hoc working group, barriers to communication will be reduced or removed completely and the County and agencies of the criminal justice system will be able to communicate more effectively. The use of a structure for collaboration may initially cause discord, but it is critical to communicate the purpose and intended benefits with all impacted parties. It is anticipated that any tensions will be overcome as greater collective understanding of challenges and opportunities is achieved. The following additional outcomes are expected through an improved collaborative working group structure:

- Increased transparency and insight into complex and varying departmental operations
- Collaborative strategy-setting and performance reviews for the collective criminal justice system
- Enhanced outcomes and measures of performance for the collective criminal justice system

C-2	Create a strategy and performance management process within the criminal justice working group structure				
	Savings	3	Efficiency	3	Effectiveness


Overview

As part of the collaboration model and the ad hoc working group, the County should establish a joint strategy and performance management process that will help define a reporting structure for the agencies of the criminal justice system and the County Executive Office. Each agency should work to develop management reporting scorecards that capture information relevant to capturing agency performance. This may include metrics that are already publicly reported and available, but does not include the release of sensitive strategic or security-related information (as relevant by agency).

When these metrics are reported regularly, the reporting structure may be used to identify where support is required for each agency, offering a balance and greater synergy across the criminal justice system. As a part of the reporting process, the County should establish a quarterly meeting in which all criminal justice and public protection leaders are involved, beyond members of the ad hoc working group.

Scorecards should be specific to each agency’s unique operating environment, but could consider reporting on the following pieces of information:

- Number of FTEs
- Key changes in leadership
- Top three strategic initiatives for the next quarter and action items falling into that timeframe
- Key performance indicators (see the graphic for a recommended balanced approach to systemic performance evaluation)
- Key challenges or risks
- Needs for support from, or requests to work with, other stakeholders in the criminal justice system (e.g., Riverside University Health System - Behavioral Health, Riverside University Health System – Correctional Healthcare Services, Riverside County Superior Court, Department of Public Social Services)



COUNTYWIDE RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview (continued)

The agencies will be responsible for presenting their individual objectives to the Committee, but the Committee itself will also be responsible for adopting joint goals, success measures, and defined areas of investment for the criminal justice group as a whole. The group should work together to determine which measures should be used to evaluate system-wide success, such as:

- Overall satisfaction of various user groups of the criminal justice system (e.g., attorneys, victims, inmates, probationers, programming providers, employees)
- Number of clients entering the criminal justice system and number leaving the system at various points in the process

In developing performance metrics for the system, the committee and the public must understand that not all metrics that indicate success for one individual department will indicate success for the other (e.g., a reduced sentence for a Public Defender client will likely mean a minimized prosecutorial success for the District Attorney). As such, the committee must put significant thought into the measures that it will track and for which it will be accountable.

Observations and Analysis

Based on interviews and observation of the management processes of each of the four agencies under review, key management reporting outputs and processes for each of the agencies under review appear to be internally driven and occasionally externally-driven to entities other than the Board of Supervisors. The table below indicates some, but not all, management reporting methods and tools utilized by the agencies under review.

Agency	Reporting Tool or Event	Audience	Frequency
Sheriff	Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Uniform Crime Reports (UCR)	Public	Annual
	Contract City Partner Meetings	Contract Cities	Quarterly
Probation	Strategic Plan (multiple ongoing projects/programs)	Public	Annual
	Field Services Dashboard	Division Management	Monthly
	Institutional Services Dashboard	Division Management	Monthly / ad hoc
District Attorney	Executive Management Report (EMR)	Executive Management and Unit Management as applicable	Monthly
	100 Day Report / Annual Report	Public	100 Days / annual thereafter
Public Defender	Caseload	Division Management	Ad Hoc

Although many of these tools are relevant to the operations of each individual agency, joint, strategic, criminal justice system-level goals and objectives are not reported at the countywide level, except for the AB109 Public Safety Realignment Implementation Plan Update submitted annually to the Board of Supervisors by the Community Correction Partnership Executive Committee. There are no consistent or required management reporting dashboards or documents provided by each agency to the Board, and thus there is no baseline against which the Board can evaluate the joint performance of the system.

Anticipated Impact

The development of a strategy and performance management process, in conjunction with a defined scorecard and accountability process, will help ensure that the system is achieving its stated objectives through realistic and achievable outcome measures. These objectives will help establish a foundation for the system to measure and monitor its overall effectiveness – measured, for example, by the following questions:

- For those who are entering the system, do they have access to swift, efficient, and cost-effective justice?
- For those who enter the jail system, do they have access to relevant and effective programming?
- For those who are exiting the system, are they provided with support that will help reduce their chances of recidivism?
- How many of those who entered the system to begin with end up recidivating?

With the ability to answer the above and further questions, the County will be better equipped to make decisions that will help ensure that fewer people ultimately re-enter the system and that those who do have access to the most efficient and effective services available. In addition to addressing offenders who re-enter the system, the working group may adjust its focus in the future to set a joint strategy to help prevent offenders from ever entering the system in the first place. Agency should provide structured reports on their progress against stated joint objectives and the ability of their departments to meet the goals of the overall criminal justice system. Members of the criminal justice working group should work together to help ensure that appropriate progress is being made upon countywide goals.

C-3	Expand integration of criminal justice department IT systems		
	Savings 2	Efficiency 1	Effectiveness 2

Overview

The agencies under review, in addition to the Superior Courts, should explore opportunities to integrate their case and information management systems. Not only will doing so support the move to a paperless county, but will also help to increase the efficiency of moving offenders through the system. Although there may be some integration planned or in process, the County should expand these plans to other relevant departments.

Observations and Analysis

The County criminal justice departments, along with the Courts and RCIT, were participating in a data sharing committee at the time of this review. This effort is focusing on identifying opportunities to further share and integrate information. Using this effort as a baseline, the departments should further explore opportunities to integrate systems, using the same platform wherever possible. Through the process of this review, a number of systems were identified across multiple agencies and entities; a few of the key systems are shown in the table below.

Agency	System	Purpose
Sheriff	Jail Information Management System (JIMS)	JIMS serves to manage the inmates who are housed in Riverside's jail facilities on a daily basis.
	Programs and Alternate Sentencing System (PASS)	PASS serves as the system for out-of-custody inmate tracking and management
	Records Management System (RMS)	RMS maintains all records and serves as a message interface with CLETS (see below).
Probation	Juvenile Adult Management System (JAMS)	JAMS serves as the juvenile and adult offender management system through which probationer case files are tracked.
District Attorney	Damion	Serves as a modular case management system helping to track criminal and civil cases; does not maintain data relevant to Writs & Appeals.
Public Defender	DefenderData	Serves as a modular case management system helping to track all Public Defender cases; built originally for adult cases and not specifically designed to track juvenile cases.
County/State	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)	The CLETS systems is a secured access system that allows criminal justice agencies of the State of California run a background check on an offender or client.

In addition to the lack of an integrated system, the public safety agencies, particularly the Public Defender, ODA, and Sheriff's Office, are not currently using an electronic evidence-sharing platform. Although the ODA was researching options at the time of this report, no decisions had been made. However, at the time of this report, the ODA was moving forward with a new case management system on the Microsoft Dynamics platform and had indicated that the office was contacting other criminal justice system agencies (i.e., Probation and Public Defender) to discuss potential platform sharing.

Anticipated Impact

An integrated system will help support a future state in which an offender or other client of the criminal justice system can be tracked throughout the entire system, rather than be an individual with multiple case numbers, interaction IDs, and countless other identifiers, making it difficult to trace the path through the system. In addition, enhanced integration may improve visibility with other criminal justice system stakeholders, such as Social Services, Mental Health, and other agencies tracking information related to individuals coming into contact with County services beyond justice agencies. In the interim, integration will help facilitate information and data sharing and may help to increase efficiency in the following ways:

- Reducing the time spent physically moving discovery between the District Attorney and the Public Defender
- Reducing the time spent to find and request a case file from another criminal justice department
- Reducing the time spent to find additional interactions an individual may have had with other criminal justice agencies

C-4	Further analyze delineation of duties between agencies and central IT					
	Savings	2	Efficiency	2	Effectiveness	2

Overview

The County should require that a review be conducted of the IT-related responsibilities of each agency within the criminal justice system compared to the responsibilities of the central Riverside County Information Technology (RCIT) agency. The purpose of this review would be to identify areas where duties are repetitive or duplicative and to review policies and procedures to determine where specific duties must be completed by the owner agency (e.g., for situations relating to information sensitivity) and implement opportunities to reduce duplication.

As an output of the review, the County should develop a detailed "Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed" (RACI) matrix to specify the process steps and levels of responsibilities for each agency. A sample RACI matrix is shown to the right, modeled after a similar matrix created for a recruiting process. Note that four separate matrices would need to be developed; one to describe the interaction between RCIT and each of the four distinct agencies.

In the future, the County should consider results of this study as an input to a broader shared services model analysis with a broader focus of multiple county services.

RACI Chart (Roles and Responsibilities Matrix)
R = Responsible, A = Accountable, C = Consulted, I = Informed

Process Name / Description: **Riverside County Information Technology Support Processes (SAMPLE)**

Created On: Revision:

Created by:

Process Ref	Process Description	Riverside County Information Tech	Sheriff Department IT	County Executive Office
1A	Identify service area concern	R		
1B	Obtain approval to modify system	R	A	
1C	Notify Departmental Lead	R	C	
2A	Assign task	R	C	
2B	Initiate service repair	R		I
2C	Contact Subject Matter Expert	C	C	
2D	Finalize repair	R		I

Observation and Analysis

Each agency has a different operating model with respect to the IT services it provides in-house and those it receives from RCIT.

- **Sheriff:** Maintains an in-house Technical Services Bureau, providing technology service and support to the Department and all outlying facilities. It also manages and maintains numerous Department databases and links to external data systems.
- **Probation:** The Probation Department used to provide IT services completely in-house; however, due to an MOU signed by the Department and RCIT, all Probation IT staff was moved to the RCIT payroll and as a result, Probation's overall cost to provide IT services has increased due to the Internal Service Fund (ISF) rates. The unit still remains within the Probation Department's physical location in downtown Riverside. Probation indicates that it prefers to not continue to the MOU with RCIT due to higher operational costs, reduced efficiencies, and lack of control over their IT resources.
- **District Attorney:** The Office maintains an in-house Technology Services Bureau, including a Director as well as systems, business, and user support. The ODA indicates that it prefers to not utilize the services of RCIT due to the relative ease with which they can utilize their own personnel, but as with other agencies, they are still responsible for the ISF charge.
- **Public Defender:** The Public Defender utilizes the services of RCIT without employing any major in-house IT functions. However, attorneys as well as line staff are responsible for working with their case management system, DefenderData, and may be able to use additional support or better understand the services that RCIT can provide to help them better manage their information.

Additionally, the ODA is in the process of implementing a new case management system and is discussing potential integration with other agencies in the system. This will need to be considered when evaluating current and future role delineations with RCIT and the individual agencies.

Anticipated Impact

By clarifying the roles and responsibilities of RCIT versus each of the individual user agencies within the scope of this review, the County can expect to achieve the following results:

- Decreased redundancy between duties of RCIT and user agencies, with the potential to result in increased savings and efficiencies particularly for the Sheriff and District Attorney;
- Increased assurance of the proper delineation of duties and increased clarity among employees regarding the appropriate contacts for certain issues; and
- Decreased cycle time for IT support services in instances where the appropriate service provider (i.e., RCIT or internal services) was originally unclear.

C-5	Further analyze training offerings and impact to risk management				
	Savings	1	Efficiency	2	Effectiveness

Overview


The County should undertake an effort to document and communicate training requirements for all criminal justice system agencies, specifically focused on non-professional countywide trainings that are required by nature of being a county agency. From this review, the County should work with each agency to identify:

- Training courses that have already been developed and are offered by the County of Riverside Learning Center (COR LC) and should be capitalized upon by the agencies;
- Training courses that the individual agencies are not compliant with and develop a plan to mitigate non-compliance in a timely manner; and
- Opportunities to utilize the COR LC personnel to help develop training courses specific to the agency that may require resources beyond those at the agency level.
- Common themes in liability claims to perform root cause analysis and thereby target both RCHR and agency training to assist in mitigating factors and circumstances that may drive risk, while taking into account environmental and legal trends that are outside agency and RCHR control.

As a part of this review, the communication of compliance rates and training requirements should be evaluated in a structured manner as part of addressing the concepts above.

Observations and Analysis

According to information provided by the COR LC, each department of the County is required to complete specific training requirements. The requirements include such requirements as: Disability Awareness, Disciplinary Process, Employee Workplace Violence, Family and Medical Leave Act, New Employee Orientation, and numerous others. Also through the review, the presence of at least one individual dedicated to training within each agency was observed, which is due in part to the unique departmental training requirements (e.g., POST certification, MCLE). Training requirements across the County can be thought of in terms of the diagram illustrated below.



