

SAFETY OF COUNTY EMPLOYEES AND VISITORS IN COUNTY BUILDINGS

SUMMARY

This report focuses on the safety of County employees in six general justice centers and six County buildings. Except for the Central Justice Center in Santa Ana, the Lamoreaux Justice Center in Orange, and the Thomas Riley Terminal at John Wayne Airport, there is no weapon screening to protect against the introduction of weapons into these County facilities.

The smaller general justice centers (North, Harbor, West, South Main, and South Annex) need improved security measures to better protect County employees. These centers lack perimeter and entrance surveillance (officers and cameras) and have a high number of visitors.

The six County buildings included in this study were selected for physical size, public access, number of employees, and the sensitive nature of their responsibilities.

The Hall of Administration, an office building for the top elected and appointed officials of Orange County, represents a County building that needs additional security protection. A single, armed sheriff deputy is present on the ground floor during business hours. This deputy's responsibilities do not include registering visitors or verifying County employment. This building has an average of 800 visitors per day.

During visits to the smaller justice centers (North, Harbor, West, South Main, and South Annex) several safety issues were apparent: lack of wheelchair accessibility, no sprinkler protection, lack of proper handicapped parking, congested working conditions, and slip-hazard flooring.

To address the security issues, the 1999–2000 Orange County Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors develop plans to improve the security and safety of County employees and the public in the justice centers and County buildings.

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

During visits, tours, and the fact-gathering interviewing process, the Grand Jury noted security and safety risks to County employees working in some of the public County buildings and justice centers. The weapons interdiction practices used in airports and federal buildings are lacking in all County buildings except the Central Justice Center and the Lamoreaux Justice Center. Many buildings have no protective procedures to prevent unauthorized entry. Other County buildings employ a variety of protective measures from armed deputies to visitor sign-in procedures.

METHOD OF STUDY

Several reports and documents were reviewed that focused on safety and security in the justice centers and the six County buildings. The following documents played a major role in the Grand Jury's understanding of the key issues:

- *Americans with Disabilities Act Overview*: Internet address <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/ada>.
- The 1998–99 Grand Jury report, *Security of County Employees: County Justice Facilities Hall of Administration*.
- Letter of March 31, 2000, from the Sheriff-Coroner Department on security for selected County buildings.
- Memo of March 25, 2000, on weapon screening results from the Sheriff-Coroner Department.
- Memo of March 13, 2000, on building data for selected County buildings from the Public Facilities and Resources Department (PFRD).
- Memo of March 20, 2000, on ADA compliance in County buildings from the PFRD.
- Miscellaneous trial court rules, Rule 810, p 125-133.
- Report of March 22, 2000, on statistics for North, West, Harbor, South Main, and South Annex Justice Centers from the office of Justice Center Operations.

INTERVIEWS

Many fact-gathering interviews were held with various Orange County agencies. Interviews were also conducted with representatives of the sheriffs' departments in three other counties.

TOURS/VISITS

Tours were taken of the Lamoreaux Justice Center, the six County general justice centers, and six selected County buildings. County buildings were also visited in Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and San Diego counties.

Quantitative Data—Appendix

A significant amount of data was collected, analyzed, and used in the preparation of this report. Most of this data was supplied by the office of Justice Center Operations, PFRD, and the Sheriff-Coroner Department. The Appendix includes six tables summarizing the key elements of this information:

Lamoreaux Justice Center Detection Results (Table 3)

Central Justice Center 1999 Detection Results (Table 4)

General Justice Center Building Summary (Table 5)

Selected County Building Summary (Table 6)

General Justice Center Safety Index (Table 7)

County Building Safety Index (Table 8)

