

**2017-2018 Grand Jury Report**  
**RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT**  
**Response to Specific Findings and Recommendations**  
**August 20, 2018**

**GRAND JURY FINDINGS:**

**Grand Jury Finding # 1:**

**Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment Form**

The *Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment* form lacks pertinent medical questions for clinical staff to determine medical concerns of the inmate/detainee screened for booking. The title of the form indicates that a medical history will be assessed. However, the form only addresses five medical issues: exposure to a contagious disease, current drug use and type, and withdrawal symptoms, suicidal ideations and if the inmate/detainee is transgender. There are no other comprehensive medical questions on the form pertaining to the health of the individual that identify any concerns clinical staff should be aware of during the inmate's stay

The form contains a "Statement of Consent to Medical Treatment" which states:

*I (do) (do not) authorize the attending physician and medical staff to provide such services and treatments as deemed reasonable and necessary for my health and well-being while in the custody of the Sheriff.*

This form includes a place for the inmate/detainee's signature with date and a place for a witness signature with date. There is no place for the inmate/detainee to print their name. There is no place for a witness to print their name.

In several of these forms where the inmate/detainee refused to sign, the witness signature line contained a staff identification number, not a signature, meaning that the form was not completely filled out as designated.

Because the staff are not properly completing the form, it makes it difficult to determine who authenticated the form.

On one form utilized by the Desert Regional Medical Center titled *Leaving Hospital Against Medical Advice*, it was noted that an inmate signed a refusal of medical treatment. There is no subsequent refusal form signed by the inmate at the jail that the Riverside County Grand Jury (Grand Jury) could locate. Per *California Title*

*15, §3351- Inmate Refusal of Treatment*, the *Inmate Refusal of Treatment* form must be signed for each subsequent clinical treatment, or appointment, whether at a detention facility or at an outside hospital. Refusal of treatment forms are not universally transferable from one area to another.

There is no statement on the form to inform the inmate/detainee that lifesaving measures will be performed to preserve life. Clinical staff has a mandate to intervene in performing lifesaving measure. There is no place for the inmate/detainee to print and sign their name acknowledging that they understand this information. The Medical Department does have a policy for refusal of treatment and the inmate is required to sign each time, but it is not reflected on this form.

### **Response to Grand Jury Finding #1:**

#### **Respondent disagrees wholly with the finding.**

Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("RCSD") disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that the Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment form "lacks pertinent medical questions for clinical staff to determine medical concerns" and that the "form indicates that a medical history will be assessed" or that it should contain "comprehensive medical questions" on the basis that it is misleading and inaccurate.

The Grand Jury misconstrues the use and purpose of the Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment Form.<sup>1</sup> The contents of the form are pre-populated from information that was furnished during the initial medical screening involving a Correctional Health Services ("CHS") registered nurse and the inmate. The Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment form's limited purpose is to inform RCSD staff of certain health and safety concerns that need to be addressed during the intake booking process. For example, if the form indicates that the inmate has voiced current or very recent suicidal thoughts, RCSD booking staff will place the inmate in a safety cell pending a mental health evaluation. The form is not used by clinical staff.

Respondent RCSD disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that "There is no place for the inmate/detainee to print their name. There is no place for a witness to print their name" on the basis that it is unnecessary. The inmate's name is already printed in the top left corner of the form.

---

<sup>1</sup> See attached Exhibit 1.

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

Moreover, having a witness print their name on the form is unnecessary because there is a place for a witness to sign the form.

Regarding the Grand Jury's finding that RCSD staff are not properly completing the Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment form, Respondent RCSD has a Corrections Quality Assurance Team ("QAT") that performs several important functions. The QAT's primary responsibility is to coordinate and conduct facility inspections at all five (5) Riverside County jails regarding compliance with RCSD Corrections Division policies, Title 15 regulations and other legal requirements. QAT will undertake inspections of inmate booking files to determine if there is any accuracy to the portion of the Grand Jury's finding that RCSD staff are not properly completing the Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment form. If QAT identifies a systemic problem with the staff not completing the form, training will be provided to staff as corrective action. This training would be part of RCSD's Continuing Education Training ("CET") that is provided to Corrections staff on a quarterly basis when new and/or updated policies are implemented.