Observation and Analysis (continued)

While each agency has its unique training requirements (illustrated by the non-overlapping portion of the four outside circles), there are common trainings that may be required by the County and may be the same across each agency. Additionally, agencies may take advantage of opportunities to collaborate on common professional training requirements (e.g., MCLE requirements for the Offices of the District Attorney and Public Defender).

The variety of training requirements and provision by multiple agencies has led, in some cases, to the creation of multiple training tracking mechanisms and therefore may have created duplication across departments. However, RCHR tracks the completion rate of countywide mandated course for individual employees within each agency and compiles a report showing the overall rate of completion for each agency. As of February 2016, the weighted completion rate (courses completed of total courses required) for all agencies in this review was 67%.

Lack of completion of required courses may expose the County to numerous risks, including legal risk of a lawsuit (e.g., if an employee has not been properly trained on harassment prevention or workplace violence) and financial risk resulting from the payout associated with such a lawsuit. Current completion rates may be driven by a lack of communication and understanding of the required trainings.

The County should also review training requirements and delivery both from RCHR and within agencies in light of common themes and root cause analysis trends identified based on a structured and recurring joint review of factors and circumstances driving risks that could be mitigated through targeted training or other interventions, while taking into account environmental and legal trends that are outside agency and RCHR control.

Anticipated Impact

With a focus on identifying the roles and duties of the COR LC and the agencies of the criminal justice system, training personnel within individual agencies, and developing a plan to best execute training requirements across the criminal justice system, the County can expect to achieve the following results:

- An increase in overall completion rate as new employees are trained in accordance with the new mandatory training policy and timeline, therefore reducing the County's liability
- More efficient and effective development or procurement of agency-specific training courses based on the determination of the most applicable provider for various courses
- Decreased redundancy between the central HR training function and agency-specific HR/training functions

C-6	Identify opportunities to enhance County employee recruitment and hiring process				
	Savings	3	Efficiency	2	Effectiveness

Overview

The County should initiate an evaluation of the processes used by Riverside County Human Resources as well as criminal justice agency Human Resources departments to recruit both temporary and permanent employees. The County should seek to define the roles and responsibilities of each department through a detailed RACI matrix, and identify points within the process that appear to be bottlenecks or create unnecessary administrative tasks and significantly increase the cycle time. From this analysis, the County should identify areas within the process to be consolidated or streamlined, particularly where handoffs occur between agencies.

Observation and Analysis

Each agency indicated concern with two key elements relating to employee recruitment and hiring: a lack of qualified individuals and the length of time between identification of a hiring need and the fulfillment of a position. Other concerns voiced during interviews with various personnel across each agency are identified below:

Agency	Area(s) of Concern
Sheriff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of candidates who can pass the rigorous background check process ▪ Length of time required to conduct background check process ▪ Lack of process to automatically remove applicants who have previously applied and are fundamentally ineligible
Probation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of candidates who can pass the rigorous background check process ▪ Availability of candidates who are bilingual ▪ Ability to prioritize multiple positions to be filled at once rather than in a sequential fashion
District Attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of candidates who can pass the rigorous background check process ▪ Availability of candidates with a level of experience appropriate for the Bureau of Investigations ▪ Length of time to procure a temporary (TAP) employee ▪ Length of time to identify potential candidates ▪ Length of time to approve and onboard candidates once selected by the agency ▪ Ability to hire employees for positions that have been frozen (see recommendation C-9)
Public Defender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of candidates who are bilingual with attorney and/or investigator backgrounds

Between interviews with agency representatives and Riverside County Human Resources (RC-HR), it was evident that the delineation of duties between the two groups is not clearly defined, leading to duplication of tasks and backlogs when tasks are requested of the incorrect contact. Additionally, it was communicated that the process may include additional opportunities for streamlining or improvement at points of integration with Occupational Health and Psychological reviews.

Anticipated Impact

By conducting an analysis of the recruiting and hiring process as well as clarifying the roles and responsibilities for RC-HR and each agency within the processes, the County can expect to achieve the following results:

- Faster cycle times due in part to increased awareness of which entity is responsible for certain steps in the process
- Financial savings due to shorter cycle times and decreased duplication of process steps
- Decreased propensity to rely upon TAP employees once hired simply because of the length of time to hire and onboard

In the longer term, the agencies can anticipate retaining candidates for open positions, whereas they frequently lose candidates in the current situation due to the duration between selection and hiring.

C-7	Conduct detailed leave administration and process analysis		
	Savings 3	Efficiency 2	Effectiveness 2

Overview

The County should consider conducting a detailed analysis of the process related to formal leaves of absence, including the administration of such leaves from both RCHR and individual department perspectives. As a result of this review, the County should be able to identify the roles and responsibilities with the process and evaluate the need for delineation of duties between the agencies and RC-HR and identify opportunities for enhanced consistency and improved coordination and efficiency. Once the process is reviewed and a new process is defined, detailed opportunities for improvement should be identified and savings associated with enhanced controls should be clear.

Observations and Analysis

Through interviews with RC-HR and each agency, it appears that leaves are administered inconsistently across the County, partially due to the fact that is unclear which agency/department is responsible for such administration. Information pertaining to the County’s policies on leaves for employees is available on RC-HR’s website and covers a variety of state and federal leaves, including but not limited to: Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), California Family Rights Act (CFRA), and Pregnancy Disability Leave (PDL). However, the information is intended to inform employees of their rights related to leaves, rather than provide detail on the administration of such leaves. Employees are encouraged to contact their department/HR designee or the Human Resources Services Team (within RC-HR) – which may cause initial confusion by lacking a single point of contact for leave-related questions.

RC-HR indicated that a leave administration process is not defined for the County, but that one does exist for the Riverside University Health System (RUHS). In reviewing the roles and responsibilities of each of the four agencies under review and RC-HR with regard to this process, the County may want to consider the established process flows and defined policies in use by the RUHS as guides or models for efficient operations. This would include specific information on the employee, leave designee, and supervisor responsibilities within the process. Given that four distinct agencies would be requiring such information, four sets of responsibility documents may be developed as a part of this recommendation.

The lack of a defined process and lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities exposes the County to significant financial and legal risk. The County may unknowingly be out of compliance with federal and state regulations pertaining to leaves of absence.

Anticipated Impact

Through an established leave administration process, the County can expect to reduce its legal and financial risk while also helping to reduce the inefficiencies occurring through the transfer of an employee on leave’s job functions to a temporary employee. The implementation of this recommendation in conjunction with recommendation C-6 will ultimately help reduce the amount of time it takes for an employee to officially be recognized as on leave and the time in between the notice of leave and the filling of the position with a temporary employee. Ultimately, this recommendation will help the County support its employees while reducing the potential waste found in the system.

C-8	Define and communicate policies related to position freezing and unfreezing					
	Savings	3	Efficiency	2	Effectiveness	2

Overview

The County should define and document the process by which positions can be frozen and thawed within all departments, specifically those under the criminal justice system review. A frozen position is one that is defined as a position that is recognized in the position roster for a given department, but is not funded with the current budget. To “thaw” a frozen position, approval must be received from the applicable budget analyst within the County Executive Office, meaning that the funds would be made available to fund the position. As a part of this recommendation, the County must specify the requirements to be met by operating departments to have a position thawed, and must define the communication channels to and from the Executive Office to facilitate this process.

Observation and Analysis

Through interviews with the agencies, it was determined that the challenges related to position freezing and thawing are not perceived equally across all departments. For example, the Sheriff’s Office did not communicate any challenges related to this process, while the District Attorney indicated it could not gain approval to freeze one attorney-level position in exchange for the thawing of a budget-neutral three paralegal-level positions, among other challenges. Further, the Public Defender indicated that it does not face challenges related to freezing/thawing due to the fact that all vacant positions were completely removed from its roster and unfunded recently, and Probation communicated that it does not face this challenge.

The Executive Office indicated that County agencies are responsible for making requests to thaw positions and that the appropriate budget analyst will review the request before making a recommendation for the Board to approve or deny. According to RC-HR, each situation where a freeze or thaw is considered is evaluated on an individual basis, as the practice came into place based upon direction from the Executive Office, which may occur in email or memo format.

Anticipated Impact

As part of an enhanced budgeting process, the goal of a defined process for the freezing and thawing of positions is to help agencies plan for and manage their budget and workload in a more efficient and effective manner throughout the year. If the policies are defined clearly, agencies should be aware of when they may be at risk of losing a previously filled position, or gaining one that was frozen. This will help agencies manage the demand for the services and their overall workload. It will also help improve communication and understanding between the individual agencies and the Executive Office.

C-9	Review roles of the public safety departments in labor negotiation process		
	Savings 1	Efficiency 2	Effectiveness 2

Overview

It is recommended that the County review the roles of the public safety departments in the labor negotiation process. This expanded communication will serve to help ensure that departments seek to maintain a structured negotiation approach with union stakeholders. Additionally, it is recommended that each public safety department and their associated leadership maintain an open and authentic dialogue with each labor union.

Observation and Analysis

Negotiations for salary and benefits are currently led by RC-HR and the labor union. While these negotiations involve senior representatives from each department, RC-HR is the only party that negotiates the salary and benefits portion of the agreement. Departments should play a more active role in assessing the impact of salary and benefits on their respective budgets prior to decisions being finalized. As a quality assurance practice, before an agreement is reached, each public safety department should provide concurrence with the expected budget impact. The County and Board could then be provided this concurrence as part of their understanding of the need to appropriately fund the negotiated increases. This validation step will help ensure clarity and will foster an enhanced sense of communication and partnership as well as clarify expected fiscal impact.

Anticipated Impact

An enhanced understanding of the roles of respective departments in the labor negotiation process and subsequent impact analysis will allow the County and Departments to make more informed decisions relative to the fiscal impact of negotiated salary and benefit increases across the long-term financial health of the County.

C-10	Identify opportunities for automated HR processes					
	Savings	3	Efficiency	2	Effectiveness	2

Overview

Each agency should conduct a review of its time entry and payroll processes to identify opportunities for increased efficiency via automation and duplication reduction as a part of the overall county processes. The review should involve an identification of the existing processes, opportunities for improvement, and goals for the future processes. A pilot group should be identified for both payroll and time entry and results should be observed before implementing across the entire agency.

Observation and Analysis

The Probation Department utilizes the County's PeopleSoft payroll system and is currently in the process of implementing a pilot process for the self-entry module within the system, with the intent to roll-out to the entire Department in the future. The pilot will be initiated within the HR Division's Payroll Unit and the ultimate implementation of the self-entry module within the PeopleSoft payroll system is one of the Probation Department Services and Business Plan objectives for FY2015-16 to review the online payroll systems.

Similarly, RSO has adopted the AgencyWeb system to automate the scheduling, leave, and timekeeping tasks across the agency. RSO must still print, sign, and submit timesheets to comply with ACO requirements, all of which could be avoided with a better integrated County-wide process.

Automated self-entry of employee time will help support more detailed budget processes as well as workflow and workload studies suggested in other sections of this report. Overall it will help support the collection and analysis of data for enhanced management reporting. These processes should be evaluated at a County level, identifying opportunities for consistency and coordination through the central system.

Anticipated Impact

Updated payroll and time entry processes will help support the following benefits:

- Tracking of case-related time by attorney (for the Office of the Public Defender and the Office of the District Attorney)
- Tracking of various work activities to help agencies budget at a more detailed level in the future
- Improved accuracy of time entries through reduction of manual entry

C-11	Enhance annual budget process for public safety departments				
	Savings	3	Efficiency	3	Effectiveness

Overview

With support from recommendations DA-3 and PD-5, the County should enhance the annual budget process for public safety departments. This should require a more detailed budget development and approval process than is currently in place. The County should establish guidelines for review and clarify baseline requirements for the Board of Supervisors, as well as more specific expectations from all parties involved in the process. Such expectations may allow for improved clarity on RSO Field Operations costs allocated to contract cities against those that are allocated to County budgets as "Baseline" or "General Overhead" services.

Observation and Analysis

Through review of the County's fiscal year budget, interviews with personnel within the County Executive Office, and interviews with personnel with an understanding of the budget process from within each agency, it was determined that the budgeting process is neither consistent nor detailed with regard to process guidance for public safety departments. A review of the County's adopted budget book for public safety agencies reveals the following reported figures, as applicable by agency and budget unit.