BACKGROUND

HISTORY OF WEAPON SCREENING IN ORANGE COUNTY

Orange County has three facilities with weapon screening: The Central Justice Center, the Lamoreaux Justice Center, and the Thomas Riley Terminal at John Wayne Airport. Weapon screening as defined in this study is the use of magnetometers, x-ray machines, and hand-held metal detecting wands. For the purposes of this report, the focus will be on statistics and trends from screening results at the Central Justice Center and the Lamoreaux Justice Center. The Lamoreaux Justice Center initiated weapon screening in 1995. (Table 3 summarizes the results of weapon screening for that facility from 1995 to 1999.) At the Central Justice Center, four screening-stations at three entrances became operational in May 1999 (Table 4 summarizes the detection results from May 1999 through December 1999). In these facilities, visitors, court, and County employees are required to go through the screening-stations when they enter the building. After the start of screening in May 1999, the initial guidelines at Central were revised to allow employees to enter the building with pepper spray and certain cosmetic items, i.e., hair spray. However, non-employees are still not allowed to enter with these items. There is no statistical data to separate weapons confiscated from visitors and those confiscated from employees. Judges and selected staff at Central bypass the security-stations by using the reserved parking lot under the courthouse. There is a \$1.8 million plan to expand metal detectors to the remaining four County-owned justice centers: North, Harbor, West, and South Main.

RESULTS OF CURRENT DETECTION EFFORTS

Screening equipment located in the lobby at the Lamoreaux Justice Center detected and intercepted 4,342 weapons in 1999. At the Central Justice Center, 7,865 weapons were seized during the first eight months of 1999 (Tables 3 and 4). Based on an annualization of detection results at the Central Justice Center in 1999 (11,796) and comparing the number of visitors at the Central Justice Center with the other five justice centers (7,500

to 9,200), the Grand Jury estimates that up to 14,000 potential weapons could be entering the five smaller justice centers annually.

TABLE 1

Estimated Average Number of Daily Visitors	
Central	Total 7,500¹
North	3,500
Harbor	1,700
West	2,400
South Main & South Annex	1,600
	Total 9,200

¹ Includes traffic from 900 State and County Employees

The trend from 1995–1999 for the Lamoreaux Justice Center, indicates that metal-detection screening is effective as a deterrent. Since the inception of screening at Lamoreaux, the confiscation of weapons has declined 35 percent. The seizure of major weapons (knives, scissors, firearms, ammunition, and razor blades) has declined 45 percent (Table 3).

JUSTICE CENTERS

There are six general justice centers in Orange County; Central, North, Harbor, West, South Main, and South Annex. They range in physical size from 21,000 square feet to 542,000 square feet. The largest is Central with 542,000 square feet and 68 courtrooms. The other five centers have a total of 441,000 square feet and 58 courtrooms. There are two general classes of employees working daily in the justice centers: employees of the State (superior court judges and certain court personnel) and employees of the County (sheriffs, public defenders, district attorney personnel, probation department personnel, etc.) The number of State and County workers in the justice centers varies from 70 to 900 employees. There is also a significant disparity in working space per employee, from 300 to 602 square feet (Table 5).

The difference in physical features, size, and number of employees is also evident in the security arrangements. The Central Justice Center has four weapon-screening stations at three entrances involving a total of 11 marshals. The Central facility also has an underground garage for court officers where two guards are on duty at the gatehouse. South Main and Harbor have adequate secure parking for all court officers. The West and South Annex have no secure parking.

There are a total of 13 marshals involved in providing entrance security at the Central Justice Center. The five other justice centers have no officers dedicated to building security (outside of the bailiffs scheduled for courtroom security). There are no surveillance cameras to monitor ingress and egress in any of these justice centers. Based

on the Grand Jury's analysis, over 1,000 potential weapons could be entering the five smaller justice centers every month of the year.

In the South Justice Center in Laguna Niguel, there are five courtrooms in the building; due to overcrowding, an adjacent trailer periodically serves as a sixth courtroom. In the complex, other buildings have been added or renovated to accommodate the needs of the District Attorney, the Probation Department, and the petite jury. The working area per employee is low compared to the other County-owned general justice centers (Table 5).