Respondent RCSD disagrees with the Grand jury's characterization that "There is no statement on the form to inform the inmate/detainee that lifesaving measures will be performed to preserve life" and that "There is no place for the inmate/detainee to print and sign their name acknowledging that they understand this information" or that refusal of treatment "is not reflected on this form" on the basis that it is unnecessary.

As previously stated above, the Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment form is not used by clinical staff, but rather is designed solely to inform RCSD staff in making them aware of certain health and safety concerns that need to be addressed during the intake booking process. It should be noted that inmates sign a "General Informed Consent" form<sup>2</sup> as part of the medical health assessment examination, which is conducted by a CHS nurse after RCSD staff has completed the inmate's booking process.

## **Grand Jury Finding #2:**

### **Supplemental Intake Questionnaire**

The current *Supplemental Intake Questionnaire* form states:

---

<sup>2</sup> See attached Exhibit 2.

*Swallowing or concealing any type of drug or substance inside your body poses a serious risk of harm and could lead to sudden death. We are concerned with your health and safety and want to provide you necessary medical attention if you are concealing any drugs or substances inside your body. Are you concealing any drugs or other substances inside your body?*

There is no acknowledgment section that the inmate/detainee read the statement and/or acknowledged that they understood.

The form does not contain a statement informing the inmate/detainee that the Sheriff will, with medical intervention, take X-rays or perform a body cavity search if an inmate/detainee is suspected of smuggling a controlled substance or other contraband into the facility. The Sheriff must take all precautions to maintain safety and security of its facilities. There is no provision for a witness signature and printed name if the inmate refuses to sign the form.

After reviewing several *Intake Questionnaire* forms, the inmate/detainee's printed name with booking number was left blank. If this form was lost or detached from the booking file, it would be difficult to match the form with the correct inmate/detainee.

### **Response to Grand Jury Finding #2:**

#### **Respondent disagrees wholly with the finding.**

It appears that the "Supplemental Intake Questionnaire" referred to by the Grand Jury is actually entitled as the "Supplemental Intake Question."<sup>3</sup> This is due to the fact that the form only asks one question about whether or not an inmate is concealing drugs or other substances inside their body.

Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("RCSD") disagrees with the characterization by the Grand Jury that "There is no acknowledgment section that the inmate/detainee read the statement and/or acknowledged that they understood" on the basis that it is misleading and inaccurate. Each inmate must check the "yes" or "no" box on the form in answering the question about whether the inmate is concealing drugs or other substances inside his/her body. Immediately below the check boxes is where the inmate also prints his/her name, signs and dates the form.

---

<sup>3</sup> See attached Exhibit 3.

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

Respondent RCSD disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that the Supplemental Intake Question form should "contain a statement informing the inmate/detainee that the Sheriff will, with medical intervention, take X-rays or perform a body cavity search if an inmate/detainee is suspected of smuggling a controlled substance or other contraband into the facility" on the basis that it is inaccurate and unnecessary. The Grand Jury misconstrues the form's use and purpose. The form's limited purpose is to further inform the inmate of the dangers of ingesting drugs and inform RCSD staff whether an inmate has drugs concealed inside his/her person.

Respondent RCSD disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that "There is no provision for a witness signature and printed name if the inmate refuses to sign the form" on the basis that it is misleading and inaccurate. The form has a designated space for a witnessing deputy's signature, identification number and date.

Respondent RCSD disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that "After reviewing several *Intake Questionnaire* forms, the inmate/detainee's printed name with booking number was left blank" on the basis that it is misleading and inaccurate. It implies that a significant number of booking files reviewed contained Supplemental Intake Question forms that were not properly completed. Respondent is only aware of a single Supplemental Intake Question form that was provided to the Grand Jury. It appears that the Grand Jury has focused on an isolated case and taken it out of proper context to suggest that a significant number of booking files maintained by Respondent RCSD suffer from deficiencies with incomplete forms.<sup>4</sup>

Regarding the Grand Jury's finding that RCSD staff are not properly completing the Supplemental Intake Question form, RCSD's Corrections Quality Assurance Team ("QAT") will inspect inmate booking files to determine if there is any accuracy to the Grand Jury's finding that staff is not properly completing the Supplemental Intake Question form. If QAT identifies a systemic problem with the staff not completing the form, then training will be provided to staff as corrective action. This training would be part of RCSD's Continuing Education Training ("CET").

