File	No.	190994

Committee Item No.	<u> 15</u>	
Board Item No.		

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

_	Government Audit and Oversight	Date:	October 17, 2019
Board of Supe	ervisors Meeting:	Date:	
Cmte Board Note the control of the	_	eport	oort
OTHER			
_			
Prepared by:			oer 11, 2019
Prepared by:	John Carroll Da	ate:	

9

12

14

21

25

[Settlement of Lawsuit - Riana Buffin and Crystal Patterson - City to Comply with New Pretrial Detention Policies and Provide Funding for Pretrial Diversion Project]

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by Riana Buffin and Crystal Patterson against Sheriff Vicki Hennessy in her official capacity as Sheriff; the settlement prohibits the Sheriff from using the existing bail schedule for arrested individuals and from using any similar policy that determines the existence or length of pre-arraignment detention based on an arrestee's ability to pay, requires the Sheriff to release certain arrestees within 18 hours from the time of booking under some circumstances, and is conditioned on the City providing additional funding to the Own Recognizance Project of the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; the lawsuit was filed on October 28, 2015, in U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Case No. 15-CV-04959-YGR; entitled Riana Buffin and Crystal Patterson, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Vicki Hennessy in her official capacity as the San Francisco Sheriff, et al.; the lawsuit involves claims that the Sheriff's use of the San Francisco Superior Court's bail schedule as a basis for pre-arraignment detention or release of arrestees violates the United States Constitution.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Consistent with the terms of a stipulated final judgment entered on September 3, 2019, the Board of Supervisors hereby approves the stipulated final judgment in the action entitled Riana Buffin and Crystal Patterson, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Vicki Hennessy in her official capacity as the San Francisco Sheriff, et al., U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, Case No. 15-CV-04959-YGR, by the terms set forth in the stipulated final judgment, available in Board of Supervisors File No. 190994. Under the stipulated final judgment, the Sheriff will be prohibited from using the

bail schedule or any form or derivative thereof that determines the existence or length of prearraignment detention based on an arrestee's ability to pay; and the Sheriff will be required to release certain arrestees within 18 hours from the time of booking unless certain conditions are met. The stipulated judgment is conditioned on the City providing additional funding to enable the Own Recognizance Project of the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The lawsuit involves claims that the Sheriff's use of the San Francisco Superior Court's bail schedule as a basis for pre-arraignment detention or release, as required by state law, violates the United States Constitution.

Section 2. The above-named action was filed in U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California on October 28, 2015, and the following parties were named in the lawsuit: Plaintiffs Riana Buffin and Crystal Patterson, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated; Defendant Vicki Hennessy in her official capacity as the San Francisco Sheriff; initially named and later dismissed Defendants City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and Attorney General of the State of California; and Intervenor Defendants California Bail Agents Association.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED: DENNIS J. HERRERA City Attorney WAYNE SNODGRASS Deputy City Attorney FUNDS AVAILABLE: Controller n:\govlit\li2019\160447\01395430.docx

RECOMMENDED:

SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

VIČKI HENNEŠŠÝ

Sheriff

3 4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

//

Plaintiffs and Defendant the San Francisco Sheriff are pleased to inform the Court that, with the assistance of Chief Magistrate Judge Spero, they have reached agreement as to the appropriate remedy to be imposed in this case, with two exceptions. The Stipulated Final Judgment Remedying Constitutional Violation is attached as **Exhibit A**.

First, the parties have agreed to modify the procedures for seeking alterations on release, as currently reflected in California Penal Code § 1269c, in two ways: (1) pursuant to Section IV.A of Exhibit A, for arrestees charged with an offense not enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1, a peace officer may file a declaration to extend the 18-hour automatic release deadline by 12 hours if there is reasonable cause to believe that an arrestee may not appear at arraignment, or poses a threat to public safety; and (2) pursuant to Section IV.B of Exhibit A, for arrestees charged with offenses not enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1(a), the arrestee or their attorney, friend or family member shall have the right to submit an application under § 1269c to the magistrate or commissioner seeking a swifter judicial determination and release than the automatic 18-hour release provision. Plaintiffs also seek to modify these procedures a third way (Section IV.C), which is to provide all arrestees charged with offenses enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1(a) the right to submit an application (by the arrestee or their attorney, friend or family member) under § 1269c to the magistrate or commissioner seeking OR release prior to arraignment. The Sheriff does not stipulate to this provision and takes no position on whether the Court should adopt it. The parties agree that the Court's decision on this issue shall not impact any other provision of the stipulated final judgment.