The South Justice Center Annex was designed as a commercial building, not a justice center. The County has leased second-floor space at this location since 1980 and has constructed three courtrooms. The three courtrooms have extensive window exposure (not bullet proof) and there are multiple entrance and exit routes to the second floor. Although the Annex is a Superior Court and shares the same jurisdictional responsibilities as the other County justice centers, no felony trials are scheduled at this facility because of the building's physical limitations. The Annex primarily handles civil, small claims, emergency protective hearings, and traffic court functions.

There is an existing \$1.8 million plan to cover future staffing and weapon-screening equipment in the four County-owned smaller justice centers. This plan has been developed in phases over the last several years.

Since AB233 (transferring court funding from the county to the state) became effective in January 1, 1998, there has been minimum County fiscal support for improving security measures for the five smaller justice centers. Even with the passage of AB233, the County still has responsibility for the exterior security of all six justice centers (Rule 810).

A serious incident occurred at the West Justice Center when an individual set himself on fire and died on June 4, 1999. This occurred near the main entrance and was observed by many visitors and employees.

COUNTY BUILDINGS

The six County buildings included in this study were selected for size, public access, number of employees, and the sensitive nature of their responsibilities (Table 6). They range in size from 30,000 square feet to 188,000 square feet. The number of employees varies from 50 to 800.

Security procedures and the level of protection vary significantly at the six buildings. The building and security features are summarized in Table 6. Specific comments for each location are included below:

Social Services Agency—Main Street

This is a 10-story facility that houses the managers and support staff of the Agency. There is no required check-in procedure for visitors at the reception area. A deputy sheriff is present during business hours.

Social Services Agency—Eckhoff Street

This large, leased facility (136,000 square feet) serves 700 employees of the Children and Family Services Division. During three Grand Jury visits, many individuals and families were waiting in the small lobby area to see their assigned social worker. A check-in procedure is enforced, and two deputies are assigned to provide lobby and perimeter security. There is locked-key access to all work areas above the ground floor. The amount of office space per employee is 194 square feet, significantly less than the other five buildings.

Probation Department—Main Street

This facility, like the building at Eckhoff, has an active lobby area (average 425 visitors per day). A check-in procedure is enforced, and there are two deputies assigned to provide lobby and perimeter security. There are three surveillance cameras that cover the main entrances to the building. This older facility has a total of 21 entrances: far too many to control and maintain effective security.

Hall of Administration—Civic Center Plaza

This location represents the County building with the greatest need for improved security (Table 8). The major reasons for this are:

- 800 visitors per day
- no visitor sign-in requirements
- 13 entrances
- high-profile occupants

This building has been the focus of two security assessments in the last two years: by the Sheriff-Coroner Department in the fall of 1998 and by private consultants in the fall of 1999.

Sheriff-Coroner Department—Hutton Towers

This is a secure facility with locked access to the interior of the buildings. Visitors are requested to show identification in the lobby before being granted access to the interior of the building.

Child Abuse Services Team (CAST)

This leased facility has a deputy present in the lobby during business hours. With the low number of average visitors per day (50), this officer is able to personally check each individual entering the building.

Each County agency is responsible for determining its own security precautions. The Sheriff-Coroner Department gets involved in security planning at County buildings only when an agency requests its assistance.

SECURITY ISSUES IN NEIGHBORING COUNTIES

As part of its investigation, the Grand Jury visited four justice centers in three other counties: Central in Los Angeles; Central and Vista in San Diego; and Central in San Bernardino.

Both Los Angeles and San Diego Counties have had several years of experience with weapon screening. San Diego installed equipment in the early 1990s and maintained records of the numbers and types of weapons confiscated at checkpoints in nine buildings. Installation of screening-stations in Los Angeles courthouses began in 1994–95. San Bernardino County, like Orange County, is relatively new to the weapon-screening process. Equipment was installed on an expedited basis in the fall of 1999 because of a pending high profile trial. Weapon screening has also been installed at one other justice center (Victorville) in San Bernardino County.