### **Grand Jury Finding #3:**

#### ***DNA Tracking Worksheet***

---

<sup>4</sup> The total number of booking files opened during fiscal year 2017 – 2018 was 50,371.

The *DNA Tracking Worksheet* provides for the tracking of DNA samples in compliance with California Penal Code § 296.1(a)(2) and (3) and Riverside County Sheriff's Policy 504.06 DNA Samples. Several *DNA Tracking Worksheets* in the booking packet were reviewed, but the form was left blank in all four sections except for the inmate/detainee's name and booking number.

**Response to Grand Jury Finding #3:**

**Respondent disagrees wholly with the finding.**

Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("RCSD") disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that "several *DNA Tracking Worksheets* in the booking packet were reviewed, but the form was left blank in all four sections except for the inmate/detainee's name and booking number" on the basis that it is misleading and inaccurate. It implies that a significant number of booking files reviewed contained DNA Tracking Worksheets that were not properly completed. Respondent is only aware of a single DNA Tracking Worksheet that was provided to the Grand Jury. It appears that the Grand Jury has focused on an isolated case and taken it out of proper context to suggest that a significant number of booking files maintained by Respondent RCSD suffer from deficiencies with incomplete forms.<sup>5</sup>

Regarding the Grand Jury's finding that RCSD staff are not properly completing the DNA Tracking Worksheet, RCSD's Corrections Quality Assurance Team ("QAT") will inspect inmate booking files to determine if there is any accuracy to the Grand Jury's finding that staff is not properly completing the DNA Tracking Worksheet. If QAT identifies a systemic problem with the staff not completing the form, then training will be provided to staff as corrective action. This training would be part of RCSD's Continuing Education Training ("CET").

**Grand Jury Finding #4:**

**Medical Attention/Observation**

When an inmate/detainee is placed into a sobering cell for observation, the custody staff is required by Policy 502.10- *Security Logs/Checks*, to conduct security checks at least once every thirty minutes. This was verified. However, there was no documentation obtained, from the Riverside County Correctional Health Care

---

<sup>5</sup> The total number of booking files opened during fiscal year 2017 – 2018 was 50,371.

Administration, requiring clinical staff to make similar thirty minute checks for clinical observations.

One report indicated that an inmate/detainee was placed in a sobering cell at 0740 hours (7:40 a.m.) but was not observed by clinical staff until 1200 hours (12:00 p.m.), which was more than four hours later. There was no recorded entry in the computer of any clinical observation of the inmate/detainee during this time period found in the documents, reviewed by the Grand Jury. If the inmate was in distress during this time, custody staff may have missed pertinent medical symptoms. Custody staff is not typically medically trained to recognize less obvious medical or critical symptoms such as an escalating fever or dehydration, which a clinician could more easily identify.

There is no clinical protocol/policy provision the Grand Jury could find, nor any notation in submitted reports, requiring medical or psychiatric clinical staff to conduct routine rounds in holding/sobering cells, consistent or similar to custody staff mandates.

**Response to Grand Jury Finding #4:**

**The response to this finding will be provided in a separate response by Correctional Health Services.**

**Grand Jury Finding #5:**

**Critical Incident Logs**

*Critical Incident* Logs are designed to give a synopsis of critical information concerning issues with the crime scenes, critical incidents, search and rescue missions, Special Emergency Response Team (SERT) incidents, and critical aid operations as described on the form. The current *Critical Incident Logs* do not contain this pertinent information and are not completed accurately as required. Personnel listed on the logs require their printed name (last, first) and rank, as well

as other pertinent information. The rank of clinical staff is not properly annotated. Medical staff use a generic "medical staff designation which is not in compliance with the form. Proper clinical rank or position such as LVN, RN, or MD must be properly annotated as required on the form, the same as required by custodial staff such as Sergeant (Sgt.) or Corporal (Cpl.).

The form is not descriptive enough to give a true picture describing what the actual critical incident pertained to and the circumstances. The form only lists categories for staff, rank, ID, time in/out, name, and not the synopsis of the incident. In the incident section, it listed "non-responsive"; in another report in the incident section, it lists "10-44". This does not reflect why this incident required special response.

