[MS-0398.039.010.001]

THE CITY OF
SAN DIEGO

JOHN HARTLEY
Councilmember, Third District

Revised 5/20/91

DOWNTOWN COURT/JAIL COMPLEX COMMITTEE

FINAL DRAFT PROPOSAL

I

Introduction

The provision of a system justice is a fundamental responsibility of government and the criminal justice system are primarily a fun e government. The County is the entity that imple ions at the local level; however, San Diego C a crisis in providing adequate facilities esponsibility.

The Downtown C nder the leadership of Councilm on on the need for adequate cou commendations for addressing th n atmosphere of support for th

The intent of thi ussions and to bring into focus t. issues that have not been resolved.

The group has consider e been made to date. It has discussed the fol. the monetary aspects of several proposals, inclu uction costs; the location and design of a court complex ds of constituents involved; and the location of jail facili s.

There is agreement that the court complex should remain in downtown San Diego. This report considers the major issues, recommends solutions, and explains the reasons for those recommendations.

THE CITY OF
SAN DIEGO

JOHN HARTLEY
Councilmember, Third District

Revised 5/20/91

DOWNTOWN COURT/JAIL COMPLEX COMMITTEE

FINAL DRAFT PROPOSAL

I

Introduction

The provision of a system of justice is a fundamental responsibility of government. Court and the criminal justice system are primarily a function of State government. The County is the entity that implements State functions at the local level; however, San Diego County is faced with a crisis in providing adequate facilities for carrying out this responsibility.

The Downtown Court/Jail Complex came together under the leadership of Councilmember John Hartley to focus attention on the need for adequate court and jail facilities, to provide recommendations for addressing these critical needs, and to create an atmosphere of support for those recommendations.

The intent of this report is to synthesize our discussions and to bring into focus the areas of consensus and the issues that have not been resolved.

The group has considered studies that have been made to date. It has discussed the following matters: the monetary aspects of several proposals, including construction costs; the location and design of a court complex the needs of constituents involved; and the location of jail facilities.

There is agreement that the court complex should remain in downtown San Diego. This report considers the major issues, recommends solutions, and explains the reasons for those recommendations.

CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • 202 "C" STREET • SAN DIEGO • CALIFORNIA 92101 • (619) 236-6633
Printed on recycled paper

II

Courthouse

A. Recommendation: Build a new court complex downtown.

B. Comments: The court complex should include facilities for the Superior and Municipal Courts adequate through the year 2020, space for supporting facilities, and provisions for the District Attorney, Public Defender, and the County Law Library.

C. Rationale:

1. The existing building is functionally obsolete. Renovation would not meet existing or projected needs, nor would revocation be cost effective.

2. A downtown location is critical to the economic viability of the downtown area, allows the utilization of existing County and City land, and provides desirable proximity to the seat of County and City government, the Federal courts, and the State appellate court.

3. The court complex should be designed to provide for both the immediate and the long term needs of the County.

4. The inclusion within the complex of the supporting facilities, the District Attorney's office, the Public Defender's office, and County Law Library would be a cost effective combination of uses, and would facilitate operational efficiency.

III

Jail

A. Recommendation: Build a jail downtown in conjunction with the court complex adequate to provide holding facilities for felony prisoners actively involved in court proceedings, adequate through the year 2020. The jail should also be designed for booking and detaining misdemeanants until release or transfer to another facility.

B. Comments: The desirability and feasibility of expanding this jail facility to include facilities for misdemeanor bookings as well as a facility for sentenced prisoners needs further study.

C. Rationale:

1. Efficient and economic transportation of prisoners to and from the courts requires that the facilities be part of the same complex.

2. A Housing facility for sentenced prisoners should not be included in the complex. All alternative sites for this facility should be studied encompassing economic, environmental, judicial, and public concerns.

3. The jail should be designed to provide for both the immediate and long term needs of the County.

IV

Financing of Construction

A. Recommendation: Ensure the necessary funding is in place to construct new downtown court complex and needed jail facilities.

B. Comments:

1. Proposition A, if allowed to fund, should raise the required money to construct the new court complex and jail facilities.

2. In the event of failure of Proposition A, the following should be in place:

   a. Strategy for new campaign ballot issue;

   b. All alternative sources for funding identified and prioritized.

3. Maximize use of all alternative sources.

4. The complexity and scope of building a new court complex and jail facilities requires delineating a Master Plan that will be agreed upon by all concerned parties.

C. Rationale:

1. The need for a new court complex and jail facilities was recognized as a high priority in 1988, which is why Proposition A was approved.

2. In the two years since the passage of Proposition A, the need for new facilities has intensified. If proposition A fails, it is likely that a new ballot measure will be needed. Due to the amount of funding, alternative sources most probably would fall short.