Several differences were observed in the weapon-screening process in these three counties compared to Orange County:

- State and County employees of the two San Diego County justice centers are not subject to screening.
- Personal property trays are processed through the screening equipment in San Diego, San Bernardino, and Los Angeles Counties.
- College interns are hired to operate the screening-stations in the San Bernardino Central Justice Center. (A Deputy Sheriff is assigned to supervisory duties at each station.)

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Signed into law on July 26, 1990, the *Americans with Disabilities Act* of 1990 (ADA), Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327, was intended to make public facilities more accessible to people with disabilities.

When Congress approved the Act, it allowed a two-year phase-in period for government agencies to advertise about the new regulations and for businesses to remove barriers, install ramps, designate parking spots, and make bathrooms accessible to all individuals.

While the employment provisions of the ADA apply to employers of fifteen employees or more, its public accommodations provisions apply to all businesses, regardless of the number of employees. All state and local government agencies are covered regardless of size.

ADA is divided into five titles:

- Employment (Title I)
- Public Services (Title II)
- Public Accommodations (Title III)
- Telecommunication (Title IV)
- Miscellaneous (Title V)

For purposes of this report, transition plans for four buildings were reviewed as to their compliance with Titles II and III (Table 2). These two titles focus on the following:

Public Services (Title II) Public services, which include state and local government agencies, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and other commuter authorities, cannot deny participation in programs or activities to people with disabilities which are available to people without disabilities.

Public Accommodations (Title III) All new construction and modifications must be accessible to individuals with disabilities. For existing facilities, barriers to services must be removed if readily achievable. Public accommodations include facilities such as restaurants, hotels, grocery stores, retail stores, etc., as well as privately owned transportation systems.

HISTORY OF ADA IN ORANGE COUNTY

In 1994, the County prepared an ADA Corrections Plan for the facilities that needed additional work to reach compliance. These surveys were submitted to the Board on November 22, 1994, just before bankruptcy was declared. The lack of funding that resulted from the bankruptcy left little opportunity for effective planning or implementation of improvements to County facilities. As a result, County buildings currently have numerous areas to correct to achieve ADA compliance. As listed in Table 2, there are 411 action items that need to be addressed for ADA compliance at North, Harbor, West, and South Main.

TABLE 2*

ADA II Action Items	
North	132
Harbor	102
West	116
South Main	61
Total	411

*Source Documents—ADA II Transition Plans

As the County emerged from bankruptcy, the County Executive Office made it a priority to restore orderly planning to the facility management process. In 1998, the ADA II Coordinator position was created to offer direction over the program.

The County has recently completed a new transition plan for ADA (ADA II) compliance for all County-owned and leased facilities with public access requirements as identified in May 1999. The Board of Supervisors will review this four-year compliance plan in July 2000.

FIRE SAFETY—JUSTICE CENTERS

Fire-safety inspections are conducted annually by local fire departments acting under the authority of the County Fire Marshal. Violations are recorded and must be corrected by the time a re-inspection is scheduled. Since many of the County buildings are old, they have only the minimum requirements for fire safety such as fire hoses and extinguishers. The exception is in the prisoner-holding areas where automatic sprinklers have been installed. However, there are no sprinklers in any of the working areas of the six justice centers. As with the regulations in the *Americans with Disabilities Act*, the age of the buildings has been the factor in not requiring them to meet current standards. One of the exceptions is that any significant remodeling of an existing structure requires compliance with current codes. The Central Justice Center is an example; current renovations will have to include automatic sprinklers and smoke alarms.

FINDINGS

In accordance with *California Penal Code* Sections 933 and 933.05, responses are required to all findings. The 1999–2000 Orange County Grand Jury has arrived at the following findings:

1. The five smaller justice centers need improved security measures to better protect County employees (Table 7).

A response to Finding 1 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

2. Except for the Central Justice Center, there is no weapon screening in the twelve County buildings and justice centers included in this report.