#### **Response to Grand Jury Finding #5:**

#### **Respondent disagrees wholly with the finding.**

Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("RCSD") disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that "Critical Incident Logs are designed to give a synopsis of critical information concerning issues with crime scenes, critical incidents, search and rescue missions, Special Emergency Response Team (SERT) incidents, and critical aid operations as described on the form" on the basis that it is inaccurate and misleading.

The Grand Jury is apparently referring to "Riverside County Sheriff-Form 420" when it is describing Critical Incident Logs.<sup>6</sup> The Grand Jury misconstrues the use and purpose of the form based on its finding which implies that this form is the only one used by RCSD's Corrections staff to document critical incidents. According to the Critical Incident Log/RSD-420 Instructions, the form is designed to be "...used to track personnel, equipment, and costs for crime scenes, critical incidents, Sheriff's Response Team (SERT) incidents, search and rescue missions, and mutual aid operations." The form is also completed when personnel arrive and leave the scene.<sup>7</sup> The form is not used by clinical staff.

Respondent RCSD disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that "Proper clinical rank or position such as LVN, RN, or MD must be properly annotated as required on the form, the same

---

<sup>6</sup> See attached Exhibit 4.

<sup>7</sup> See attached Exhibit 5.

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

as required by custodial staff such as Sergeant (Sgt.) or Corporal (Cpl.)” on the basis that it is unnecessary. The form already provides for sufficient identifying information applicable to clinical staff such the individual’s full name, assigned jail and employee identification number.

Respondent RCSD disagrees with the Grand Jury’s characterization that “the form is not descriptive enough to give a true picture describing what the actual critical incident pertained to and the circumstances” on the basis that it is misleading and unnecessary.

As previously stated above, the Riverside County Sheriff-Form 420 is designed solely for the use by RCSD staff in tracking certain logistical details associated with a critical incident. The form is not intended to contain a substantive description of the critical incident itself. However, per RCSD Corrections policy, there are a variety of written reports associated with a critical incident that can be generated which provide substantive details.<sup>8</sup> These reports may include: After Action Report, Initial Use of Force Report, Supplemental Use of Force Report, Special Weapons and Munitions Use of Force as well as an Incident Report.

#### **Grand Jury Finding #6:**

##### **Outside Hospitals “Ok to Book”/Exclusion of Normal Medical Screenings**

The standard booking protocol requires a non-correctional hospital to clear an inmate/detainee for formal booking at a detention facility if there is a medical concern, mental health concern, or injury at the time of arrest before the inmate/detainee will be accepted at a detention facility.

However, in reviewing documents provided to the Grand Jury from medical and custody staff pertaining to the "OK to Book" clearance from a non-correctional hospital, there were no additional documents indicating that a more thorough comprehensive clinical screening was conducted.

The non-correctional hospital may only focus on the immediate health issues to determine if the inmate/detainee is "OK" to be processed and accepted into the detention facility. If the detention clinical staff do not conduct a thorough medical screening in addition to the "OK to Book" clearance, the facility may not be aware of any undiagnosed medical or mental health conditions or diseases until a later date.

---

<sup>8</sup> Corrections Division Policy 505.01, Sections 6.1 and 6.2.

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

**Response to Grand Jury Finding #6:**

**The response to this finding will be provided in a separate response by Correctional Health Services.**

**Grand Jury Finding #7:**

**Sobering Cell Logs**

A review of several Sobering Cell Logs revealed they were not properly completed according to protocol codes listed on the form. Some of the notations were not legible. The only annotation listed was C-4, commonly known as "Code 4", meaning that everything is OK. However, this code is not one of the authorized codes listed on the form.

**Response to Grand Jury Finding #7:**

**Respondent disagrees partially with the finding.**

Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("RCSD") disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that a "review of several Sobering Cell Logs revealed they were not properly completed according to protocol codes listed on the form. Some of the notations were not legible. The only annotation listed was C-4, commonly known as 'Code 4', meaning that everything is OK. However, this code is not one of the authorized codes listed on the form" on the basis that it is misleading because it implies that a significant number of Sobering Cell Logs reviewed were not properly completed. Respondent RCSD is only aware of a single Sobering Cell Log that was provided to the Grand Jury.