Revenue Objects	Expenditure Objects
Charges For Current Services	Fixed Assets
Fines, Forfeitures & Penalties	Intrafund Transfers
Intergovernmental Revenues	Other Charges
Licenses, Permits & Franchises	Salaries and Benefits
Other Revenue	Services and Supplies
Revenue From Use Of Money & Property	

Of the four agencies under review, the Sheriff budget is provided to the Board and Executive Office in the most detailed format, with a total of 11 budget units. Conversely, Probation budgets with three budget units, District Attorney with two, and Public Defender with one. As examples of internal leading practices across the County, RSO budgets internally with more than 60 budget sub-organizations and the Probation Department budgets at the division level, resulting in a more detailed internal budget for each.

In addition, the County should establish a more structured "study session" approach to allow each department to share details and challenges from a fiscal and operational perspective that allow for enhanced context to the Board and Executive Office as formal budget hearings and processes begin. Such discussions could be integrated into the Ad-Hoc Criminal Justice Working Group meetings as contemplated in recommendation C-1.

COUNTYWIDE RECOMMENDATIONS

Observation and Analysis (continued)

Although the County currently works from an established budget development schedule, during interviews it was determined that the agencies may experience the following circumstances throughout the budget cycle:

1. Develop budget according to County-determined budget units
2. Develop separate budget according to departmental-determined budget units
3. Present budget to County
4. Receive conditional approval from County for total amount lower than requested budget
5. Present budget and expenditure updates throughout the budget year and receive additional funds as necessary (note: this step may occur multiple times)

Anticipated Impact

Utilizing a more defined and communicated budget development process for the public safety agencies will help the County have a more detailed understanding of the key areas of spending within each department which properly reflects the collective county objectives and strategy for the criminal justice system. Once the cycle is established and communicated, it will help the County and individual agencies in future years as they will have a more detailed picture of how revenues and expenditures trend or change over time.

Additionally, a defined and communicated budget process will help assure agencies that their approved budget at the beginning of the fiscal year is the one and only budget for which they will be held to account, helping to improve the accuracy of budget and financial management.

Sheriff's Office

Detailed services, recommendations, and commendations

Agency Overview

The members of Riverside County's Sheriff's Office (RSO) perform a diverse set of demanding roles as they provide law enforcement and related services to the community. RSO defines its mission as follows:


Riverside Sheriff's Office Mission Statement

- In partnership with the public, we serve to protect the public by the suppression and prevention of crime, and the reduction of criminal recidivism; and,
- Perform all mandates of the Office of Sheriff as provided in the U.S. Constitution and laws of the State of California, including the investigation and enforcement of violations of federal and state laws and local ordinances in a fair and reasonable manner; and,
- Serve the superior and municipal courts by providing court security, service of civil process, and execution of lawful orders of the court; and,
- Maintain the county jails and prisoners committed therein as prescribed by law in a fair and humane manner.

The law enforcement professionals of RSO, with a staff of over 4,000 dedicated men and women, cover, either directly or indirectly through support services, over 7,200 square miles. The Office is dedicated to serving the residents of its communities with integrity, professionalism, leadership and loyalty and provide the following core services:

- **First Responders** – 24/7 uniformed first responders to handle calls for service from the public
- **Police Services** – for 17 of 28 cities and 1 tribal community, various school districts, among others
- **Search and Rescue** – 24/7 responsibilities countywide
- **Emergency Response** – 24/7 law enforcement emergency response for disasters and terrorist attacks countywide
- **Mutual Aid Coordination** – for law enforcement resources countywide
- **Enforce Criminal Law** – in contract cities, unincorporated areas, and on tribal lands
- **Jail System** – operate and maintain a countywide jail system to serve all agencies and our local courts
- **Court Services** – court security and civil service countywide
- **Coroner-Public Administrator** – responsibilities countywide
- **Joint Task Forces** – lead agency for federal, state, and local integration of joint task force efforts


With an FY15/16 budget of over \$695 million, RSO employs a mix of sworn and non-sworn as well as classified personnel. As of 12/24/15 the Office consisted of 51% sworn personnel, 22% non-sworn, and 27% classified with 154 funded positions unfilled. Depicted below are the eight year staffing levels. In effort to supplement these figures, RSO utilizes over 1,600 volunteers who work in a myriad of assignments to include neighborhood watch, correctional facility support, patrol operations, clerical support, investigations, accounting, computer entry, the chaplain corps, and search and rescue.



Agency Overview (continued)

The current budgetary state of RSO has been impacted significantly by past pay increases. In the charts below we see the historical compensation from 2007 onward as well as the negotiated salary contracts for the last eight fiscal years for all ranks and classifications in RSO. These increases have had significant impacts upon RSO's FY 15/16 \$694,506,530 budget as 81% (\$565M) is allocated to salaries and benefits, 18% (\$125M) to services and supplies, and 1% (\$5M) to fixed assets and leases.

ALL COMPENSATION FY07/08 TO FY15/16 (IN MILLIONS)



Position	FY 08/09	FY 09/10	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	Cum. Total
LEMU	14%	8%	9%	9%	0%	8%	8%	9%	65%
RSA	8%	9%	7%	0%	0%	9%	9%	9%	51%
LIUNA	8%	8%	0%	0%	0%	5%	11%	11%	43%
SEIU	8%	8%	0%	0%	0%	5%	11%	11%	43%

For FY15/16, RSO's structural year-end budget deficit was projected as \$48M due to a difference in RSO original projections and CEO targeted Net County Cost (NCC). Four major drivers of RSO's projected structural deficits include:


- Unfunded Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) increases – \$30 million
- Unfunded Internal Service Fund (ISF) Increases – \$15 million
- Unincorporated Patrol & ECDC Staffing Increases – \$3 million (related to staff hired in FY14/15 prior to Board directed hiring slow-down in FY15/16)

RSO has indicated that future projected structural deficits will persist until an improved model of covering MOU and ISF increases is achieved in working with the Board and Executive Office. In addition to its expectations for operational excellence, RSO sets a high standard for itself in terms of its budgeting process and control of expenditures within 1% of RSO annual projections. This is a highly commendable result for an agency of over \$695 million in annual spending, and is a testament to the degree of sincerity and professionalism that RSO brings to the budget management process.

SHERIFF'S OFFICE: OVERVIEW

Organizational Structure

RSO has a staff of over 4,000 men and women and covers over 7,200 square miles of California's fourth largest county, representing one of the largest sheriffs' offices in the U.S. RSO is organized into three Divisions which are led by an Assistant Sheriff as depicted below. Additional information on services provided can be found in the service inventory section of this report.



Commendations

The Riverside Sheriff's Office employs a number of conscientious and explicit evidence based practices in its daily operations. Considering the impact of the realignment of public safety in Riverside County beginning in 2012, RSO is to be commended for their flexibility of operations and consistent effort to anticipate changing strategic needs and opportunities within the County. The Sheriff's Office should also be commended for the following:

Field Operations

- Contract city partners view departmental services as excellent and high quality at a local level
- Use of alternatives such as TRU, CSOs, and Cite-Release practices
- High quality call response times in city and unincorporated areas
- Leading practice crime analysis capabilities and intelligence/analytical products

Corrections


- Management of operations in constrained facility environment such as HMU and transport units
- Presence of jail alternatives via electronic monitoring and work release programs
- Cooperative efforts with system partners to better manage correctional challenges

Administration, Coroner & Courts

- Expanded risk-based training programs
- Strategic use of internal steering committees
- Detailed budget unit structure at sub-organization level
- Ratio of civilian use higher than surrounding benchmarks

Overview: Field Operations

With a FY15/16 budget of over \$350.68 million, the RSO field operations unit patrols the varied geography of Southern California from the Colorado River in the east to Norco, Corona and Wildomar in the West. As of 12/24/2015, RSO maintained a force of 793 field operations deputies, and 81 corporals that provide much of the region's law enforcement through ten Sheriff's Stations spread across the region. In addition, 265 deputies and corporals provide law enforcement services to the unincorporated and tribal areas. As depicted below, the 17 contract cities served include: Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Coachella, Eastvale, Indian Wells, Jurupa Valley, Lake Elsinore, La Quinta, Menifee, Moreno Valley, Norco, Palm Desert, Perris, Rancho Mirage, San Jacinto, Temecula, and Wildomar.



Station Operations

RSO has ten stations from which Field Operations services are provided, as described below.

- **Cabazon Station:** city of Calimesa, the unincorporated community of Whitewater, and the Morongo Indian Reservation
- **Colorado River Station:** unincorporated territory outside the city of Blythe
- **Hemet Station:** city of San Jacinto and the unincorporated communities of Homeland, Idyllwild, Nuevo, and Winchester
- **Jurupa Valley Station:** cities of Eastvale, Jurupa Valley, and Norco
- **Lake Elsinore Station:** the cities of Wildomar and Lake Elsinore
- **Moreno Valley Station:** cities of Moreno Valley, Edgemont, Sunnymead, the Riverside University Health System, and March JPA
- **Palm Desert Station:** cities of Indian Wells, Rancho Mirage and Palm Desert
- **Perris Station:** cities of Perris, Menifee, and Canyon Lake
- **Southwest Station:** serves the city of Temecula and the unincorporated communities of French Valley and De Luz
- **Thermal Station:** cities of La Quinta and Coachella and the unincorporated areas of Thermal and Mecca

Additional Force Multipliers

In addition to these stations, Field Operations works in conjunction with the Special Enforcement Bureau (SEB), the Sheriff's Emergency Response Team (SERT), the Gang Task Force (GTF), Aviation, Coroner, Forensics, Public Administrator, the Ben Clark Training Center, Central Dispatch, and the Special Investigations Bureau in order to provide essential services across the County of Riverside.

Evidence-based practices

Evidence-based practices are the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of current best evidence in making decisions. RSO employs a number of evidence-based practices and employs a judicious use of committees comprised of personnel from all ranks to reevaluate these practices. Field operations most notably employs a practice in which they continually monitor and evaluate crime statistics broken down in a number of different ways. This includes spatial analysis of crime data across Stations, Zones, Reporting Districts and designated Corridors. Through the use of GeoSpatial Technologies and CrimeMap tools, RSO's Crime Analysis Unit (CAU) views the data and hotspots using traditional quantitative tools as well as some lesser-known, but equally powerful, crime density tools.

RSO consistently monitors the impact their Special Enforcement Bureau and other special teams have on crime hotspots throughout our region. Using the results of this analysis, they direct patrol to the areas that need the most attention. This information is also shared with our Sheriff's Executive Staff, as well as the Station Commanders along with their administrative teams. Data is continuously analyzed both locally and regionally and when appropriate, as station analysts provide local crime forecasting information and the Central Crime Analysis provides more predictive measures.

In addition, RSO's CAU utilizes a Risk Terrain Modeling and Near Repeat Analysis along with in-house predictive tools that look at a variety of non-traditional data sets, such as dog ownership and proximity to certain geographic features and their impact on expected crime patterns. RSO is currently developing a new deployment utility that allows their scheduling practices to have a significant impact on crime, based on need and availability of officers to respond. These combined efforts give the department an evidence-based view of crime throughout RSO's areas of responsibility.

RSO-1	Conduct detailed review and analysis of patrol work demands				
	Savings	1	Efficiency	1	Effectiveness

Overview


RSO should conduct a detailed review of patrol work demands and activities to identify opportunities to enhance data-driven deployment by time of day, day of week, and resource skillset to drive shift pattern and scheduling.

Observation and Analysis

Based on interviews, ride-alongs, and data analysis of patrol watch staffing, it was observed the predominant scheduling strategy for the RSO police force is a 4-10 plan with overlapping shifts. As depicted below, there is opportunity to review this scheduling approach in light of the profile of patrol work demands as represented by average calls for service by hour of the day. While additional activities may drive patrol work demand, calls for service, officer-initiated activities, and preliminary investigations and report writing are often the most prominent work tasks comprising an officer's day.

The graph below illustrates average deployment per hour on a County-wide basis, which includes Deputies, Corporals, Sergeants and Community Service Officers (CSO). This is compared to a 12-month average 911 calls per hour to illustrate where proportional gaps in coverage may occur. A more thorough analysis of patrol work demands is needed to help ensure optimal alignment of resource supply with highest priority work demands (i.e. peak times for Priority 1 and 2 calls). The current data architecture of the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system does not allow for data mining of patrol "work demand" information, including calls by type (i.e. EDP code), number of units responding by call, and individual duration on-scene of responding units – all of which constitute resource demand drivers and impact officer's availability.

% 911 Calls vs. Deployed FTE per Hour




As depicted above, the overlapping 4-10 model results in a total of 30 hours of overlapping resource availability in a 24-hour cycle. If such availability is not appropriately aligned to a thorough understanding of prioritized work demand drivers, this may result in a 25% over-capacity situation where an additional 6 hours per resource are perpetually consumed to cover a 24-hour period. RSO has noted that overlaps are currently necessary to allow for shift changes which include equipment preparation, briefings, and other end of shift tasks.

