



SACRAMENTO COUNTY  
JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION

**LAW ENFORCEMENT FACILITY INSPECTION**

Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Section 209(b) and Section 229<sup>1</sup>

2017

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Safety Center/Hall of Justice | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> William J. Kinney Facility |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Joseph E. Rooney Facility            | <input type="checkbox"/> Galt Police Department                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Folsom Police Department             | <input type="checkbox"/> Cal Expo                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Citrus Heights                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____                           |

Date of Inspection: March 1, 2018

Commander/Facility Manager: Cpt. Pamela Seyffert  
Lt. Steve Hansen  
Nancy Boemer

Address: 3350 Marysville Blvd., Sacramento CA 95827

Phone: 916-808-2423

E-mail: NBoemer@pd.cityofsacramento.org

**INSPECTION OUTCOMES**

- X- No Follow-Up Required       Follow-Up Required
- Sheriff or Police Chief Notified of Deficiencies

**Comments –**

The William Kinney substation of the Sacramento Police Department is a ‘closed-to-the-public’ facility in the Del Paso Heights-Hagginwood area of Sacramento. The premises are well maintained as most of the actual law enforcement business and access to the building is gained and conducted through the facility’s rear entrance and main parking lot in the rear of the building.

Administrative Analyst Nancy Boemer and deputy station commander Lt Steve Hansen were available and represented Sacramento Police Department and answered all questions as per the Sacramento County Juvenile Justice Commission inspection form. It should be noted that there has been a dramatic administrative turn around in this facility. The commander and top deputy commander and the facility manager/administrative analyst are all new to the facility’s management team. Given the routine bureaucratic/logistic administration involved in managing a facility, the process was reasonably

<sup>1</sup>Section 209(b) of the WIC states: A judge of the juvenile court shall conduct an annual inspection, either in person or through a delegated member of the appropriate county or regional juvenile justice commission, of any law enforcement facility, which contains a lockup for adults which in the preceding year was used for the secure detention of any minor. Section 229 of the WIC states: A juvenile justice commission shall annually inspect any jail or lockup within the county, which in the preceding calendar year was used for confinement for more than 24 hours of any minor.

described. It should be noted however, that specifics of juvenile processing, likewise as has been observed at other Sacramento Police Department locations, is not a priority.

As was noticed in previous inspections, there seemed to be very little activity going on in the building as very few personnel seemed to be on site. As described, whenever juveniles were brought into the facility, they would enter from the rear parking lot area, through the backdoor, to an area several feet from the door, where posted Standard Operating Procedures for juveniles, as well as the necessary custody forms are posted, obvious, and available. Given this availability, there should be very few issues or concerns with the very few juveniles who are brought to this facility.

The detention rooms were clean, austere, but functional. Observation cameras are linked to the facility computer network and are hidden in various 'hiding-in-plain-sight' locations in each room so that any juvenile in custody can be monitored by any officer, from any computer, laptop, or cellphone. Closed circuit television and camera links to video-tape machines that were 'high-tech' and expensive not that long ago are now burdensome. What must be commented on, however, is that this convenience has led to what may be the unintended consequence of officer inattention that has been an historical issue with past JJC inspections. Specifically, when an officer brings in a juvenile for custody, the juvenile is supposed to be looked in on every 30 minutes. Admittedly, in some cases, this could be seen as obsessive, but it is a regulation nonetheless. Previous inspections, as did the current one, noticed that on random forms, the same officer appeared to sit down and note progressive 30 minute time segments using the same penmanship stroke, same pen, at seemingly the same time. It is believed that an officer simply sat down and jotted the specified time to match the appropriate time spans because s/he understood this was necessary to match the duration of the custody but did not likely conduct those checks. Actual checks were not conducted. The JJC has voiced this concern in the past and even met with a past chief and his captains in 2017 to highlight and discuss the problem. This meeting led to assurances that our notice was appreciated and would be taken seriously. To our surprise and pleasure, a new form had been created with clearer instructions outlined and was in place last (2017) year, at least at the Freeport station. However, during this inspection cycle, at this facility, the previous (pre 2017) form was being utilized. The JJC's admonishment led to a possible one-year change in process and bookkeeping at one station. Further departmental training will now be requested. The inspection team acknowledges that with the few cases that are processed at this facility, this is a short-coming in procedure not a deficiency. It is noted however, that as annoying as this may be to the officers charged with completing this task, our criticism is appropriate. A reminder to use proper procedure and record appropriate information on forms that will later be examined, to officers who bring juveniles into custody is recommended. This is disappointing as last year's inspection noted the stellar accounting found at Kinney.