Respondent RCSD's Corrections Quality Assurance Team ("QAT") recently audited Sobering Cell Logs from all five (5) Riverside County jails to determine if staff was not properly completing such logs. The audit revealed a small percentage of RCSD staff used "Code 4" or "C-4" on Sobering Cell Logs under the observations column. As a result, QAT took corrective action by including the following advisory in the inspection reports sent to the captains of those jails in which this occurred:

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

As a general note, there have been incidences of staff documenting 'Code 4' or 'C-4' on Sobering Cell Logs, under the observations column. Staff are to use the appropriate letters corresponding with the codes listed at the bottom of Form 531b. Please ensure staff are aware of this requirement.

**Grand Jury Finding #8:**

**Physician or Other Clinical Staff on Call**

There is no process in place to identify the medical personnel or the physician on call for each shift in an easily accessible database. The Medical Director informed the Grand Jury that payroll would have to be contacted to ascertain this information.

**Response to Grand Jury Finding #8:**

**The response to this finding will be provided in a separate response by Correctional Health Services.**

**Grand Jury Finding #9:**

**Critical Incident Reports Completed by Custody and Clinical Staff**

All reports start out as "I" as the person writing the report. There is no way to identify the person actually writing, or authoring, the report because there is no signature line, printed name line, or employee ID number line to connect the report to the author. The word "I" does not identify who actually wrote the report

There is no indication a supervisor reviews any reports ensuring all information and issues of the incident are thoroughly addressed. There is no place for a supervisor to print and sign their name, affix their ID number and rank, or identify who reviewed the report.

**Response to Grand Jury Finding #9:**

**Respondent disagrees wholly with the finding.**

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

It appears the "Critical Incident Report" referred to by the Grand Jury actually consists of the "Incident Report Form A 435" and the "Continuation Page Form C 442." These forms are used by Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("RCSD") staff in providing substantive descriptive details of an incident.<sup>9</sup>

Respondent RCSD disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that "All reports start out as 'I' as the person writing the report. There is no way to identify the person actually writing, or authoring, the report because there is no signature line, printed name line, or employee ID number line to connect the report to the author" on the basis that it is inaccurate. The Incident Report Form A 435 has sections entitled "Reporting Officer" and "Officer I.D." that identify the person who wrote the report.

Respondent RCSD disagrees with the Grand Jury's characterization that "There is no place for a supervisor to print and sign their name, affix their ID number and rank, or identify who reviewed the report" on the basis that it is inaccurate. The Incident Report Form A 435 has a section "Reviewed By/Date" that identifies the supervisor who reviewed and approved the report. Correctional Health Services will be providing a separate response to this finding.

### **Grand Jury Finding #10:**

#### **Reports Not Properly Screened for Content Continuity**

In a Critical Incident Report reviewed, custody and clinical staff observed a plastic bag secured to an inmate/detainee and the clinician removed the bag. However, there was no further mention of the bag, the disposition of the bag in the original report, or any subsequent or supplemental reports.

Continuity of information and "chain of custody" evidence, if it was deemed evidence, was lost in subsequent documentation. Supervisory review would have caught this discrepancy and had it addressed in a supplemental report.

### **Response to Grand Jury Finding #10:**

#### **Respondent agrees with the finding.**

---

<sup>9</sup> See attached Exhibit 6.

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

It appears that the "Critical Incident Report" the Grand Jury is referring to is one of the Initial Incident Reports or Supplemental Incident Reports the Grand Jury was provided. Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("RCSD") agrees there should have been further documentation regarding the plastic bag's disposition and documentation as to whether the plastic bag was considered evidence.

**Grand Jury Finding #11:**

**Automated External Defibrillators (AED1)**

In reviewing reports from the nursing staff, one report indicated that the AED was available and the AED electric pads were placed on the inmate to deliver a shock. However, the AED did not deliver a shock. There was no documentation clarifying whether the AED malfunctioned or if the AED indicated a shock was not warranted and therefore did not deliver the shock. When reading the reports, it is not clear whether the AED was malfunctioning or if it was a proper reading by the machine.

