

Juvenile Justice Commission
of San Diego County

Jails and Lockups 2022 Inspection Report

2021 Yearly Statistics (from Log Books)

0 # **Secure** detentions **OVER** 6 hours
0 # **Secure** detentions **UNDER** 6 hours
0 # **Non-secure** detentions **OVER** 6 hours
62 # **Non-secure** detentions **UNDER** 6 hours

Authority: Pursuant to Welfare & Institutions Code Section 209(b), 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 that contains a lockup for adults which, in the preceding year, was used for the secure detention of any minor.

Please respond to sections that apply to the facility you are inspecting (type or print clearly)

Facility Name: SDPD – Mid-City Division Date of Inspection: 10/19/2022
Address: 4310 Landis Street Date of Last Inspection: 9/29/2021
San Diego, CA 92105 Phone Number: 619-516-3000

Facility Manager: Capt. William Griffin Contact Person: Amy Buell
Phone No.: 619-516-3000 Phone No.: 619-516-3022
Staff Assisting: _____ E-mail: abuell@pd.sandiego.gov
Phone No.: _____ Alt. Contact: _____

Presiding Juvenile Court Judge: Hon. Ana España
Commission Chair: Yvette D. Klepin
Phone No.: 858-634-1555
Inspecting Commissioners: Ed Weiner and Darwin Fishman

I. GENERAL COMMENTS:

The two Juvenile Service Officers were only 2-months on the task of keeping the logs and did not have much experience and could not give much insight into how decisions were made to release to parents, take to Juvenile Hall or East Mesa, transport to Polinsky Children’s Center or to Rady Hospital except to rely on the arresting or detaining officer.

When discussion focused on diversion programs, the officers related that some juveniles were able to have diversion services provided by San Diego Youth Services. Only when the supervising sergeant joined the group at the end of the inspection was there a better discussion of the District Attorney’s diversion program and the way the National Conflict Resolution Center’s process of sometimes bringing both victims and family members of juveniles into the process.

There was some discussion of whether there could be an immediate diversion at the discretion of an officer and the answer was that there would be an “arrest” record of every juvenile and that the Police Department’s “contact sheet” is treated the same as an arrest record. When asked about whether Mid-City had its own diversion program (as recommended in last year’s JJC report) the discussion referred to the San Diego Youth Services program. It was pointed out that other police agencies had their own diversion programs held at the station (indicating a program at the Southeastern Division of the San Diego Police Department that the JJC knew about from a prior inspection there), the officers had no response.

II. **RECOMMENDATIONS** *(if any)*:

1. The Juvenile Justice Commission recommends that juvenile officers in charge of preparing summary logs to be sent to Sacramento should have at least one year of experience or be trained under the supervision of a “mentor” officer for at least one year. One example of a log entry was “release to East Mesa Re-entry Program” which we could not determine whether it was a juvenile facility or just a mistake in the computer entry.
2. The Juvenile Justice Commission recommends the SDPD develop their own diversion program to offer more diversion opportunities to youth detained/arrested.

The following questions are used to assess compliance with the state standards governing law enforcement facilities in which minors are held in temporary custody. See Article 9, *Minors in Temporary Custody in a Law Enforcement Facility*, Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations (15 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 1140–1151)

III. CONDITIONS OF DETENTION:

- A. Are minors provided with orientation? Yes No
- B. Are they informed of the purpose of detention? Yes No
- C. Are they told the length of time detention is expected to last? Yes No
- D. Are they informed of the six-hour maximum time limit? Yes No

IV. CONDITIONS OF SECURE DETENTION (e.g. cell/locked room):

- A. What is the proximity of minors to adult inmates?
Adults are separated in other cells or juveniles are taken to a conference room.
- B. What is the ability and frequency of staff to supervise minor?
100% of the time
- C. Is there constant auditory access to staff? Yes No
- D. Are minors provided with a snack if requested? Yes No
- E. Do minors have access to toilets and washing facilities? Yes No
- F. Do minors have access to a drinking fountain or water? Yes No
- G. Are there provisions to provide clothing or blankets to assure comfort? Yes No

V. CONDITIONS OF SECURE DETENTION OUTSIDE A LOCKED ENCLOSURE:

(this includes minors who are handcuffed to a fixed object such as a rail, bench, chair or table):

- A. Are minors assured no “contact” with adult inmates? Yes No
- B. Is there constant supervision? Yes No
- C. Is there a 30-minute limit and Watch Commander approval every 30 minutes thereafter?
Under constant supervision.
- D. Are minors placed in cell when one becomes available?
Has not been an issue.
- E. Do minors have access to toilet and washing facilities? Yes No
- F. Is there access to a drinking fountain? Yes No

VI. CONDITIONS OF NON-SECURE DETENTION:

- A. Is there direct and constant supervision by staff during the entire custody period? Yes No
- B. Are males and females put in same room? Yes No

VII. INTOXICATED MINORS:

- A. Does the facility have written procedures for the handling of minors under the influence of any intoxicating substances? Yes No
- B. Did the facility detain any minors, either secure or non-secure, determined to be under the influence of an intoxicating substance? Yes No

If yes:

1. Was medical clearance obtained? Yes No
2. Were these detentions documented? Yes No
3. If the detention was secure, were there documented safety checks no less than once every 15 minutes? Yes No
4. If the detention was non-secure, was the minor in the constant presence of staff? Yes No
5. Who provides medical clearance for these minors?

The officers had no personal knowledge of whether any minors were taken to Rady Children's Hospital because of intoxicating substances

VIII. DOCUMENTATION:

- A. Are all mandated visual checks documented? **Not noticed on logs.** Yes No
- B. Are secure/non-secure detention logs used? Yes No
- C. Do the detention logs list the offense and reason which formed the decision to place the minor in secure detention, as well as the length of time the minor was securely detained? Yes No
- D. Does the facility have signage posted explaining the procedures for the handling of secure / non-secure detention of minors? Yes No

IX. ARE THERE INSTANCES IN WHICH A MINOR(S) WAS HELD FOR MORE THAN SIX HOURS? IF YES, LIST THE DATES, STARTING AND ENDING TIME AND CIRCUMSTANCES FOR EACH INSTANCE.

N/A

X. Minors Interviewed (Comments):

No minors were present at the time of inspection.