In addition, a patrol work demand analysis would allow RSO to evaluate expanding its current alternative call resolution practices for non-emergency calls for service (i.e. Priority 3, 4, or below). While RSO's current telephone resolution efforts exceed some similar nearby California counties, a significant opportunity exists to expand such alternative resolution efforts to more efficiently resolve patrol work demands.

Currently, RSO utilizes its Telephone Reporting Unit (TRU) to handle approximately 1.5-2.0% of total call volume – 68% of total calls represent Priority 3 or lower, RSO should analyze further opportunities to provide alternate resolution to free up additional patrol unit available time. Typical TRU calls include non-emergency calls such as petty theft, lost property, fraud/identity theft, and other follow-up calls.

Historically, RSO has implemented the policy of responding to calls for service with an officer anytime they were requested by the public. The effort to increase usage of the TRU needs to be made in conjunction with a general public education process that better manages the expectations of the public in terms of balancing the cost and level of service. Education to the public is needed relative to the various demands on patrol unit time and relative urgency of such demands, along with how resolving less-urgent requests with alternative means can actually improve public perceptions of the service received.



Priority	2015 Calls	Description
P1	9227	Immediate Threat to Life/Property
P2	266,996	Urgent, Non-Life Threatening
P3	376,080	Past, Non-Emergency Circumstances
P4	176,479	
P5	36,177	

Anticipated Impact

A thorough understanding and prioritization of work demand drivers can help RSO ensure an optimal alignment of resource supply with resource demands. Given the current data-mining limitations of the CAD system, such an analysis is predicated on using statistically-valid sampling techniques to identify a granular and reliable view of patrol work demand to include:

- **Patrol resource activity analysis:** Proportion of time spent on calls for service, officer-initiated activities, investigations and reports, administrative time, and other variable work demands to allow RSO to maximize productive time.
- **Patrol calls for service analysis:** Composition of calls for service logged into the CAD system and classified by "EDP Codes" allowing RSO a deeper understanding of time of day and day of week fluctuations of call types and possible expansion of alternative call resolution techniques.
- **Patrol call crewing analysis:** Quantity of resources deployed on average to calls by type to help enable RSO to identify patterns and opportunities for enhanced supervisory control or training on appropriate deployment, including use of other skillsets from partner agencies such as Behavioral Health Clinicians from the Riverside CREST team.
- **Patrol tasking and coordination analysis:** Process of resource deployment and control from call intake, assessment, dispatch, deployment, and status reporting to help ensure appropriate visibility and management control is available to the station Watch Commander roles.

The above analysis represents a significant effort for RSO but can help yield further insight into opportunities to optimize available patrol time to direct resources to those RSO priorities deemed of highest importance to leadership and the communities that RSO serves.


RSO-2	Perform a review and analysis of patrol supply factors				
	Savings	1	Efficiency	1	Effectiveness

Overview

In addition to conducting a comprehensive analysis of patrol demand, RSO should continue its current efforts to manage patrol supply factors. While balancing the need for officer work-life balance, it is critically important to optimize the supply of officers to meet work demands at the busiest times.

Observation and Analysis

Net availability is defined as an RSO officer's time available to perform their key roles and responsibilities after the impact of leave and other administrative responsibilities have been subtracted from their gross paid hours of work. The chart below shows a snapshot of a typical RSO officer's net availability. In total, vacation, holidays and sick leave amount to 280 hours that an officer is not available to perform patrol assignments.



Potential opportunities for improvement in further managing patrol supply factors include the following concepts.

- **Leave Administration:** Increased management of administrative oversights such as sick leave, FMLA, and Worker's Comp in conjunction with Riverside County Human Resources (RC-HR).
- **Patrol Briefings:** Review and reduction of time spent on patrol shift briefings.
- **Administrative Duties:** Review and reduction of time spent on administrative tasks.
- **Vehicle Preparation:** Decreasing the window of time for vehicle preparation.

Observation and Analysis (continued)

The table below is based on field observations and estimations, indicating that the average RSO Deputy could potentially be limited to 1,400 hours of availability for patrol hours in the field. As 67% (1,400 of 2,080) of overall paid time per year represents the net productive time, close administration of unavailable time is an imperative.

Component	Hours
Gross hours scheduled per officer	2,080
Vacation, holiday, sick, training time	300
Average net available after leave/training	1,780
Shift meals and breaks	124
Patrol shift briefings	42
Administrative duties	124
Vehicle and equipment preparation and inspection	42
Court attendance/subpoena	40
Office meetings & committees	8
Average net available time	1,400

The RSO has shown significant progress in managing supply factors in terms of court attendance through its innovative AgencyWeb court scheduling tool. An expansion of accomplishments such as this can have a major impact on the \$14.1 million in unreimbursed over-time as well as overall patrol resource availability at high-demand times. RSO is limited by various collective-bargaining MOU requirements, such as "donning/doffing" and other aspects of the MOU that constrain the amount of available time an officer may be afforded for core patrol duties.

Anticipated Impact

Further decreases in vacancy and relief factors that impact officer availability can help RSO reduce its current \$14.1 million per year in un-reimbursed over-time (2.7% of total personnel spending). For other law enforcement and correctional agencies across the nation, over-time spending can normally range between 5-10% of total personnel spending. Reduced vacancy factors can also improve:

- An increase in overall station operational efficiency and effectiveness due to availability of units in high-demand times
- Increased officer safety through availability of more resources at high-demand times as required by RSO
- Streamlined non-patrol time to allow for overall enhanced cost-effectiveness in personnel cost structure

RSO-3	Conduct a review and analysis of investigative work demands		
	Savings 2	Efficiency 1	Effectiveness 1


Overview

RSO should conduct a detailed review of investigative work demands and activities to identify opportunities to enhance data-driven deployment by time of day, day of week, and resource skillset to drive shift pattern and scheduling.

Observations and Analysis

Investigative workloads are currently not tracked consistently across RSO station locations. As each station exhibits varying degrees of both violent and property crime as well as varying investigative staffing levels, a more consistent approach to measure and track the workload and performance of investigative resources may assist RSO in better balancing workloads across station locations.

Additionally, RSO's overall Field Operations resource availability would be impacted positively if RSO had the ability to request that investigative resources go "in-service" for call response and patrol. This ability would additionally serve to help improve collaboration, monitor less experienced staff, and serve to improve initial investigations through direct example.



Anticipated Impact

A thorough understanding and prioritization of work demand drivers can help RSO ensure an optimal alignment of resource supply with resource demands. Such an analysis is predicated on using statistically-valid sampling techniques to identify a granular and reliable view of investigative work demand to help ensure improved balance across workloads at RSO stations as well as help to better align investigative staffing and shift schedules with investigative work demands.

RSO-4	Invest in CAD/RMS technology and enhanced management information		
	Savings 2	Efficiency 1	Effectiveness 1

Overview

RSO should work with the County to prioritize efforts to upgrade the current Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) and Records Management System (RMS) technologies. Modernized CAD/RMS platforms will allow for enhanced management information to allow the RSO to obtain automated reporting for purposes of monitoring and improving productivity and performance.

Observation and Analysis

During field observations, the following themes were noted with respect to CAD/RMS and related technologies:

- CAD/RMS technology does not utilize the GPS tracking capability which greatly decreases efficiency and situational awareness for officers in the field. An increase in situational awareness may yield decreased response times, greater operational efficiency and enhanced safety and security.
- Central Dispatch facilities are in need of significant infrastructure upgrades to both mechanical and technological aspects of the facility. Such upgrades can allow for reduced risk of CAD/RMS system disruption based on issues with underlying infrastructure.
- Existing Mobile Data Computers (MDCs) are in need of upgrades in order to continue to provide timely and accurate information to the officer and enable the officer to quickly and easily convey and receive information in the course of performing regular duties.
- Tablet computing capabilities are beginning to be implemented throughout RSO. Efforts in this area are encouraged as this is seen as a long-term investment. Current practices of using a separate device for ticket writing (due to separate city-funded devices), in-car computing, and report writing decrease operational efficiency. Additionally ticket devices are only used in cities, are city-funded, and are not integrated with RSO systems.
- Station Watch Commander roles do not have full situational awareness of tasking and coordination of the resources deployed within their station areas, as the CAD system allows for direct dispatch of calls for service to available units directly from Central Dispatch. Access to CAD call screens for Watch Commanders can help improve resource deployment and control at the station-level, and perhaps at broader levels in time.


Anticipated Impact

An enhanced CAD/RMS system environment will allow RSO to more easily drive decision making. Management will possess a greater situational awareness and sense of their operational efficiency that will drive a more accurate and automated analysis of workload demands and resourcing decisions. Enhanced systems can also improve the efficiency and accuracy of management decision making, as well as improve field resource performance.

As CAD/RMS modernization represents a significant investment and fiscal outlay in the future, RSO should engage with its County partners to assess and identify the financial and operational benefits afforded through such enhanced capabilities to help develop a business case for system change and implementation.

Overview: Corrections


RSO operates five correctional facilities, Robert Presley Detention Center, Smith Correctional Facility, Indio Jail Facility, Southwest Detention Center and the Blythe Jail. Each facility presents its own unique challenges. As outlined below, each facility is geographically unique; was built in various periods; and has a unique bed capacity. These correctional facilities also have variance in their ability to house women, meet medical needs of inmates and treat the mentally ill. Older, and smaller facilities are particularly limited in capability to provide services and inmate programming. RSO's correctional facilities also operate and coordinate robust inmate work release and electronic monitoring programs.



Riverside County Correctional Facility Overview						
Facility	BSCC Rated Capacity	Year Built	Men Housed	Women Housed	Medical Staff Available	Mental Health Staff
Blythe	79	1964	Yes	No	Limited*	Limited*
Indio	238	1959	Yes	Yes	Yes	Limited*
Smith Correctional Facility	1458	1920**	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Presley Detention Center	760	1989	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Southwest Detention Center	1094	1993	Yes	No	Yes	Yes


* Limited medical and mental health staff indicates inability to deal with serious inmate treatment needs. ** Facility upgrades to Smith Correctional Facility have occurred periodically subsequent to the original 1920 build date.

2015 Average Daily Population




Overview (continued)

The jails are a continuously fluctuating environment with new inmates coming in and being released. AB 109 and Prop 47 has affected this flow of inmates and the characteristics of those being booked and released. The jails operate at capacity and thus this flow of inmates is consistent with both a criminal justice system that is adjusting to changing legal schemes and a corrections system that has limited bed space to hold offenders.



The RSO also employs electronic monitoring and work release programs, which are significantly less costly to the County in terms of housing cost per inmate per day (i.e. \$7-\$12 per day). The RSO has full time and part time programs that aid in easing capacity issues at county correctional facilities. The below decrease in program use is indicative of the effects of prop 47, as more offenders fall in the misdemeanor category, they are more likely to be cite and released or released on own recognizance rather than supervised programs such as those mentioned here.



RSO-5	Develop an activity-based jails staffing model approach		
	Savings 2	Efficiency 1	Effectiveness 1

Overview


Build upon BSCC staffing analysis to develop an activity-based staffing model and approach. The current critical staffing model, takes into consideration basically two factors 1. function of assigned staff position and 2. relief factors for those positions. This conceptual framework assumes that to function safely the jails have static posts with personnel limited to only the physical or functional area in which they are assigned for that shift. While jail commanders and management may operate under an activity-based mindset, a more formalized approach supported by an activity-based staffing model is recommended.

Observation and Analysis

Based on field observations, the jails are a dynamic, ever changing environment with consistent and considerable demands on jail personnel. Staff work together to overcome these challenges; jail captains and leaders adapt to incidences and inmate needs by using various tools to meet demands, such as shifting personnel, operating below minimum staffing levels and locking down inmates to name a few. Multiple medical runs to local hospitals may require staffing levels to fall below established minimums; jail staff adapt to these demands by teaming and employing the above tools to operate safely and carry out mandatory jail activities.

Jail staff line ups reveal that aside from ad-hoc adjustments to scheduling RSO jail floor staffing is generally flat (i.e. the same number of people are staffed on every shift). The justification for this is that each shift requires a minimum staffing level to each fixed post regardless of activity level in the jail. A detailed activity-based analysis can be built from the observation of activity within each jail facility as well as a review of correctional activity reports and monthly statistics (tracked per RSO SOP 506.18) to construct daily jail activity schedules that would inform the implementation of an activity-based staffing model.

The below example chart provides a visual representation of expected activity level against staffing of floor personnel. Routine activities considered in this chart include feedings; hourly welfare checks; sick call; mail call; court visits and return; jail intake and programming. The chart is designed to be a demonstrative aid to show baseline anticipated needs based on routine activities; not layered into this are overtime needs for escorting medical personnel, and critical incidents such as jail fights or inmate medical emergencies which require a more detailed analysis of frequency of occurrence.