It should be noted that the Bureau of State and Community Corrections had made their inspection in December 2017 (only 3 months before this inspection), so the paperwork problem should not have been a concern.

In summary, during the calendar year 2017, it was reported that the Kinney substation processed 12 juveniles total, but only 11 logs could be found. Four months (August, September, October, and November) had no juvenile activity. The youngest was a 9 year old female, who was held for 30 minutes 245pc (Assault with a Deadly Weapon). The oldest were 3 17 year olds. The most frequently reported violations was 211pc (n=4, Robbery), next was 288pc (n=3, Lewd or Lascivious Act), two 245pc, one 148pc (Obstruction of a Police Officer), and one 25400pc (Carrying a Concealed Weapon). The 9 year old was the only female to be held in custody. It should be noted that these 12 contacts was a

serious drop from last year's 24, however is much more line with recent trends. Last year's number in this context was a distinct outlier.

Aside from the reversion back to unfortunate bookkeeping habits, Kinney is a laudable site.

**Date Report Submitted:**



Dan Okada, Commissioner, Team Leader



Sandra Waterhouse, Commissioner

## I. INTERVIEW WITH COMMANDER/FACILITY DIRECTOR

<b>1. Date of Last JJDPC Inspection:</b>	August 24, 2016
<b>2. Date of Last Corrections Standards Authority Inspection: Discuss findings (if appropriate):</b>	December 5, 2017
<b>3. Total number of juveniles securely detained during the past 12 months:</b> <b>Total: 12    Boys: 10    Girls: 1</b> (BSCC report 12 juveniles held; only 11 reports found)	
<b>4. Average age or age range of detained juveniles:</b>	9-17yo / 13.3 yrs
<b>5. Purpose(s) of detention:</b> 211pc (Robbery); 245pc (Assault w/Deadly Weapon); 288pc (Lewd and Lascivious Conduct); 148pc (Obstruction of Police Officer); 24500pc (Carrying Concealed Weapon)	
<b>6. Average length of time detained:</b> 1 case reported INR with no release time reported	1.9 hours
<b>7. Longest time a juvenile was held in secure detention:</b>	4.5 hours
<b>8. Number of juveniles securely detained for more than 6 hours:</b>	None
<b>9. Do you maintain locked files on all juveniles?</b> -X- Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<b>10. Do you maintain an in/out log for all juveniles held in secure detention?</b> -X- Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<b>11. Describe supervision style -</b> a. 24-hour supervision    -X- Y <input type="checkbox"/> N b. constant or <u>intermittent</u> (circle/underline one) c. observed in person, <u>by camera</u> or other? (circle/underline one)	
<b>12. What is the staff to juvenile ratio (if applicable)?</b> N/A	
<b>13. Request to see a copy of the facility's rules and/or discipline procedures for juveniles. Would a grievance procedure be appropriate for this facility?</b> -X- Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<b>14. Where appropriate, over the past 12 months document the number of :</b> a. incidents of discipline:            0 b. attempted suicides:                0 c. suicides:                                0 d. deaths from other causes:        0	
<b>15. Is any programming provided to detained juveniles (e.g., recreation, education, counseling, etc.)?</b> N/A	
<b>16. Where is food prepared and how is it delivered?</b> Snacks available / fast food close by if needed	

**17. Transportation - a. Do you transport juveniles from this facility?** -X- Y  N  
**b. Destination(s):** Sacramento County Youth Detention Facility  
**c. Please describe methods and procedures:** Transportation on a case-by-case basis in patrol car

**18. Staff Training -**  
**a. Is there a Staff Procedure Manual for handling juveniles on the premises?** Yes  
**b. Does all staff receive training in how to handle securely detained juveniles?**-X- Y   
N  
**How frequently and by whom is staff trained?** POST Certification; on-site review; roll-call bulletins; department memoranda