A response to Finding 2 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

3. There are entrance and perimeter surveillance cameras installed in only two of the twelve buildings selected for this study.

A response to Finding 3 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

4. Five of the six justice centers (North, West, Harbor, South Main, and South Annex) have no deputies dedicated to entrance or perimeter security.

A response to Finding 4 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

5. Of the six County buildings included in this study, the Hall of Administration is the building with the greatest need for improved security for employees and visitors (Table 8).

A response to Finding 5 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

6. There is no historical or current data that differentiates between those weapons confiscated from visitors and those confiscated from employees at the Lamoreaux Justice Center or the Central Justice Center.

A response to Finding 6 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

7. The South Main and South Annex Justice Centers have significant safety and security concerns in addition to the elements displayed in the Table 7. These include:

- Lack of secure parking for court officers (South Annex).
- Numerous areas to correct to achieve ADA compliance; 61 action items for a 42,000 square foot building (South Main).
- Congested working conditions—(South Main and South Annex).
- Challenge of controlling visitor traffic in a multi-building/trailer complex (South Main).
- Difficulty of installing weapon-screening equipment in a leased commercial facility (Annex).

A response to Finding 7 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

8. Many County buildings have numerous areas to correct to achieve full ADA compliance.

A response to Finding 8 is required from the **Board of Supervisors** and requested from the **County Executive Office, Division of Risk Management**.

9. The County has prepared a 2000–2003 ADA II transition plan for *Americans with Disabilities Act* compliance for all County-owned and leased facilities with public access requirements as identified in May 1999.

A response to Finding 9 is required from the **Board of Supervisors** and requested from the **County Executive Office, Division of Risk Management**.

10. A plan has been developed to expand weapon screening to the four smaller County-owned justice centers (North, West, Harbor, and South Main).

A response to Finding 10 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

11. The Social Services Agency building on Eckhoff has less square footage per employee than the other eleven buildings (Tables 5 and 6).

A response to Finding 11 is required from the **Board of Supervisors** and requested from the **Social Services Agency**.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In accordance with *California Penal Code* Sections 933 and 933.05, each recommendation must be responded to by the government entity to which it is addressed. These responses are submitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court. Based on the findings, the 1999–2000 Orange County Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Board of Supervisors should meet with the Superior Court to discuss and examine short-term security improvements for the five smaller justice centers.

A response to Recommendation 1 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

- 2a. The Board of Supervisors should meet with the Superior Court to discuss and examine long-term security improvements for the six justice centers. Even after the passage of AB233, the exterior security of justice centers is still a responsibility of the County (Rule 810).

- 2b. The Board of Supervisors should direct the Orange County Sheriff-Coroner to appoint a study team to develop a long-range plan to improve the security of employees and the public in County buildings (non-justice centers).

These plans (2a and 2b) would address findings two through six. Specific actions would include:

- Develop steps to improve security at all County buildings (Findings 2 and 4).
- Explore the possible use of the marshals assigned to courtroom duty to perimeter and entrance security at peak traffic periods in the five justice centers without weapons screening (Findings 2 and 4).
- Explore the increased use of surveillance cameras for entrance and perimeter security in the justice centers and most vulnerable County buildings (Finding 3).
- Investigate steps to improve security in the Hall of Administration (Finding 5).
- Explore the possibility of collecting data on weapons confiscated from visitors and those confiscated from employees at the Lamoreaux and the Central Justice Centers (Finding 6).
- Determine if the County employees in the smaller justice centers need to be included in the weapon screening process. (Finding 6).

A response to Recommendations 2a and 2b is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

3. The capital expenditures for the construction of a new South Justice Center should be included in the fiscal year 2000–2001 budget (Finding 7).

A response to Recommendation 3 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

4. The County should continue to examine ways to accelerate the current ADA II transition plan, especially in the phases dealing with the exterior and interior paths (Finding 8).