Observation and Analysis (continued)

Implementation of an activity-based staffing model could be facilitated by the creation of a centralized staffing unit. Centralization can drive efficiencies that cannot be done in a decentralized staffing model. A central staffing unit can build upon existing RSO Planning Unit practices and provide a strategic approach to staffing. Centralization will drive efficiency through a more scientific demand-based staffing analysis and jail staff line up adjustments. This centralized unit will have a global picture of anticipated demands. As the RSO correctional system shifts the inmate population between jails for various purposes daily, such as due to need for services or classification at individual facilities, a staffing unit that has visibility on these system-wide shifts would be better able to drive efficiency through periodic adjustments to jail staffing.

Centralization will also have ancillary benefits of reducing the scheduling and personnel management burden of each jail; freeing up staff to focus on core jail functions. RSO executives will have a single point of accountability for all staffing issues. The RSO has quality controls on overtime; centralization such as this would provide even further improvements to these controls and accountability to RSO executives. While we understand the RSO Planning Unit provides some focus on macro-level staffing issues, we encourage the formalization of some of their tasks into a centralized jail staffing unit, while adopting the additional tasks discussed in this recommendation.

Anticipated Impact

An activity-based staffing approach can assist RSO in helping to demonstrate that its jail facilities operate efficiently and effectively to meet the daily demands of jail operations. Implementation will require detailed daily jail activity schedules, which will have additional benefits of driving accountability and reducing ad-hoc implementation of when and if some activities are completed on a consistent basis. Daily jail activity schedules are also the basis for each jail's demand analysis which in turn can be used to drive further efficiency through re-organization of work tasks to meet staffing or other operational constraints.


RSO-6	Expand jail utilization study and strategic prioritization of inmate population				
	Savings	1	Efficiency	1	Effectiveness

Overview

The RSO recently underwent efforts to better understand their inmate population. This recommendation should encourage a further deep study and analysis of the jail population. This analysis should have two outcomes, 1. a deeper understanding of who is in the jail and 2. a prioritization model of who should be in the jail. The latter would require DA, courts and community buy-in. The RSO would have an opportunity to develop and implement core strategies and policies around controlling the inmate population and its characteristics where possible.

Observation and Analysis

The RSO maintains an at-capacity jail system, as typically 85-90% occupied beds is recognized nationally as a practical limit primarily due to classification requirements to keep certain inmates separate from others (e.g. gang affiliation, mental health). Recent analysis by RSO and CA Fwd of the jail population revealed useful insights into whom is actually being housed. However, the inmate population may require further understanding, as the top charge for an inmate is not fully representative of their offending history. One challenge facing RSO ability to control jail population is the RSO's mandate to accept all bookings from all law enforcement throughout the county. As such, it is difficult to have a unified strategy with an offender that may result in arrest or alternatives to arrest.



The RSO has limited resources and ability to hold the current offending population. A targeted approach that identifies and prioritizes offenders most likely to reoffend particularly in areas where the cost to society is greater than the cost of incapacitation should be formalized into a strategy and implemented through existing population control tools. This approach should result in a more hardened and career criminal in the jails (and potentially more resource intense). Low level crime, substance abuse, and mentally ill populations would likely be filtered out from this targeted approach – requiring a systemic review of housing and rehabilitation options for such offending populations.

RSO already employs tools to control its offender population, and should continue the use of alternatives to jail such as electronic monitoring and work release. Furthermore, RSO commonly cite-releases offenders and could seek to collaborate more effectively with Probation to screen offenders to help maximize Own Recognizance (OR) and Supervised Own Recognizance (SOR) release usage. RSO also has the ability to reduce the jail population due to Federal mandates on jail capacity, known as "Federal kicks." These tools must be used in conjunction with the above mentioned strategy; consensus must be drawn from all stakeholders as to what populations are to be managed within RSO jails and what alternatives are acceptable for other offending populations.

Observation and Analysis (continued)

The table below serves as a comparative look at similar California counties and highlights the need for RSO to aim for consistent and efficient administration of demand reduction tools such as the ones mentioned in this section. The public, arrestees and RSO staff should better understand why and who is eligible for release and the process of release should occur faster for pre-trial and misdemeanor offenders. These policies of releasing inmates sometimes result in negative sentiment because the public believes these arrestees are not being held accountable. An effective strategy must account for means of accountability other than jail. Community based sanctions often result in more effective recidivism reduction efforts. The arrestees eligible for these procedural releases from jail often include lower risk populations that are affected greater by jail-increasing their chances of recidivism the greater the length of stay spent in the facility. If the RSO and the Riverside County Criminal Justice system can effectively weigh system effects on the offending population, its demand reduction strategy and public safety, significant efficiencies and cost savings may result in the future. According to a 2013 correctional facility needs assessment (detailed below), it is projected that RSO would require an additional 10,000 jail beds by 2028. This estimation highlights the urgent need to undertake new strategies in jail demand reduction.

County	Population	BSCC Rated Jail Beds as of 1/5/16	BSCC Beds per Population	Total Jail Beds per RSO	Total Jail Beds per Population
Riverside	2,255,059	3,629	1/621	3,914	1/576
San Bernardino	2,076,274	7,012	1/296	7,908	1/262
Orange	3,081,804	5,063	1/609	7,448	1/411
San Diego	3,150,178	5,695	1/553	6,740	1/467
Fresno	952,166	2,744	1/347	3,291	1/289
Sacramento	1,445,806	4,005	1/361	4,406	1/328

**BSCC local detention facilities rated capacity; excluded title IV facilities. Effective beds are per RSO survey estimates.*

Riverside Jail Bed Need Projections	
Short Term (2013-2018)	4,000
Mid Term (2018-2023)	3,000
Long Term (2023-2028)	3,000
Total By 2028	10,000

**The ECDC facility in Indio will add an additional 1,300 bed capacity by FY17/18.*

Anticipated Impact

RSO may achieve demand reduction and subsequent cost savings by building on current efforts to become more data-driven. This deeper analytical view will decrease demand and alleviate subsequent impacts on transportation of prisoners. Additionally, this data analysis will generate a more profound understanding of the classification of inmates and will aid in prioritization of confinement based on stakeholder input. The strategic objective being where appropriate to divert inmates through data-based decision-making away from custody and into alternative placements. A targeted understanding of inmates mostly likely to reoffend could help shape strategies and policies geared towards incapacitation and rehabilitation of these offenders while simultaneously filtering out lower level offenders who maybe better suited for community based solutions. This strategy would also have ancillary benefits of reducing system effects on low risk inmates (i.e. having a further criminogenic effect through incarceration) if they are kept out of the system. An expanded jail utilization analysis will serve as a tool to learn from today's experiences to better plan for future correctional system needs, including alternative facilities that may provide more appropriate and less restrictive environments than the current jail facilities are capable of providing today. This is a long-term process of system demand planning that will leverage the efforts of RSO's Corrections Planning Unit to best identify the facilities and programming needed to best serve the County's needs for corrections and rehabilitation into the future.

RSO-7	Expand and evaluate inmate programming and incentivization				
	Savings	2	Efficiency	2	Effectiveness


Overview

RSO should build upon efforts to expand inmate programming. RSO has a variety of programs geared towards rehabilitation, education and reducing recidivism. These programs are all evidence based and recommendations of the state governing correctional body. RSO should consider targeting a broader range of inmates to fill current programs and create new programs that meet the needs of higher risk inmates. RSO should also consider reevaluation of incentive schemes around how to increase participation in these programs.

Observation and Analysis

RSO indicated that inmate participation in programs has declined and inmates are not incentivized to participate in programs. RSO staff attribute this decline in participation with Prop 47 and fedkick policies. The perception is that inmates anticipate release from jail facilities prior to the possible completion of any programs offered at the facility and thus do not participate. Programs offered at RSO jails are largely geared towards low-risk (levels 1 and 2) inmates but some level 2 inmates (not yet sentenced) are further limited in the programs in which they can participate. These policies reduce the pool of available candidates for programming; this limited group of eligible candidates then must self-select programming with limited incentives to do so. The RSO is limited in its ability to incentivize participation due to rules around sentencing and thus cooperation with the courts is necessary.

Two existing programs, Guidance and Opportunities to Achieve Lifelong Success (GOALS) and Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) are evidence-based practices available to eligible offenders. GOALS is an intensive 120-275 day cognitive behavioral program and focuses on criminal thinking and behavior, moral reasoning, pro-social skills, recognizing and managing high-risk situations, relationships, responsible living, reentry and transition planning, adult basic and vocational training opportunities, and community linkages, among other elements. RSAT provides substance abuse treatment for inmates who are GOALS participants. The chart below shows that in 2014, almost all GOALS participants were also enrolled in RSAT, but that overall GOALS participation was declining.



RSO is currently taking steps towards expanding their programs. RSO officials reported a new program geared towards level 5 inmates (highest risk) that started approximately one year ago that is finding success. These types of steps should be commended and the RSO should consider further expansion of all current programs and creation of more targeted programs, tailored and targeted to inmate populations that take up the most jail beds. The work that CA Forward has undertaken to better understand the inmate population can be instrumental to taking a more scientific approach in identifying target populations geared at multiple goals to include rehabilitation; reducing recidivism; reducing side door entries and reducing daily jail beds used by core inmate groups.

Observation and Analysis (continued)

The expansion and evaluation of programs requires collaboration of multiple agencies with the RSO and a comprehensive evaluation of best practices in inmate programming. As noted below, the RSO employs several evidence based practices in classifying, rehabilitating and educating inmates.

- Classification of inmates
- Inmate education
- Proxy Risk Assessment Tool
- Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) Assessment
- Objective-based decision tree classification system
- Assessment tool to deliver rehabilitative services
- Evidence-based pre-screening tool
- Secure electronic confinement program

The offerings of current programs are evidence based and show relative success when targeted at lower risk inmates. Recent studies have indicated that this mix of programming would be substantially less effective if higher risk inmates were included. A recalibration of inmate programming in RSO jails would require a complete rethinking as to which menu of new practices would fit best to an updated strategy on inmate programming.

Anticipated Impact

A different mixture and expansion of inmate programming could assist the RSO in meeting its goals of limiting daily jail beds used (reducing capacity); reducing recidivism and providing services to their inmate population. Effectively targeting inmates for programming could result in a more effective and successful programs. Expanding the pool of eligible candidates for programming will ensure resources and funding for these programs are being utilized. Evaluation of these programs effectiveness will provide for accountability in programming. This recommendation, combined with a broader strategy on demand reduction, to include alternatives to jail where rehabilitation and education are most effective will provide the county with the best chances of meeting system-wide criminal justice goals.

RSO-8	Invest in JIMS information management system modernization				
	Savings	2	Efficiency	1	Effectiveness

Overview

The RSO correctional department should continue efforts to acquire an updated jail information management system. An updated system will provide updated tools and reporting capability for the department. Recommendations included in this report require that efficiency be driven by reliable data. The department needs a system that provides the type of dashboard capability that can drive decision making effectiveness through on demand relevant data.

Observation and Analysis

Interviews with RSO staff revealed that the current jail information management system (JIMS) is unable to meet their management information and reporting needs without significant data-mining efforts. Staff reported that the system does not store or track all relevant datasets. The system has limited dashboard capability, resulting in RSO staff spending hours building basic and routine reports needed for management. Staff at the HMU expressed frustration that the system tracks and drops inmates by booking number - resulting in differences in statistics if offenders are rebooked on new crimes. These inefficiencies thus require more experienced staff to interface with the system when reports need to be generated or data pulled, also requiring a high degree of effort from those experienced staff.

Staff reported that the thoroughness of recent studies of the jail population were hampered by the limitations of the system. Mining data from JIMS is time intensive and exorbitant. An effective JIMS system would lead efforts to be data driven in managing resources and understanding the jail population. The RSO should continue efforts to acquire funding to make this long term capital investment. When moving forward with implementation, RSO should complete a careful vendor selection process that is thoughtful to long term operations and maintenance cost, while delivering the requisite capabilities to manage RSO jails more effectively.

A detailed inventory of RSO staff needs should be completed to acquire the best JIMS system modernization solution. When an updated system is acquired staff whose primary job is interfacing with JIMS should be reevaluated to ensure the appropriate level of staff is tasked with the appropriate jobs - i.e. highly experienced staff should not remain working on a product that can be utilized by lower cost staff members. In addition, business process analysis should precede any outlays for a new system to help ensure expected benefits in efficiency and effectiveness can be properly fulfilled.

Anticipated Impact

A modern JIMS system would improve the departments' efforts to be more data driven. Staff would be more efficient in daily tasks that require interfacing with JIMS and the level of staff needed to interface with JIMS in some instances can be reduced. This represents a significant investment for the RSO but long term cost savings would result from the daily administrative efficiencies that would result after implementation of the new system.