**Response to Grand Jury Finding #11:**

**The response to this finding will be provided in a separate response by Correctional Health Services.**

## **GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

### **Grand Jury Recommendation #1:**

#### **Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment form**

- a) The *Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment* form should contain additional medical questions and information to assist both medical and psychiatric staff in understanding the inmates/detainee's complete medical history.
- b) The title of the form should be renamed to better reflect the limited information it contains, if additional medical information is not requested on the form.
- c) A statement should be included informing the inmate that although they have a right to refuse medical treatment, lifesaving measures will be taken.
- d) There should also be a statement included which informs the inmate/detainee that subsequent refusals of clinical treatments will also require their signature each time. There should be a place for the inmate/detainee to sign and print their name acknowledging that they understand what they are signing.
- e) There should be a signature and printed name line of staff along with a place for their ID number and rank/title to clearly identify who witnessed the signing of this form.

### **Response to Grand Jury #1:**

**The recommendation for “a” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

The Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment Form is not used by clinical staff from Correctional Health Services (“CHS”) and Riverside University Health System – Behavioral Health (“RUHS-BH”).

**The recommendation for “b” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

Changing the form's title would provide no tangible benefit to Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department (“RCSD”) staff and is unnecessary.

**The recommendation for “c” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

The Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment Form is not used by clinical staff, but rather is designed solely for the use by RCSD staff in making them aware of certain health and safety concerns that need to be addressed during the intake booking process. It should be noted that inmates sign a separate “General Informed Consent” form<sup>10</sup> as part of the medical health assessment examination conducted by CHS clinical staff that takes place immediately after RCSD staff has completed its intake booking process with the inmate. Including the statement in the form would provide no tangible benefit to Respondent RCSD staff or inmates and is unnecessary.

**The recommendation for “d” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

As noted above, the Initial Medical History/Suicide Assessment Form is not used by clinical staff. The form's limited purpose is to inform RCSD staff of certain health and safety concerns that need to be addressed during the intake booking process. Inmates sign a separate “General Informed Consent” form<sup>11</sup> as part of the medical health assessment examination, which is conducted by CHS clinical staff after RCSD staff have completed the inmate's booking process. Including the statement in the form would provide no tangible benefit to Respondent RCSD staff or inmates and is unnecessary.

**The recommendation for “e” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

---

<sup>10</sup> See attached Exhibit 2.

<sup>11</sup> See attached Exhibit 2.

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

Adding a printed name line for use by RCSD staff, along with a place for their ID number and rank/title to clearly identify who witnessed the signing of this form, is redundant and unnecessary. There is already a place for a witness to sign/date the form and the entire booking process is recorded by video camera.

### **Grand Jury Recommendation #2:**

#### **Supplemental Intake Questionnaire**

- a) The form should be revised to include a statement informing the inmate that the Sheriff will take whatever precautions are necessary to preserve the safety and security of the facility. It should also include a place for the inmate/detainee to print and sign their name acknowledging they understand.
- b) The form should be revised to include a provision for the witness to print and sign their name with ID number if the inmate/detainee refused to sign the form.
- c) The inmate/detainee's printed name should be placed on the form, regardless, to correlate the inmate to the form being completed.

### **Response to Grand Jury #2:**

**The recommendation for “a” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

The Grand Jury misconstrues the Supplemental Intake Question form's use and purpose. The form's limited purpose is to further inform the inmate of the dangers of ingesting drugs and inform RCSD staff whether an inmate has drugs concealed inside his/her person. Revising the Supplemental Intake Question form to include language that informs the inmate that “the Sheriff will take whatever precautions are necessary to preserve the safety and security of the facility” would provide no tangible benefit to RCSD staff or inmates and is unnecessary.

Revising the form to include a place for the inmate/detainee to print and sign their name acknowledging they understand is unnecessary. Each inmate must check the “yes” or “no” box on the form in answering the question about whether the inmate is concealing drugs or other substances inside his/her body. Immediately below the check boxes is where the inmate also prints his/her name, signs and dates the form.

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

**The recommendation for “b” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

Revising the Supplemental Intake Question form to include a provision for the witness to print and sign their name with ID number if the inmate/detainee refuses to sign the form is unnecessary. The form has a designated space for a witnessing deputy's signature, identification number and date. Respondent RCSD staff completes this form regardless of whether or not the inmate refuses to sign the form.