A response to Recommendation 4 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

5. The proposed four-year ADA II transition plan needs sustained financial support from the Board of Supervisors at each annual budget review until the plan is completed (Finding 9).

A response to Recommendation 5 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

6. The Board of Supervisors should increase their lobbying efforts with the state to fund weapon screening for the four County-owned justice centers without weapon screening (Finding 10).

A response to Recommendation 6 is required from the **Board of Supervisors**.

7. The Social Services Agency should explore ways to improve the congested working conditions at Eckhoff Street (Finding 11).

A response to Recommendation 7 is required from the **Board of Supervisors** and requested from the **Social Services Agency**.

COMMENDATIONS

To the **Orange County Sheriff-Coroner Department, Public Facilities and Resources Department**, and the office of **Justice Center Operations**, for their prompt response to requests regarding building security and safety information.

To the **Chairman of the Justice Center Facilities Committee** for his support and assistance in the completion of this report.

APPENDIX—TABLE 3

LAMOREAUX JUSTICE CENTER—DETECTION RESULTS 1995 & 1999

Description	1995	1999	% Change 1995 & 1999
Knives (General)	3,951	2,021	-49
Knives (Illegal)	50	29	-42
Scissors	751	586	-22
Razor Blades	540	282	-48
Firearms	3	3	-0-
Ammunition	114	36	-68
Sub Total—Major	5,409	2,957	-45
Mace/Pepper Spray	230	272	+18
Martial Arts Weapons	24	2	-92
Drugs/Narcotics	10	10	-0-
Narcotic Paraphernalia	21	14	-33
Metal Knuckles	17	10	-41
Handcuffs	49	35	-29
Corkscrews	250	247	-1
Stun Guns	41	15	-63
Tools	201	297	+48
Letter Openers	37	33	-11
Graffiti Tools	28	49	+75
Alcohol	55	39	-29
Miscellaneous Items	279	362	+30
Grand Total	6,651	4,342	-35
Crime Reports	10	20	+100
Incident Reports	180	39	-78
Citations	38	32	-16
Arrests	7	19	+171

APPENDIX—TABLE 4

CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER—DETECTION RESULTS MAY AND DECEMBER 1999

Description	May	December	Percentage Change	Total May through December
Knives (General)	478	373	-22	3,252
Knives (Illegal)	11	0	-100	23
Scissors	115	74	-36	735
Razor Blades	117	128	+9	943
Firearms	0	0	-0-	0
Ammunition	24	2	-92	48
Sub Total—Major	745	577	-23	5,001
Mace/Pepper Spray	77	41	-47	416
Martial Arts Weapons	0	3	-0-	23
Drugs/Narcotics	10	4	-60	40
Narcotic Paraphernalia	18	10	-44	65
Metal Knuckles	6	1	-83	13
Handcuffs	1	1	-0-	12
Corkscrews	29	68	+134	508
Stun Guns	0	0	-0-	1
Tools	90	118	+31	895
Letter Openers	9	2	-78	41
Graffiti Tools	4	6	+50	55
Alcohol	0	12	-0-	18
Miscellaneous Items	120	55	-54	777
Grand Total	1,109	898	-19	7,865
Crime Reports	6	5	-17	31
Incident Reports	1	10	+900	27
Citations	6	5	-17	27
Arrests	6	5	-17	31

APPENDIX—TABLE 5

GENERAL JUSTICE CENTER BUILDING SUMMARY

	CENTRAL	HARBOR	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH MAIN	SOUTH ANNEX
1. Current Security System						
• # of perimeter/entrance security personnel	13	0	0	0	0	0
• Estimated visitors per day	7,500 ¹	1,700	2,400	3,500	900	700
• Surveillance cameras	No	No	No	No	No	No
• # of entrances	3	7	13	17	7	11
• Secured parking for court officers	Yes	Yes	No	7 Secured 26 Protected	Yes	No
2. Major Building Features						
• Owned or leased	Owned	Owned	Owned	Owned	Owned	Leased
• Square footage ²	542,000	111,000	123,000	144,000	42,000	21,000
• # of employees	900	233	280	349	136	70
• Square footage per employee	602	476	439	413	309	300
• # of courtrooms	68	14	17	18	6	3
3. Code & Safety Conditions						
• Fire code	Legally compliant ³	Legally compliant ³	Legally compliant ³	Legally compliant ³	Legally compliant ³	Legally compliant ³
• ADA compliance	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴

Legally Compliant: Meets requirements by law—not necessarily compliant with current code.