As JIMS modernization represents a significant investment and fiscal outlay in the future, RSO should engage with its County partners to assess and identify the financial and operational benefits afforded through such enhanced capabilities to help develop a business case for system change and implementation.

RSO-9	Evaluate expansion and innovation in alternatives to inmate movement		
	Savings 3	Efficiency 2	Effectiveness 1


Overview

The RSO correctional department should consider expansion of current alternatives to inmate movement such as video arraignment and adoption of new technologies such as web visits; telehealth; telepsychiatry capabilities. These technologies help to lower the cost and risk in inmate transportation. These innovative tools also improve efficiency in providing services to an even broader pool of candidates. Web visits specifically make it easier for family members to communicate with inmates who may not be located near their home thus allowing the RSO to place inmates most conveniently for the system and not the offender.


Observation and Analysis

The RSO correctional department has an extensive transportation operation serving inmate and system needs. Inmate are move for numerous reasons but most abundant for court or transfer between facilities. Parole and probation are the next two major categories that require significant movement. Third would be the various types of medical appointments grouped, reflective of the increased need for services by today's inmates. The below charts contain the raw data on inmate movement for 2015 by reason type.

2015 Number of Primary Inmate Transports by Type



2015 Additional Inmate Transports by Type



The RSO currently has two facilities capable of video arraignment. RSO staff reported that video arraignment has been an effective tool for them and inmates generally appreciate the reduced time it takes to get the process done. The public defenders officer has noted some concern in expanded use of video arraignment as they believe it has the possibility of lowering the offenders chances of the best outcomes in receiving bail. Offenders physically in court have the opportunity to interact with the judge and their families; all important parts of an ability to articulate and show ties to the community which ties to outcomes in release from jail. This will require further coordination and understanding by the courts; DA; public defender; inmate as to the benefits of video arraignment. While the option should remain a voluntary process, the RSO could expand its use at current facilities and ensure it is available at the 3 facilities that currently don't utilize the technology.

Observation and Analysis (continued)

RSO should continue its efforts to acquire technologies that enable web visits for inmates. This capability would allow for inmate family members to go to any designated facility and communicate with inmates at any location in the system. RSO indicated that inmates are often moved to allow for closer proximity to family members. This cost to the community of inmate movement could be reduced by providing this alternative. RSO staff continuously expressed frustration in the need for greater services for inmates and having to transport these inmates to outside facilities. Some facilities do not have a doctor on call 24/7 or a nurse practitioner. The use of telehealth and telepsychiatry are in line with advances in modern medicine and delivery of services. The cost to the county for delivery of these services and the accompanying transportation to outside facilities could be reduced significantly. It should be noted that the County is procuring expanded tele-health and tele-psychiatry as part of its implementation of recent improvement initiatives.

Anticipated Impact

The RSO undergoes a massive effort to move inmates around the county for a variety of reasons, to include court; inmate need for services; programming; relocation to facilities closer to family. The cost of this movement could be reduced by offering and providing alternatives. In addition to reducing cost; the RSO will better serve their inmate population with enhanced access to services and family via web video link. These modernization efforts would push the RSO further into best practices for correctional reform.

Overview: Administration, Coroner & Courts

In addition to law enforcement and corrections responsibilities, RSO maintains a robust internal administrative, court services and coroner bureau. Under the leadership of an Assistant Sheriff, the department maintains a staff of over 772 personnel. Additional services that fall under the Administration, Coroner and Courts Bureau include: The Professional Standards Bureau, Media Information Bureau, Accounting and Finance, Personnel Bureau, Technical Services Bureau, Information Service Bureau, the Grants Unit, Field Operations Fiscal Unit, Public Safety Enterprise Communications (PSEC), the Ben Clark Training Center, Patrol Academy Trainers, Dispatch, Sheriff CAL-DNA, Sheriff CAL-Photo, CAL-ID, and the Chaplain Corps.

Administration

The Sheriff's Administrative Bureau maintains a FY 15/16 budget of \$13,367,152 and provides leadership to all Department stations, facilities, and bureaus. Through the direction from the executive team, the administrative unit manages the operations of the Department. Additionally, Media Relations staff, carry concealed weapons permitting unit, public records requests, employee records, and the Department's legal counsel fall under the administrative umbrella.

Coroner

Located in both Perris and Indio, the Sheriff's Coroner bureau maintains a FY15/16 budget of \$10,375,503. The Coroner Bureau investigates and reports on all violent, sudden or unusual deaths of persons within the County as established by California law. In all cases which come under its jurisdiction, the Coroner's Bureau will conduct thorough Medico-Legal Death Investigations in order to determine the Manner, Mode, and Cause of Death for each decedent. Deputy Coroners establish medical facts pertaining to each case. Additionally, they direct medical and other scientific personnel to establish and provide information necessary to carry out this mandate. Additional services the Coroner Bureau provides are:

- **Forensics:** The Sheriff's Forensic Services are located in Indio and Perris and provides examination for each death that falls under the Coroner's jurisdiction. The forensics team provides a thorough receiving process for examinations including undressing, weighing, obtaining an ID photograph, obtaining fingerprints and documenting property.
- **The Coroner Incident Response Team (CIRT):** CIRT is a specialized unit within the Coroner's Bureau trained to handle incidents which require additional technical expertise. The CIRT team responds to buried body cases, cases that require a body to be extricated from a confined space or up high angles, in remote areas requiring technical rope recovery skills, cases where the body has been exposed to hazardous materials, and mass fatality incidents. The personnel figures are included in the Coroner East and West figures.
- **Evidence-based practices:** Conscientious, explicit and judicious use of current best evidence in making decisions is employed throughout the Administration, Coroner and Courts Bureau. Evidence based practices related to the Coroner Bureau are listed below:

Coroner Review	Child Death Review Team (CDRT)	Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse Review Team (CDRT)	Coroner Incident Response Team (CIRT)
Dive Team	Teen Empowerment Mentoring Program Options (Tempo)	First Responder Death Investigator Course (POST)	UCR Medical School Collaboration
RMRU Cadaver Dog Training	Missing Persons Day	Cold Case Homicide collaboration with DA	Monthly Trauma Board Meeting with Riverside University Health Systems
Public Presentations – DA, PD, Academy, Nursing Students	Law Enforcement Presentations – Role of the Coroner	Hospice Care	Anthropologist

Courts

With a FY 15/16 budget of \$31,164,392, the Sheriff's Court Services Division is divided between three locations and serves as an officer of the court and is responsible for security in the courts, execution of orders issued by the court, and service and enforcement of civil processes.

- **East:** Located in Indio, this office serves the Larson Justice Center (LJC) in Indio, the Juvenile Court in Indio, the Palm Springs Court, and the Blythe Court.
- **Central:** Located in Hemet, this office serves the Southwest Justice Center (SWJC), the Temecula Court, the Hemet Court, and the Banning Court.
- **West:** Located in Riverside, this office serves the Historic Court, Hall of Justice (HOJ), Family Law Court, Juvenile Court, and Self-Help Center in Riverside, as well as the Moreno Valley and Corona Courts.

Additionally, the CAC Security group, located in Riverside, provides security at the County Administrative Center in Riverside for all meetings of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, and for all county departments operating within the CAC.

Evidence-based practices: There are a number of evidence-based practices that the courts employ. Examples of these include and the resulting workload statistics are detailed below:

- Security for high risk trials
- Security for off-site juror activity
- Security for juror sequestration
- Bi-Annual Emergency Evacuation Training for all court and CAC personnel
- Active shooter training for CAC and court personnel and judges
- Security risk assessment

Riverside Superior Court Facilities-Visitors Screened, 2014	
Court Facility	Persons Screened
Historic Court	244,387
Hall of Justice	674,664
Family Law Court	242,563
Moreno Valley Court	214,534
Juvenile Courts (Riverside)	84,118
Corona Court	2,688
Southwest Justice Center	30,439
Temecula Court	505,543
Hemet Court	29,807
Banning Court	208,284
Larson Justice Center	105,352
Indio Court Annex	605,885
Juvenile Courts (Indio)	14,844
Palm Springs Court	91,568
Blythe Court	14,190
Total	3,068,866

RSO-10	Review functional force mix for sworn, non-sworn, and civilian resources		
	Savings 2	Efficiency 1	Effectiveness 2

Overview

RSO should conduct a thorough review of the force mix in its major operating and functional units within Field Operations, Corrections, and Administration divisions (i.e. jail facilities, stations, and bureaus). Positions and job functions are oftentimes interchangeable between sworn and non-sworn staff. All positions should be evaluated to ensure that the right mix of staff is provided at the right cost. A recurring practice of periodic force mix reviews should be adopted to help demonstrate continued commitment to allocating the right skillsets to the appropriate roles at the appropriate cost profile.

Observations and Analysis

The RSO has employed a variety of innovative force-mix approaches, including the use of CSOs, TRU Officers, and most notably Correctional-designation resources. With over 1600 volunteer reserves, RSO successfully manages a robust volunteer force. As is commonly observed in large law enforcement and correctional agencies, a recurring need for re-evaluating force mix and use of highest cost sworn resources is imperative to provide an adequate degree of assurance to fiscal and coordination bodies.


RSO should develop a systematic approach to reviewing allocation of force-mix to the core functions below, allowing for recurring and structured reviews into the future:

- Administration
- Support Services
- Patrol
- Corrections
- Court Services
- Coroner
- Public Administration

Anticipated Impact

An optimal force-mix can help RSO decrease overall personnel spending where a less-costly resource can be utilized, redeploy sworn resources to roles where benefit commensurate with cost is obtained, and mitigate the need for overtime use in positions where minimum staffing requirements for sworn posts is present.

RSO Filled Positions
As of pay period 14 (June 11-June 24, 2015)



Total Number of Positions: 4,135*

*Not including 1600 volunteer reserves

RSO-11	Enhance employee succession, development, and mentoring programs				
	Savings	2	Efficiency	1	Effectiveness

Overview

As part of the personnel management processes currently in place RSO should further develop their performance and accountability methods and plan for succession of leadership positions. Additionally, RSO should implement a mentorship program to recruit and retain new employees as well as enhance overall effectiveness.

Observation and Analysis

The RSO currently recognizes and implements a number of practices and strategies to evaluate performance, retain officers, and help provide adequate career growth. This is witnessed in the associated table which indicates strong officer retention figures.

An example of this practice comes from the Ben Clark Training Center which implemented a mentorship program for the academy trainees. This program served to decrease the failure rate and improved the morale of the officers. Though the guidance of veteran officers, trainees were able to recognize challenges and opportunities with their training, and develop a clear path toward their goals.

Based on the positive results from Ben Clark Training Center's mentorship program it is recommended that RSO promote an expanded mentoring program. The program will be mutually beneficial as it will serve as an opportunity for skilled veteran officers and inexperienced junior officers to knowledge-share. The insight, guidance and developmental opportunities that a veteran can offer, will provide a path toward success. Additionally, the fresh perspective and articulation of past challenges by the junior officer will serve to reinforce training standards in the veteran officers and challenge historical practices.

Attrition Data					
Reason	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	Total	Avg.
Resigned	20	9	15	44	14.67
Retired	41	23	10	74	24.67
Disability Retired	7	5	3	15	5.00
Voluntary Demotions	0	0	0	0	0.00
Terminations	6	4	4	14	4.67
Emergency Retirement	0	0	0	0	0.00
Deceased	2	1	1	3	1.00
*Position Adjustment	0	0	0	0	0.00
Totals	76	33	33	150	50.01

During interviews it was recognized that the Sheriff's Office has the opportunity to more extensively prepare for eventual changes in leadership. It is recommended that the RSO Executive team develop this succession of command by identifying future leadership of RSO through an appropriate qualification and identification process. While the process of identifying and grooming candidates may be time consuming, the mentorship program will serve as a basic solution to this and will help provide a first level of oversight.

Observations and Analysis (continued)

Succession is a fundamental preparation exercise for the future and can only properly be conducted based upon accurate information. Based on interviews and observation, there were mixed feelings on the clarity and ease toward the path of career advancement. While RSO has mechanisms currently in place which measure the performance of their officers, such measures should be reviewed in order to ensure consistency and objectivity where possible.

The criticality of this effort can be witnessed in the chart below. Since 2007 there have been a significant number of promotions in a limited number of RSO positions. This signifies a large generational change of command and a necessity to prepare for the challenges that will be presented due to the potential loss of institutional knowledge and experience.

Level	Positions	Promotions	Turnover Ratio
Executives	12	35	2.9
Captains	24	49	2.0
Lieutenants	92	115	1.3
Sergeants	350	299	0.9
Investigators	255	221	0.9
Corporals	250	319	1.3

Anticipated Impact

Developing a baseline against which leadership can evaluate the performance of their subordinates, as well as a more comprehensive goals and mentoring program will serve to increase retention, morale, officer welfare, and job satisfaction.