Second, per Section VI of Exhibit A, the parties have not reached agreement as to attorneys' fees and costs, and expect to submit briefs on the matter to the Court following the entry of final judgment if an agreement as to fees and costs cannot ultimately be reached.

We respectfully request that the Court enter final judgment at its earliest convenience, so that the relevant time periods for implementation can begin. We would of course be pleased to address any questions the Court may have.

And an analysis of the second	Case 4:15-cv-6 59-YGR Document 368	Filed 08/3 9 Page 3 of 4
1	Dated: August 30, 2019	Respectfully submitted,
2		LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Robert E. Sims
3		Sadik Huseny Tyler P. Young
4		By: <u>/s/ Sadik Huseny</u> Sadik Huseny
5	·	Sadik Huseny
6	•	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Riana Buffin and Crystal Patterson
7		
8	Dated: August 30, 2019	Respectfully submitted,
9		DENNIS J. HERRERA City Attorney
10		By: <u>/s/ Jeremy M. Goldman</u> Jeremy M. Goldman
11		
12		Attorneys for Defendant Sheriff Vicki Hennessy
13		
14		*
15	:	
16		•
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	·	
25		
26		
·27		
28		

SIGNATURE ATTESTATION

I, Sadik Huseny, am the ECF user whose ID and password are being used to file this

Notice of Stipulated Final Judgment Remedying Constitutional Violation. In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has

Dated: August 30, 2019

been obtained from each of the other Signatories.

/s/ Sadik Huseny Sadik Huseny

LATHAM & WATKINS LEP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

EXHIBIT A

	Case 4:15-cv-0 9-YGR Document 368	3-1. Filed 08/ 19 Page 2 01 /
1		
2	•	
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	·	
9	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
10	NORTHERN DISTR	LICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	OAKLAN	D DIVISION
12		
13	RIANA BUFFIN and CRYSTAL PATTERSON, on behalf of themselves and	CASE NO. 4:15-cv-04959-YGR
14	others similarly situated,	STIPULATED FINAL JUDGMENT REMEDYING CONSTITUTIONAL
15	Plaintiffs,	VIOLATION
16	V.	
17	VICKI HENNESSY in her official capacity as the San Francisco Sheriff, <i>et al.</i> ,	*
18	Defendants.	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

As set forth in the Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment, the San Francisco Sheriff's Department's use, as required by current California law, of the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco Felony-Misdemeanor Bail Schedule ("Bail Schedule") violates the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Accordingly, to remedy the Constitutional violation and harm, and pursuant to stipulation by the parties, the Court orders the following for purposes of pre-arraignment release procedures:

- (I) The San Francisco Sheriff's Department (hereafter "Sheriff") is enjoined from using the Bail Schedule, or any form or derivative thereof that requires or has as its effect that the existence and duration of pre-arraignment detention is determined by an arrestee's ability to pay.
- (II) For all arrestees booked on an offense not enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1(a), and who are arrested without a warrant and are not otherwise ineligible for pre-arraignment OR release under state law:
 - (A) The arrestee's PSA Report, along with all other portions of the OR Workup reasonably available to the OR Project, shall be submitted to the San Francisco Superior Court within eight (8) hours from the time of booking.¹
 - (B) The Sheriff shall release the arrestee at eighteen (18) hours from the time of booking if: (1) the Superior Court has not rendered a decision on OR release at that time (which decision shall otherwise control) and (2) the PSA Report for the arrestee does not indicate "release not recommended."

¹ For purposes of this Stipulated Judgment, "Own Recognizance" or "OR" release refers to any release not conditioned on payment of bail, and includes releases subject to any non-financial conditions. The OR Workup refers to the report created by the OR Project of the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (hereafter, "OR Project") which contains the arrestee's criminal history, the police report, a cover sheet, and the PSA Report. "Booking" refers to the time that ID confirmation for an arrestee is received. The Sheriff shall maintain all reasonable procedures to ensure that ID confirmation is received as swiftly as possible. To the extent circumstances beyond the OR Project's or the Sheriff's control render the completion of the PSA Report impossible within eight (8) hours, the OR Project will exercise best efforts to complete the PSA Report as soon as feasible. The automatic release provision of Section II does not apply in cases where the OR Project has been unable to complete the PSA Report for reasons beyond the OR Project's or the Sheriff's control.