¹ Includes traffic from 900 employees that utilize first floor entrances.

² Includes Common Areas & Courtrooms.

³ No sprinklers in working areas.

⁴ Included in ADA II Transition Plan for approval at Board of Supervisors meeting in July, 2000.

APPENDIX—TABLE 6

SELECTED COUNTY BUILDING SUMMARY

	SSA	SSA	PROBATION	HALL OF ADMIN.	SHERIFF	SSA
	Main Street	Eckhoff	Main Street	Civic Center Plaza	Hutton Towers	CAST
1. Current Security System¹						
• # of perimeter/entrance security personnel	1	2	2	2	2	1
• Estimated visitors per day	25	100	425	800	300	50
• Surveillance cameras	No	No ²	Yes	No	No	Yes
• # of entrances	7	4	21	13	9	7
2. Major Building Features						
• Owned or leased	Owned	Leased	Owned	Owned	Owned	Leased
• Square footage ³	88,000	136,000	136,000	186,000	188,000	30,000
• # of employees	359	700	325	285	404	90
• Square footage per employee	245	194	419	653	465	333
3. Code and Safety Conditions						
• Fire code	Legally compliant	Legally compliant	Legally compliant	Legally compliant	Legally compliant	Legally compliant
• ADA compliance	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴	Transition plan ⁴

Legally Compliant: Meets requirements by law—not necessarily compliant with current code.

¹ Information supplied by Sheriff-Coroner Department

² Eckhoff has two closed circuit cameras for monitoring first-floor conference rooms.

³ Includes common areas.

⁴ Included in ADA II transition plan for approval at Board of Supervisors meeting in July, 2000.

APPENDIX—TABLE 7

GENERAL JUSTICE CENTER SAFETY INDEX

	SAFETY FACTORS	CENTRAL	HARBOR	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH MAIN	SOUTH ANNEX
1	Perimeter Security Officers	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
2	Entrance Security Officers	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
3	Weapons Screening Equipment	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
4	Surveillance Cameras	No	No	No	No	No	No
5	# of Entrances (under 10)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
6	# of Employees (under 200)	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
7	Sq. Ft. Per Employees (Over 400)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
8	# of Visitors (Under 500)	No	No	No	No	No	No
9	Sign-In Procedures	No	No	No	No	No	No
10	Sprinklers	No	No	No	No	No	No
	RATING INDEX	5	8	9	9	8	9

* This index is the Grand Jury's attempt to quantify information on the 6 justice centers. The index does not weigh the significance of the 10 elements. The higher the quantitative rating, the greater the need for improved security measures.

APPENDIX—TABLE 8

COUNTY BUILDING SAFETY INDEX

	SAFETY FACTORS	SSA Main St.	SSA Eckhoff	PROBATION	HALL OF ADMIN	SHERIFF Hutton Towers	CAST
1	Perimeter Security Officers	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
2	Entrance Security Officers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Weapon Screening Equipment	No	No	No	No	No	No
4	Surveillance Cameras	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
5	# of Entrances (under 10)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
6	# of Employees (under 200)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
7	Sq. Ft. Per Employee (over 300)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	# of Visitors (under 200)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
9	Sign-In Procedures	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
10	Sprinklers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	RATING INDEX	6	4	4	7	4	2

* This index is the Grand Jury's attempt to quantify information on the 6 selected buildings. The index does not weigh the significance of the 10 elements. The higher the quantitative rating, the greater the need for improved security measures.