

**DIVISION OF ADULT INSTITUTIONS
CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONAL CENTER**

PO BOX 790
SUSANVILLE, CA. 96127
(530) 257-2181



June 12, 2012

Honorable Paul L. Beeman
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Superior Court, County of Solano
600 Union Avenue
Fairfield, CA 94533

Dear Honorable Judge Beeman:

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933.05, I am providing a response to the Solano County Grand Jury of the Findings and Recommendations for Delta Conservation Camp. These responses are regarding the 2011-2012 Grand Jury Report entitled: California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) – Delta Conservation Camp, 2011-2012 Solano Grand Jury Report, Report Date: May 4, 2012.

I would like to begin by thanking the Grand Jury of Solano County for their continued support of Delta Conservation Camp. The staff at the camp looks forward to the Grand Jury's visit each year.

The Delta Conservation Camp opened in June 1988 and is one of 39 California Conservation Camps, jointly run by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). There are 18 such camps in Northern California. Delta Conservation Camp employs six inmate fire crews; consisting of up to 17 male inmates per crew. The maximum occupancy of the camp is 132 inmates. Inmates participating in the camp program have 7½ years or less remaining on their sentences. These inmates cannot have crimes consisting of any capital offenses, sex crimes or arson and can not have any escapes within the past ten years. Inmates incarcerated for domestic violence are potentially eligible for camp once their case factors have been reviewed by the Unit Classification Committee.

The figures and dollar amounts specified in the Grand Jury Report demonstrate a substantial savings to California taxpayers, but are attributable to the statewide conservation camp program. Delta Conservation Camp has been a vital participant in achieving these savings.

The Grand Jury Report has referenced three (3) areas of concern within the operation of Delta Conservation Camp and the surrounding area. CDCR has control of the listed areas of concern. The responses to CDCR's affected areas of concern are as follows:

Response to Recommendation 1a

Custody staffing levels for California Conservation Camps are based on the security classification of offenders assigned to camps, the designated population of each camp, and a statewide agreement with CDCR's partner agency, CAL FIRE. Delta Conservation Camp is designated to house 120 minimum security offenders and, as such, has a custody staff complement of eight (8) correctional officers, two (2) correctional sergeants, and one (1) correctional lieutenant. This staff complement calls for one (1) correctional officer to provide custody coverage during the First Watch or Graveyard Shift. CDCR believes that current staffing levels are appropriate, given the offender population level and classification, and does not anticipate pursuing an increase in staffing levels in the Conservation Camp system.

Response to Recommendation 1b

The installation of a camera system to provide coverage of the camp and/or camp perimeter would involve substantial costs, both with installation and maintenance. As an alternative, CDCR intends to consider adjustments with staff workload during evening hours to enable duty staff to increase the frequency of patrol activities.

Response to Recommendations 1c and 1d

At least one (1) on-duty staff member of every shift is currently required to retain in his/her possession a wireless communication device (telephone, cell phone, or radio) capable of summoning emergency aid from local emergency service providers.

Response to Recommendation 2

CDCR is currently engaged in discussions with county law enforcement agencies throughout California in pursuit of agreements that would enable offenders housed in county facilities to be assigned to conservation camps operated by CDCR and CAL FIRE.

Response to Recommendation 3a

CDCR believes that current staffing levels are appropriate given the offender population level and classification, and does not anticipate pursuing an increase in staffing levels in the Conservation Camp system. The current staffing is consistent with all conservation camps throughout the state.

Response to Recommendation 3b

CDCR is currently reviewing aspects of the offender classification process that includes elements of the process that affects the conservation camp assignments, keeping public safety as the number one priority.

Response to Recommendation 3c

CDCR believes that, given the current population housed in its conservation camps relative to classification and size, supplemental video surveillance systems are not essential to completing the mission.

Response to Recommendation 3d

CDCR believes that, given the current population housed in its conservation camps relative to classification and size, supplemental alarm systems are not essential to completing the mission.

Response to Recommendation 3e

CDCR believes that, given the current population housed in its conservation camps relative to classification and size, supplemental security fences are not essential to completing the mission.

If you have any questions or require additional information, you may contact me at (530) 257-3701.

Sincerely,



R. L. GOWER
Warden (A)

cc: K. Clark, Associate Director, Reception Centers Mission
R. Stewart, Facility Captain, Camps Liaison, Reception Centers Mission
M. Mullin, Chief Deputy Warden
P. Cochrane, Associate Warden, Camps Division