A RSO wide mentoring program will serve as a guide for junior officers who are unsure about their path toward success. Mentors will gain a personal sense of reward for the development of their protégé, a affirmation of RSO policies, procedures and tactics, a new vantage point on policing through contemporary policing practices, an ability to develop their legacy within the organization, and a sense of creativity through the fusion of various perspectives

Through the mentorship program, mentees will develop a path toward success as they will have the monitoring and guidance of a veteran officer to help avoid pitfalls, gain assistance on goal setting and charting their career growth, practice communicating and understanding senior leadership which will generate more fluid communication throughout RSO, and gain a sense of self confidence as they will continue to feel respected within the organization.

The proper identification of succession of command will allow the RSO to recognize who is next in line to fill senior executive positions, to develop an actionable process in place to selection senior leadership, reduce risk, and find the best successors. While succession is fundamentally a preparation exercise for the future and will serve to reduce downside risk, it will also produce value to the organization on an immediate basis. This is due to the fact that it will serve to motivate officers that are nearing senior leadership levels. Once they view a more lucid path toward career growth, there will be added incentives to continue to produce at a high standard.

Finally, a more standardized performance management system will allow leadership to hold their reporting agencies and personnel more accountable for their performance against RSO standards. This will process go hand-in-hand with the mentorship program and the succession of command planning. Each program will produce long term savings benefits as they will serve to retain officers, generate a more cohesive organization, and drive operational proficiency and effectiveness.

RSO-12	Accelerate Early Intervention System enhancement efforts				
	Savings	2	Efficiency	2	Effectiveness

Overview

Building upon current RSO efforts, it is recommended that RSO enhance risk management practices by accelerating the planned Early Intervention System (EIS) efforts underway within the Professional Standards Bureau (PSB). Additionally, it is recommended that RSO continue to be included in the liability insurance payout discussions as early in the process as appropriate.

Observation and Analysis

RSO should build upon current evidence-based training practices (detailed below) that serve to educate personnel of the use of force, mental health, and de-escalation of force issues. Additionally, RSO should implement an automated EIS capability to help identify and address employee patterns of behavior that may require targeted training and intervention.

Crisis intervention training (CIT)	Classified supervisory leadership development	Driver awareness / EVOC update	Identifying & countering of lone wolf attackers	History of the dept. And culture/ethics	Self-defense for non-sworn personnel
"Kelly Thomas" incident – mental health	Immigration guidelines	Defensive tactics instructor	Leadership development for lieutenants	Tribal law enforcement based training	Drug abuse recognition
Tactical options course	Officer involved peer counseling	Ground defense for law enforcement	Inmate radicalization & awareness	Explosives recognition	Tactical communications
Autism awareness and interactions	Dispatch assess suicidal caller	Background investigations	Search warrant basic and advanced	Force encounters	Sworn supervisory leadership
De-escalation training	Dispatch communications training officer	Behavioral threat assessment	Tactical response to school and community violence	Less lethal munitions – "occupy" and other national movements	Tribal awareness
Emotional survival	Dispatch domestic violence & sexual assault	Family readiness	Traffic collision investigations basic – recon	Crime scene investigation (CSI)	Use of force and documentation
Stress based training	Dispatch handling the rising tide of suicide	Child abuse sexual assault	Vehicle theft investigations	Supervisory leadership training	Excited delirium training
Crowd control management	Dispatch interpersonal skills & career survival	Civil procedures advanced	Leadership and accountability	Dispatcher public safety – advanced / basic / update	Mental health crisis intervention training for corrections
"Occupy movement" incidents	Dispatcher crisis negotiations	Taser training	Tools for tolerance for command staff	Dispatcher role critical incidents – advanced	Leadership enhancement for corrections

Another point of issue that increases the risk of the current EIS is that RSO may not be included in the payout discussions as early in the process as may be beneficial. Not only is a RSO vested partner in the outcome, but they represent subject matter experts who can provide additional details and background when necessary in order to help ensure a sound, timely, and fair process is in place to resolve current and future matters of risk and liability.

Anticipated Impact

An enhanced EIS capability can help RSO improve its identification of behavioral variances in employee behavior and thereby strategically target its training, accountability, and other field-based interventions at the appropriate time to mitigate an escalating pattern of potential risk and ultimately liability to the County or injury to RSO employees. This must also be done in concert with county-wide recommendations and appreciation of legal and environmental factors outside of the County's control and/or influence.

Contract Law Enforcement Overview

RSO provides municipal law enforcement services by contract with 17 cities, 1 tribe, and several school districts in Riverside County. RSO, among other southern California county Sheriff's Offices, is broadly regarded on the national stage as a pioneer in the contract law enforcement discipline. For RSO, there are several statutory and policy parameters that guide the allocation of costs to law enforcement services that are provided to contract cities as summarized below.

- **Board Policy B-3 – Contract Services to Cities:** This policy describes the process to establish a contract with the city council of an incorporated city, implements an annual review of contract rates by the County Auditor-Controller, and outlines the process to reduce positions upon termination of a contract revenue source.
- **Board Policy B-4 – Rates Charged for Current Services:** This policy requires County departments/offices to recover "actual cost" of providing services to other public agencies, such as contract cities. Also stated is that the Board "may direct County departments to reduce operating costs in order to reduce charges to users."
- **Government Code Sec. 51350:** This section of the California Government Code limits recovery of costs incurred in providing services to contract cities by way of excluding (1) services made available to all portions of the County as determined by resolution of the Board (i.e. "Baseline" services), and (2) services which are general overhead costs of operation that the County would incur regardless of whether or not it provided services to contract cities (i.e. "General Overhead" functions).

Government Code Section 51350

"A county which provides services through its appropriate departments, boards, commissions, officers or employees, to any city pursuant to contract or as authorized by law, shall charge the city all those costs which are incurred in providing the services so contracted or authorized.

A county shall not charge a city contracting for a particular service, either as a direct or an indirect overhead charge, any portion of those costs which are attributable to services made available to all portions of the county, as determined by resolution of the board of supervisors, or which are general overhead costs of operation of the county government.


General overhead costs, for the purpose of this section, are those costs which a county would incur regardless of whether or not it provided a service under contract to a city. Any determination of general overhead costs shall be subject to court review as to the reasonableness of such determination. This section does not apply to a contract or agreement in effect on December 31, 1983, made by a county."

Counties across California such as Orange, Sacramento, and Los Angeles have adopted Board resolutions to clarify the scope of "Baseline" services that are provided to all portions of the County, whether contract cities, non-contract cities, or unincorporated areas. While each County varies in specific definitions, "Baseline" services commonly include Search/Rescue, Special Enforcement Units, Special Investigation Units, Drug/Gang Task Forces, Hazardous Devices, Aviation Operations, Forensic Services, and others. A definition of "General Overhead" services is less well established, as Counties inconsistently include or exclude recovery of costs related to Sheriff's Executive Team, Station/Division Commanders, Training Programs, Crime Analysis, and function of the Jails, Courts, Coroner, Public Administrator, and other general functions.

- **Cal OES Law Enforcement Mutual Aid System:** Relevant to the discussion of "Baseline" services is acknowledgement that RSO is a critical component of the mutual aid system maintained by the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) Law Enforcement Branch. The Cal OES Law Enforcement Mutual Aid System operates under the authority of Government Code Sections 8550, 8569, 8615, and 8668, as well as the California Emergency Plan and Master Mutual Aid Agreement.

The Sheriff of Riverside County serves as the Operational Area Law Enforcement Coordinator for the County, and all political subdivisions within it, to coordinate response resources to States of Emergency, Local Emergencies, Unusual Occurrences, and Day-to-Day Mutual Aid for circumstances beyond the control of local law enforcement resources. Per Government Code Section 26602, the Sheriff is responsible to provide assistance and coordination to control the problem in the role of Operational Area Mutual Aid Coordinator.

Currently there are 17 contract cities for which RSO provides municipal law enforcement services as depicted below. RSO also provides law enforcement services to the Morongo band of Mission Indians, Riverside University Hospital System, March JPA and several school districts across the County. RSO also provides Mutual Aid System support as requested to the 12 non-contract "allied" cities across Riverside County, including the California Highway Patrol and adjacent Counties.



Contract Rate Model Methodology

RSO has developed the Law Enforcement Contract Rate Development Methodology ("Legend") that encompasses calculation, distribution, accumulation, output, and approval of contract rates. It should be noted that there is no set industry standard cost allocation methodology, as Counties in California and across the U.S. each utilize different approaches to calculate direct and indirect costs. Notwithstanding this fact, the RSO Legend methodology is in line with the general industry spectrum of law enforcement cost allocation practices. Key Legend components include:


- **Cost Objectives:** Patrol officer "supported" productive service hours (1780 hours per year per officer) are the primary cost object to which all direct and indirect costs are allocated to contract cities. Patrol officers include both Sheriff's Deputy and Sheriff's Corporal positions, and are largely "undedicated" to a particular contract but can be "dedicated" in certain circumstances agreed by RSO and the contract city partner. There were a combined 839.4 "supported" positions representing nearly 1.5 million service hours in the FY14/15 Legend.
 - **Unsupported Rates:** A secondary cost objective comprises the "unsupported" service hours for those positions requested by a contract city partner to be "dedicated" to their contract for special assignment purposes like Task Forces, School Resource Officers, or Special Enforcement Teams. There were 180.4 "unsupported" positions offered by RSO at either a "productive" (i.e. 1780 hours) or "compensated" (i.e. 2080 hours) hourly rate that includes an allocation of direct and indirect costs that varies from the "supported" rate per hour.
- **Cost Drivers:** Cost drivers used to allocate cost pools to both "supported" and "unsupported" cost objects are primarily based on the percentage of "included positions" to associate Class 1 (Salaries & Employee Benefits) and Class 2 (Supplies & Services) costs on a pro-rata FTE basis. Primary and other cost drivers include:
 - **Primary Cost Driver:** The primary driver that allocates Class 1, Class 2, and COWCAP cost pools to cost objects is the percentage of "included positions" that are classified as Direct Patrol, Direct Support, and Indirect Support. Positions are classified on a position-by-position basis annually with the Commanding Officer of each applicable Station or Bureau included in the Legend. Cost drivers are calculated differently by the Legend for "supported" and "unsupported" rate calculations, with fewer cost pools allocated to "unsupported" positions as well.
- **Cost Pools:** The major categories of cost included in the Legend are described further on the following pages and comprise Direct Patrol, Direct Support, and Indirect Support functions. The Legend also captures Excluded Positions that are not included in the contract rate as they are considered "Baseline," "General Overhead," or "Grant-Supported" as discussed in the section below.

- **Additional Cost Elements:** Certain cost pools are allocated outside of the Legend process using other applicable cost drivers. For example, Field Training costs are allocated based on the average attrition over the trailing 3-year period. Other cost drivers include vehicle-mileage for vehicle operating and maintenance costs, chargeable positions for facility costs, and other drivers for Records Management System (RMS), CAL-ID, and Booking Fee components. Note that the following pages are focused on the primary cost drivers for "supported" and "unsupported" positions.

Contract Rate Model Components

The RSO Legend process takes a comprehensive view of systemic costs in the Field Operations division in arriving at a determination on the fully-allocated hourly rates for "supported" positions applicable to a given contract city partner. Major components of "supported" hourly rates include:

- **Direct Patrol Costs:** This component comprises 54% of the \$149.09 FY14/15 rate and includes 766.4 Deputy and 73.0 Corporal positions. As the largest rate component, labor cost increases have a large impact on the nominal rate.
- **Direct Support Costs:** This component comprises 33% of the \$149.09 FY14/15 rate and contains 26% sworn support for patrol supervision and investigative services as well as 7% for classified support for other station-based roles.
- **Indirect Support Costs:** This component comprises 13% of the \$149.09 FY14/15 rate and includes 220.6 positions that provide indirect support to patrol operations.



From a functional perspective, the following services are provided within each of the major cost components described above as part of the "supported" rate. Components for which a difference in cost allocation was noted between "supported" and "unsupported" hourly rate calculations are also noted on the following pages.