**The recommendation for “c” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

Respondent RCSD staff are responsible for ensuring the inmate/detainee's printed name is annotated on the Supplemental Intake Question form. As a result, the recommendation is unnecessary.

**Grand Jury Recommendation #3:**

**DNA Tracking Worksheet**

The *DNA Tracking Worksheet* should be completed as required in the booking packet. If sections of the *Tracking Worksheet Sheet* do not apply, then *Not Applicable* (N/A) should be clearly annotated in those sections indicating all sections were reviewed.

**Response to Grand Jury #3:**

**The recommendation requires further analysis.**

Respondent RCSD's Corrections Quality Assurance Team (“QAT”) will undertake inspections of inmate booking files to determine if staff are not properly completing the DNA Tracking Worksheet. If QAT identifies a systemic problem with the staff not completing the DNA Tracking Worksheet and annotating “Not Applicable (N/A)” helps to resolve any identified problems, then it will be added to policy. In addition, training will be provided to staff as corrective action. This training would be part of RCSD's Continuing Education Training (“CET”) that is provided to

Corrections staff on a quarterly basis when new and/or updated policies are implemented. It is anticipated that this will occur within six months (i.e. December 2018).

**Grand Jury Recommendation #4:**

**Medical Attention/Observation**

- a) Inmate/detainees booked into detention facilities, who exhibit conditions/symptoms requiring placement into a sobering or safety cell, should receive periodic observation by both custody and medical staff. These rounds should continue every thirty minutes until it is determined that clinical monitoring is no longer necessary. This dual process would enhance timely clinical intervention for the care and treatment of inmates/detainees.
- b) Video cameras should be installed in all sobering/safety cells. This would provide constant observation between the physical observation rounds at 30-minute intervals and would greatly enhance the monitoring process and assist clinical and custody staff for quicker response intervention.
- c) Funding should be provided to purchase video monitoring equipment for sobering/holding cells.

**Response to Grand Jury #4:**

**The recommendation for “a” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

Respondent RCSD staff already provide periodic observations of inmate/detainees placed in sobering or safety cells every thirty minutes. Correctional Health Services will be providing a separate response to this recommendation.

**The recommendation for “b” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

All sobering and safety cells in all five (5) Riverside County jails already have video cameras that are used by Respondent RCSD's staff to observe inmate/detainees.

**The recommendation for “c” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

All sobering cells in all five (5) Riverside County jails already have video cameras. There is no legal requirement or any need that has been identified by Respondent RCSD to have cameras in holding cells.

**Grand Jury Recommendation #5:**

**Critical Incident Logs**

The name of the incident should clearly define, and fully describe, specifically, what the incident or situation was to obtain a full picture of what transpired. Clinical and custody staff should properly complete the Critical Incident Logs as designated on the form with their actual rank or title.

**Response to Grand Jury #5:**

**The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

It appears the Grand Jury is referring to “Riverside County Sheriff-Form 420” when it is describing Critical Incident Logs.<sup>12</sup> According to the Critical Incident Log/RSD-420 Instructions, the form is designed to be “...used to track personnel, equipment, and costs for crime scenes, critical incidents, Sheriff’s Response Team (SERT) incidents, search and rescue missions, and mutual aid operations.” The form is also completed when personnel arrive and leave the scene.<sup>13</sup> The form is not designed to “clearly define, and fully describe, specifically, what the incident or situation was to obtain a full picture of what transpired.” The form is not used by clinical staff and rarely used by RCSD staff assigned to Corrections.

**Grand Jury Recommendation #6:**

**Outside Hospitals “OK to Book”/Exclusion of Normal Medical Screenings**

---

<sup>12</sup> See attached Exhibit 4.

<sup>13</sup> See attached Exhibit 5.

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

a) All detention facilities, regardless of whether the inmate was first screened at a non-correctional hospital for "OK to Book", should conduct a full medical and mental health screening and evaluation of inmates/detainees at the time of booking. This will ensure the facility is fully aware of any medical or mental health issues.

b) The booking form should note that a full medical and mental health screening was conducted and is recorded in the inmates/detainee's medical file in accordance with HIPAA.