- (C) Release pursuant to this Section shall treat as binding the recommendation of the PSA Report as to any conditions of release, and release procedures shall be carried out as if the release recommendations in the PSA Report had been adopted by the Superior Court. No arrestee shall be entitled to release without signing an agreement to be bound by the conditions of release contained in the PSA Report's recommendation. An arrestee who is being released subject to recommended Assertive Case Management (ACM) procedures by the OR Project shall not be released from custody before completing any procedures necessary to implementing the release conditions.
- (III) For all arrestees booked on an offense enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1(a), for whom pre-arraignment OR release is not available under current law, the provisions of Section II shall not apply.
- (IV) The procedures for seeking alterations on release, as currently reflected in California Penal Code § 1269c, shall be modified as follows:
 - (A) For all arrestees booked on an offense not enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1(a), a peace officer who (1) has reasonable cause to believe that an arrestee may not appear at arraignment, or poses a threat to public safety, or (2) expects that specific information not yet provided will be delivered within the next twelve (12) hours and will probably provide reasonable cause to believe that an arrestee may not appear at arraignment, or poses a threat to public safety, shall prepare a declaration under penalty of perjury setting forth the facts and circumstances in support of his or her belief and file it with a magistrate or commissioner. Such a declaration may be filed at any point throughout the 18-hour period referenced in Section II, and will, without further judicial action, serve to extend the 18-hour period by an additional twelve (12) hours.
 - (B) For all arrestees booked on an offense not enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1(a), the arrestee or their attorney, friend or family

member shall have the right to submit an application under California Penal Code § 1269c to the magistrate or commissioner seeking a swifter judicial decision than the automatic 18-hour release provision provided for in Section II. Such an application shall not alter the obligation in Section II.A.

- (C) For all arrestees booked on an offense enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1(a), the arrestee or their attorney, friend or family member shall have the right to submit an application under California Penal Code § 1269c to the magistrate or commissioner seeking OR release prior to arraignment.
- (V) The obligations of this Stipulated Judgment are conditioned on the enactment of legislation by the City and County of San Francisco approving the Stipulated Judgment and providing additional funding to enable the OR Project to operate twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days a week. The Sheriff shall expend all reasonable efforts to seek a final vote on the enactment of such legislation within ninety (90) days of entry of this Stipulated Judgment. The Stipulated Judgment shall take full effect ninety (90) days after the enactment of such legislation. If the City and County of San Francisco has, notwithstanding the Sheriff's efforts, not enacted such legislation within ninety (90) days of entry of this Stipulated Judgment, the Stipulated Judgment shall be vacated, and unless the parties jointly notify the Court that they have agreed to extend the time, the Court shall issue its own final judgment in this matter.
- (VI) The parties shall separately file, and the Court shall separately rule, on the issue of attorneys' fees and costs.
- (VII) The Court shall retain jurisdiction over this matter until eighteen (18) months after the terms of this injunction go into full effect pursuant to Section V, and Plaintiffs shall be provided comprehensive reports every three (3) months in order to monitor the Sheriff's compliance with this Stipulated Judgment and its efficacy at remedying the constitutional harm, and to bring matters to the Court's attention as appropriate. The parties shall meet and confer in good faith so as to ensure the reports provided are sufficient for such monitoring purposes. The Sheriff will make

good faith efforts to begin to gather data regarding time of arraignment for all arrestees. The reports are currently expected to include:

- Data regarding arrestees' initiation of booking, charges, time of ID Confirmation, and time of PSA Report submission and OR Workup submission(s);
- Data regarding PSA Report recommendations;
- Data regarding the operation of Section II, including but not limited to data regarding the arrestees deemed ineligible for pre-arraignment release pursuant to Section II.B;
- Data regarding OR judicial decisions;
- Data regarding all automatic releases pursuant to Section II;
- Data regarding individual arrestees' total length of incarceration and the manner and timing of any release;
- Data regarding the number of affidavits submitted by peace officers pursuant to Section IV.A, including information on timing;
- Data regarding the number of applications submitted on behalf of arrestees pursuant to Sections IV.B and IV.C, including information on timing and ultimate determinations, to the extent such information (if any) is available.