Component	Services Included
<p>Direct Patrol \$80.50</p>	<p>Patrol Officers: \$80.50 of the FY14/15 rate represents the direct patrol operations performed by 766.4 Deputy and 73.0 Corporal positions. Duties include response to calls for service, officer-initiated activities, and other proactive or administrative duties during routine patrol shifts. This rate includes a pro-rata allocation of other Class 1 and Class 2 costs, with the largest elements comprising \$4.59 million in PSEC costs, \$3.18 million in Liability Insurance charges (36% of the \$8.81 million FY13/14 RSO total premium), and \$2.23 million in Holiday Overtime costs.</p>
<p>Direct Support \$48.56</p>	<p>Sworn Support: \$38.35 of the FY14/15 rate represents the direct supervision and investigative services performed by 32.4 Lieutenant, 137.7 Sergeant, 6.9 Deputy, 124.8 Investigator positions. Investigative services include 101.8 station-based Investigators for general misdemeanor and felony follow-up investigations as well as 23.0 Investigators assigned to Central Homicide Unit for serious felony homicide cases. This component includes a pro-rata allocation of Class 2 costs, with the largest elements comprising \$1.71 million in Liability Insurance charges (13% of the \$8.81 million FY13/14 RSO total premium) and \$0.76 million in PSEC costs.</p> <p>Classified Support: \$10.21 of the FY14/15 rate represents 185.2 classified positions such as Community Service Officers (CSO), Station Service Officers (SSO), Office Assistants (OA), and other station-based support roles that are dedicated to supporting the delivery and administration of patrol operations. This component includes a pro-rata allocation of Class 2 costs, with the largest element comprising \$0.72 million in Liability Insurance charges (8% of the \$8.81 million FY13/14 RSO total premium).</p>


Component	Services Included
<p>Indirect Support \$20.03</p>	<p>Administration: \$1.20 of the FY14/15 rate represents 12.4 positions serving in the Professional Standards Bureau and other RSO Administration roles that support patrol operations. This component includes a pro-rata allocation of Class 2 costs of \$0.1 million. Not included in the "supported" rate are "General Overhead" functions of the Sheriff's Executive Team (i.e. Sheriff, Undersheriff, Assistant Sheriffs, Chief Deputy Sheriffs) and the Media Information Bureau.</p> <p>Personnel & Recruiting: \$1.22 of the FY14/15 rate represents 9.3 positions serving in the Personnel Bureau that support patrol operations. This component includes a pro-rata allocation of Class 2 costs of \$0.7 million. Not included in the "supported" rate are "General Overhead" functions of the Bureau that support other RSO Divisions, such as Corrections, Courts, or Coroner, among other non-patrol functions.</p> <p>Information Services: \$1.21 of the FY14/15 rate represents 24.3 positions serving in the Information Services Bureau that support projects benefiting patrol operations. This component includes a pro-rata allocation of Class 2 costs of \$0.1 million. Not included in the "supported" rate are "General Overhead" functions of the Bureau that support projects for other RSO Divisions.</p> <p>Central Dispatch: \$10.67 of the FY14/15 rate represents 143.5 positions serving in the Central Dispatch that support centralizing call-taking and radio dispatch to support patrol operations. This component includes a pro-rata allocation of Class 1 and Class 2 costs of \$2.1 million and \$1.2 million respectively. Not included in the "supported" rate are "General Overhead" functions of Central Dispatch that support assistance to other departments.</p> <p>Accounting & Finance: \$0.82 of the FY14/15 rate represents 15.1 positions serving in the Accounting & Finance section that support patrol operations. This component includes a pro-rata allocation of Class 2 costs of \$0.1 million. Not included in the "supported" rate are "General Overhead" functions of the section that support other RSO Divisions, such as Corrections, Courts, or Coroner, among other non-patrol functions.</p> <p>Technical Services: \$0.95 of the FY14/15 rate represents 8.6 positions serving in the Technical Services Bureau that support patrol operations. This component includes a pro-rata allocation of Class 2 costs of \$0.3 million. Not included in the "supported" rate are "General Overhead" functions of the Bureau that support other RSO Divisions, such as Corrections, Courts, or Coroner, among other non-patrol functions.</p> <p>Contracts & Grants: \$0.38 of the FY14/15 rate represents 4.1 positions serving in the Contracts & Grants section that support patrol operations. Not included in the "supported" rate are "General Overhead" functions of the section that support other RSO Divisions, such as Corrections, Courts, or Coroner, among other non-patrol functions.</p> <p>Countywide Costs: \$1.65 of the FY14/15 rate represents a pro-rata allocation of COWCAP costs of \$2.5 million. The amount included in the "supported" rate are pro-rated to the proportion of RSO employees included in the Legend: 1,326.37 in Patrol and 204.90 in Support Services. COWCAP costs associated excluded positions (i.e. 467.63 in Patrol and 120.10 in Support Services) are considered as allocable to "General Overhead" components.</p> <p>Field Training Costs: \$1.30 of the FY14/15 rate represents the cost of a 16-week Field Training period applicable to 50.0 Patrol positions estimated to be replaced annually based on the previous 3-year actual attrition rates.</p> <p>Training Center: \$0.64 of the FY14/15 rate represents 3.3 positions serving at the Ben Clark Training Center in support of patrol operations, specifically for range qualification purposes. This component includes a pro-rata allocation of Class 2 costs of \$0.6 million.</p>

SHERIFF'S OFFICE: CONTRACT LAW ENFORCEMENT

In order to provide an understanding of how the "unsupported" and "supported" rate components compare, an example position of Sheriff's Deputy is utilized below given the high proportion of Deputy costs in both rate methodologies. Hourly rates have been calculated on a "productive" hourly rate basis assuming the 1,787 productive hours relevant to FY15/16.

Component	"Unsupported" Hourly Rate
Salary, Benefits, Other Comp	\$73.46
Supplies & Services	\$5.51
Administration	\$0.66
Personnel & Recruitment	\$0.51
Accounting & Finance	\$0.44
Countywide Costs	\$0.72
Total Costs per Hour	\$81.30

FY14/15 Legend Unsupported FTEs (Excluding Admin Positions)



■ CSO I/II ■ SD-SRO ■ SD-SET/TF ■ CPT/LT/SGT ■ Other (FT/SSO/OA)

When comparing the hourly rate components for the "unsupported" positions, a clearer understanding of the benefits afforded the "supported" positions is achievable. From an Indirect Support perspective, nearly \$15.14 more cost per hour is allocated to a "supported" position to provide support from Central Dispatch (\$10.67), Field Training (\$1.30), Information Services (\$1.21), Technical Services (\$0.95), Training Center (\$0.64), and Contracts & Grants (\$0.38).

Baseline Services & General Overhead Functions

The RSO Legend cost allocation process excludes those services and functions considered as "Baseline" or "General Overhead" as indicated in the table below. Other excluded positions include those that are "Grant-Supported" by Federal or State grants or "Dedicated/Unsupported" positions under contract with city partners.

Baseline Services*	<p>Special Enforcement: Includes Aviation, Special Weapons & Tactics (SWAT), Hazardous Device Team (HDT), Riverside Off-Road Vehicle Enforcement (ROVE), Crisis Negotiations Team (CNT), Felony Warrant Enforcement Team (FWET) units.</p> <p>Special Investigations: Includes components of Riverside Auto-Interdiction Detail (RAID), Computer & Technology Crime/High-Tech (CATCH), Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force units.</p> <p>Other Special Units: Sheriff's Emergency Response Team (SERT), including Mutual Aid Coordination for Search & Rescue and Disaster Recovery, Gang Task Forces, and Sexual Assault Felony Enforcement team units.</p> <p>Forensic Services: Includes Forensics East & West crime scene processing units.</p> <p>Crime Analysis: Includes central Crime Analysis Unit and any station-based Crime Analysts.</p>
General Overhead	<p>Sheriff's Administration: Includes the Sheriff, Undersheriff, Assistant Sheriffs, and Chief Deputy Sheriffs, along with Media Information Bureau operations, the Professional Standards Bureau Captain, and the Station Captains for 9 stations (Moreno Valley is a 90% "dedicated" position).</p> <p>Training Programs: Includes the Ben Clark Training Center non-range qualification staff as well as the Deputy Sheriff salary costs for the 24-week Basic Academy duration.</p> <p>Dispatch Center: Includes the Dispatch Captain and Telephone Reporting Unit (TRU).</p>

* Many Baseline services are both County and State/Federal grant funded, including portions of RAID, CATCH, GTFs, and other SIB and SEB resources.


RSO-13	Reaffirm service delivery alternatives and cost forecasting approach					
	Savings	2	Efficiency	2	Effectiveness	2

Overview

RSO should continue its current focus on structured quarterly Contract Cities Partner Meetings and continue to enhance communication efforts with targeted outreach to Contract Cities in need of more in-depth discussion and understanding of contract rate cost structures. In addition, RSO should continue to enhance those service delivery options available to help Contract Cities better balance scope and level of service with the costs thereof.

Observation and Analysis

RSO has an established practice of meeting with Contract Cities on a quarterly basis to cover a variety of topics, including updates on coming year cost increases as well as major projects such as RMS or PSEC. RSO should consider augmenting this quarterly cadence with further targeted outreach to those Contract Cities where more in-depth understanding of cost structures, cost forecasts, and service delivery options is needed to maintain a constructive provide-client relationship. This builds upon the current practice of offering targeted "roadshows" as was provided to 13 of 17 cities since 2013.



Historically RSO has provided conservative forecasts of contract rate cost increase, often projecting more than actual costs were retrospectively in 6 of 8 years. RSO should continue to work with Contract Cities to educate them on the forecasting process and explore longer-range forecasting horizons, as new labor MOUs are completed or major initiatives are planned. Lastly, due to current year and projected future increases in the rate, RSO should expand the discussion of service delivery alternatives with Contract Cities Partners to identify those entities willing to expand the scale and validation of alternatives such as:

- **Expanded Use of CSOs:** Many Contract Cities expressed the desire to explore expanded scope of utilization for CSO positions, to include high-visibility patrol and engagement, enhanced non-emergency call response and follow-up.
- **Expanded Use of TRU:** Many Contract Cities expressed the desire to explore expanded scope of utilization for TRU positions, to include enhanced non-emergency call response and follow-up as well as appointment-based responses.

Anticipated Impact

Enhanced communications and service delivery approaches can serve to aid RSO in enhancing current levels of customer satisfaction with Contract City Partners. In addition, service delivery alternatives may assist RSO and the Contract Cities in better balancing scope and level of services with the current cost thereof.

RSO-14	Propose a resolution for "baseline" and "general overhead" components				
	Savings	2	Efficiency	1	Effectiveness

Overview

RSO should initiate a discussion with the Board of Supervisors aimed at developing a proposed resolution that establishes a common understanding of "Baseline" services, "General Overhead" functions, and "Grant-Funded" and "Dedicated" positions that may or may not be included in future contract law enforcement rate discussions. An activity analysis of any services or functions under discussion should also be undertaken to better understand for what purpose costs are consumed as resources and assets are deployed.

Observation and Analysis

The following table describes those services that RSO currently considers "Baseline" services and "General Overhead" functions based on the cost components included in the Legend process. Before a Board resolution contemplated in Government Code 51350 is developed, RSO and the Board of Supervisors should have a discussion to understand both the operational and fiscal impacts of changing the current definition of the services and functions below.

Baseline Services*	<p>Special Enforcement: Includes Aviation, Special Weapons & Tactics (SWAT), Hazardous Device Team (HDT), Riverside Off-Road Vehicle Enforcement (ROVE), Crisis Negotiations Team (CNT), Felony Warrant Enforcement Team (FWET) units.</p> <p>Special Investigations: Includes components of Riverside Auto-Interdiction Detail (RAID), Computer & Technology Crime/High-Tech (CATCH), Anti-Human Trafficking Task Force units.</p> <p>Other Special Units: Sheriff's Emergency Response Team (SERT), including Mutual Aid Coordination for Search & Rescue and Disaster Recovery, Gang Task Forces, and Sexual Assault Felony Enforcement team units.</p> <p>Forensic Services: Includes Forensics East & West crime scene processing units.</p> <p>Crime Analysis: Includes central Crime Analysis Unit and any station-based Crime Analysts.</p>
General Overhead	<p>Sheriff's Administration: Includes the Sheriff, Undersheriff, Assistant Sheriffs, and Chief Deputy Sheriffs, along with Media Information Bureau operations, the Professional Standards Bureau Captain, and the Station Captains for 9 stations (Moreno Valley is a 90% "dedicated" position).</p> <p>Training Programs: Includes the Ben Clark Training Center non-range qualification staff as well as the Deputy Sheriff salary costs for the 24-week Basic Academy duration.</p> <p>Dispatch Center: Includes the Dispatch Captain and Telephone Reporting Unit (TRU).</p>

* Many Baseline services are both County and State/Federal grant funded, including portions of RAID, CATCH, GTFs, and other SIB and SEB resources.

While there is no consistent definition of "Baseline" or "General Overhead" across the State of California, several Counties have adopted such resolutions to clarify the fiscal responsibilities of the County against those of the Contract Cities.

Anticipated Impact

A clearer understanding of "Baseline" services and "General Overhead" functions will service to assist RSO in operational clarity as well as provide the Board with better understanding of fiscal impact. All potential paths of action must still allow for the Sheriff to exercise those duties mandated by the State of California Constitution and in his role as Operational Area Mutual Aid Coordinator.