**Response to Grand Jury #6:**

**The response to the recommendation for “a” will be provided in a separate response by Correctional Health Services.**

**The recommendation for “b” will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

Revising the booking form to note that a full medical and mental health screening was conducted and is recorded in the inmates/detainee's medical file in accordance with HIPAA would provide no tangible benefit to Respondent RCSD staff or inmates and is unnecessary.

**Grand Jury Recommendation #7:**

**Sobering Cell Logs**

*Sobering Cell Logs* should be written legibly and clearly, and if a C-4 code is to be an acceptable code, then it should be included as an option on the form.

**Response to Grand Jury #7:**

**The recommendation has been implemented.**

Respondent RCSD's Corrections Quality Assurance Team (“QAT”) recently audited Sobering Cell Logs from all five (5) Riverside County jails to determine if staff was not properly completing such logs. The audit revealed a small percentage of RCSD staff used “Code 4” or “C-4” on

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

Sobering Cell Logs under the observations column. As a result, QAT took corrective action by including the following advisory in the inspection reports sent to the captains of those jails in which this occurred:

As a general note, there have been incidences of staff documenting 'Code 4' or 'C-4' on Sobering Cell Logs, under the observations column. Staff are to use the appropriate letters corresponding with the codes listed at the bottom of Form 531b. Please ensure staff are aware of this requirement.

**Grand Jury Recommendation #8:**

**Physician or Other Clinical Staff on Call**

There should be an easily accessible historical database in all duty stations to identify all clinical staff on duty who were on-call for a particular shift or who were physically working a particular shift on a particular date.

**Response to Grand Jury #8:**

**The response to this recommendation will be provided in a separate response by Correctional Health Services.**

**Grand Jury Recommendation #9:**

**Critical Incident Reports Completed by Custody and Clinical Staff**

All reports should have a signature line, printed name line, staff ID number line, and rank line to properly identify and authenticate who authored the report. There should be a similar signature line, printed name line, staff ID number line, and rank line to authenticate the supervisor reviewing the report.

**Response to Grand Jury #9:**

**The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

It appears the report referred to by the Grand Jury as the "Critical Incident Report" is actually the "Incident Report Form A 435" which is used by Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("RCSD") staff in providing substantive descriptive details of a critical incident.<sup>14</sup> The Incident Report Form A 435 has sections entitled "Reporting Officer" and "Officer I.D." that identify the person who wrote the report. This form also has a section entitled "Reviewed By/Date" that identifies the supervisor who reviewed and approved the report. Correctional Health Services will be providing a separate response to this recommendation.

### **Grand Jury Recommendation #10:**

#### **Reports Not Properly Screened for Content Continuity**

All information in reports should clearly and thoroughly address all issues described in the report. All reports should be reviewed by a supervisor for accuracy and completeness. The supervisor's printed name, signature, rank and date should be annotated on the report. When clarification or additional information is required after further review, a supplemental report should be prepared. All supplemental reports shall have the same original report linking them all together for reference.

### **Response to Grand Jury #10:**

**The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.**

It appears the Grand Jury is referring to the "Incident Report Form A 435" and the "Continuation Page Form C 442" in its statement that "reports are not properly screened for content continuity." These two forms are primarily used by Respondent Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("RCSD") staff in providing substantive descriptive details of an incident.<sup>15</sup>

The Incident Report Form A 435 has a section entitled "Reviewed By/Date" that identifies the supervisor who reviewed and approved the report. When clarification or additional information is required after further review from a sergeant, the report's author includes the information in their initial report. A Supplemental Incident Report is used to add, clarify, or document anything

---

<sup>14</sup> See attached Exhibit 6.

<sup>15</sup> See attached Exhibit 6.

2017-2018 Grand Jury Report  
Riverside County Sheriff's Department  
August 20, 2018

deemed needed to be included in the initial report and uses the same file number as the original initial report.

**Grand Jury Recommendation #11:**

**Automated External Defibrillators (AED)**

All reports regarding the use of an AED should clearly and accurately state the reason why an AED did not deliver a shock.

**Response to Grand Jury #11:**

**The response to this recommendation will be provided in a separate response by Correctional Health Services.**