The first report shall include data from the year prior, including and up to the first three months from the date the provisions of this Order become operative and shall be due thirty (30) days after the expiration of that period, with additional reports to be filed every three months thereafter. This provision imposes no obligation except as to data in the possession of the Sheriff or the OR Project, or reasonably available to them, and shall not require the provision of data other than is maintained or will be maintained in the ordinary course of business.

(VIII) This Stipulated Judgment is intended to address the timing of release decisions prearraignment and is not otherwise intended to interfere with changes to the processes by which the Superior Court makes release determinations, including changes to the way in which risk assessments are conducted or by which entity they are conducted. Nothing in this Stipulated Judgment shall prevent the Sheriff from releasing any person subject to terms of pretrial release who has received an individualized determination by a judicial officer.

(IX) To the extent the Superior Court, California legislature, or any other entity seeks to implement material changes that may implicate the terms of this Stipulated Judgment or the pre-arraignment processes set forth herein, including to the manner in which high risk arrestees may be identified by the PSA Report for the purposes of the exception to the automatic release provisions of Section II.B, the parties shall meet and confer over potential alterations to the terms of this Stipulated Judgment and thereafter notify this Court of any joint proposal or inability to reach agreement, which may include petitioning the Court to dissolve or modify the Stipulated Judgment.

Dated:

The Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers United States District Judge

		LEGISLA	TION RECEI	VED CHECK	LIST		
Date	9/30/	19	File Number (if applicable) _	/	90994	
] Leg	jislation Pend jislation for B	oard Agenda	ttee (AMENDE (AMENDED)	D)	Comm	OALBM	VISOR\$ 560 9: 23
Grant O	Sı rdinanca	upervisor, M	layor, and De	partmental S	Submitt	als-()	all have me
[] L [] S [] S [] [] []	Signature: Supporting d Cover lette Grant bud Grant infor Letter of Ir Contract, I Ethics For Other sup	Department I- ocuments: er (original) get/application mation form, itent or grant a Leases/Agreel m 126 (if appl port documen	n including signed award letter froi ments (if applic icable) in Word ts as identified	the Mayor's de separate pdf of disability che m funding ager able) I format in the cover let	esignee, copies of cklist acy	plus the Contr f each in email egislation	
ı ي Ordinan		gisiation/sup	porting docum	ients: Sent to	DUS.L	egisiation@si	gov.org
	Legislation: Signature: Supporting of Cover letted Settlemer Other sup	City Attorney Head, Contro locuments: er (original) t Report/Agre port documen	rd copy, and 1 r (For Settlemer oller, Commissi 1 full set, and ement (for settl ts as identified porting docun	nt of Lawsuits - on Secretary) I separate pdf ements) <i>in the cover lei</i>	City Att	orney, Departr of each in emai legislation	I
	esolution	Ovininal 1 h	4	alastronia dam	in 18/n.	ual farma at	
	Signature: Supporting of J Cover letter J Grant budger J Grant information of J Contract, J Ethics For J Other sup	Department documents: er (original) lget/application form, ntent or grant Leases/Agreem 126 (if appoport documer	·	r the Mayor's d d separate pdf ed disability che om funding age cable) d format in the cover le	esignee copies of ecklist ncy	, plus the Cont of each in ema legislation	il
Resolu							
[]	Signature: Supporting [] Cover let [] Settlement [] Other sup	None (Note: Department documents: ter (original) nt Report/Agre oport documer	ard copy, and a Required for S Head, Controlle 1 full set, an ement (for sett oporting docum	lettlement of Cler, Commission desparate pdf lements)	aims - Con Secreta copies of	ity Attorney, ary) of each in ema legislation	٠
Name	and Telephon	e Number	e we for here.	Department	- _{GE} HE	J	·

Name and Telephone Number

Department

Clerk's Office/Forms/Legislation Received Checklist (1/2015) for more help go to: sfbos.org/about the board/general/legislative process handbook