3. There currently is no concurrence on what the costs will be to build a new downtown court complex and the required jail facilities. It appears that further study will be <u>necessary</u> to determine what will be the costs.

V

Financing of Operation

A. Recommendation: Ensure short and continued long term funding necessary for effective and efficient operation of all the justice facilities.

B. Comment:

1. Although a percentage of Proposition A funds will be allowed to be used for operation, it will fall short of what is necessary not only now but in the future.

2. A long term funding plan that identifies essential revenues needed should be in place.

3. All potential funding sources specific to funding operations should be identified, explored and prioritized. Community acceptability must be given utmost consideration in the prioritization.

4. A campaign needs to be developed to raise funds for efficient operation of the courts and jails.

C. Rationale:

1. Funding the operations of the courts and all justice facilities is critical. Current funding and even anticipated money from Proposition A is insufficient to operate these facilities effectively.

2. The public needs to be educated as to the monetary shortfall both in the near and long term. The direction and focus should be on a strategic educational campaign for public awareness combined with a campaign to raise money.

VI

Educational Campaign

A. Recommendation:

1. A campaign needs to be developed to increase public support and raise funds for operation of the courts and jail facilities.

2. The County and CIty have many priorities. For this project to get the votes needed for its funding, members of both the Board of Supervisors and City Council must start hearing from influential constituents that this project is important to them and to the entire community.

B. Comment:

1. Because Proposition A funds will fall short of what is needed, particularly for operation facilities, public support of our program is critical.

C. Rationale:

1. The public is unaware of the enormous cost of operating facilities that might be built with Proposition A funds.

2. A steering committee could design an effective educational campaign, featuring:

   - Engagement of a public relations consultant.
   - Polling to assess goals and techniques.
   - Development of presentations, research data and a speakers' bureau.
   - Organization of a committee.
   - Organization of a newsletter.
   - Fundraising.

DOWNTOWN COURT/JAIL COMPLEX COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Wayne Raffesberger, Co-Chair
Executive Director, San Diegans, Inc.

Peter Shenas, Esq. Co-Chair
Shenas, Shaw and Spievak

Howard Wayne, Co-Chair
Deputy Attorney General

Judge Art Jones
Superior Court

Judge Wayne Peterson
Superior Court

Craig Higgs, Esq.
Higgs, Fletcher, Mack

Pat McGovern, Esq

George Andreos, Esq
Pres, County Bar Assoc.

Paul Desrochers
Centre City Development Corp.

Steve Toohill, Esq.
Luce, Forward, Hamilton and Scripps

James Lorenz, Esq.
Lorenz, Alhadeff,Lundin & Oggel

Bill Nelson, Esq.

Ken Martone
Executive Officer,
Superior Ct.

Paul Morely, Esq.
Deputy District Attorney

Ray Blair
San Diego Taxpayer's Assoc.

Paul Meyer, Esq.
Latham & Watkins

Greg Kane, Esq.
Shifflet, Walters, Bailey & Kane

Donna Nenow
Stoorza, Ziegus, Metzger
Public Relations

Steve Travers
Special Projects Unit
Municipal Court

Pat Sweeten
Assistant Executive Officer
Superior Court

Frank Panarisi
Construction Industry Federation

Patricia Tennyson
Chief of Staff
Councilman Tom Behr

Rich Robinson
Special Projects Director
County of San Diego

Sandra Carter
Assistant Executive Director
Municipal Court

Caryl Iseman
Council Representative
Councilman John Hartley

THE CITY OF
SAN DIEGO

JOHN HARTLEY
Councilmember, Third District

COMMITTEES

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Speaker's Bureau
Education/Outreach

This committee will be the communication arm for the Downtown Court/Jail committee. This committee will generate the material that will be used to educate the public. Coordinate outreach to all concerned interests.

PUBLIC FINANCE

Proposition A
Proposition 86
Alternative Financing

This committee will focus on all potential financing for construction and operation of the courts and jails.

LIAISON

This committee will interact with all concerned parties and agencies such as CCDC, all the Bar Associations, Sheriff, SDPD. County Board of Supervisors, San Diegans, Inc., CCA, BIA, etc.

FUNDRAISING

This committee would focus on raising money for the functions of the full committee. For any educational brochures, flyers, outreach programs, etc.

FISCAL ANALYSIS
(R&D)

This committee will review proposed development and operational costs, research what other cities and counties have developed for justice facilities and the costs of same, and architectural designs.
CPA's and architects would be most helpful for this committee.

CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • 202 "C" STREET • SAN DIEGO • CALIFORNIA 92101 • (619) 236-6633
Printed on recycled paper