



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
RECEIVED
DEC 4 1981

JAMES P. JACKSON
CITY ATTORNEY
THEODORE H. KOBEY, JR.
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY
LELIAND J. SAVAGE
SAMUEL L. JACKSON
WILLIAM P. CARNAZZO
SABINA ANN GILBERT
STEPHEN B. NOCITA
CHRISTINA PRIM
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEYS

DEPARTMENT OF LAW
812 TENTH ST. SACRAMENTO, CALIF. 95814
SUITE 201 TELEPHONE (916) 449-5346

December 4, 1981

Hon. City Council
City Hall
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: RESIDENCE OF STATE PRISON PAROLEES

Dear Council Members:

On December 2, 1981, the Law and Legislation Committee recommended approval of the attached resolution relating to a change in guidelines for residence of state prison parolees. The attached letter to Councilman Lloyd Connelly from Raymond C. Brown, Chairman of the Board of Prison Terms, explains the proposal in more detail.

Approval of the attached resolution is also recommended by the Police Department.

Very truly yours,

James P. Jackson
JAMES P. JACKSON
City Attorney

JPJ/p
Attachments

Approval recommended:

Walter J. Slupe
WALTER J. SLUPE, City Manager

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

DEC 8 1981

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

RESOLUTION NO. 81-902

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL ON DATE OF
December 8, 1981

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING PROPOSED CHANGE IN GUIDELINES FOR STATE PRISON PAROLEES

WHEREAS Raymond C. Brown, Chairman of the Board of Prison Terms, has proposed a change in the residence guidelines for state prison parolees, and

WHEREAS Chairman Brown's motion to change these guidelines will be as follows:

Under the provisions of Penal Code Sections 3000f, 3052, 3053, the guideline for the residence of parolees being released from state prison will be that they reside in the county which committed that person to prison. In the case of a prisoner currently committed from two or more counties, any of the committing counties may be the county of residence. Parolees may not change the county of residence during their parole period without the advance written permission of the Board of Prison Terms. The guideline is not retroactive.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO that the City Council supports appropriate changes in the guidelines promulgated pursuant to the penal code regarding the release of parolees which will reduce the disproportionately large number of parolees coming into specific communities such as Sacramento and directs the appropriate City staff members to appear at the Board of Prison Terms meeting on December 14, 1981, to urge adoption of rule changes consistent of this statement.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

DEC 8 1981

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

25-1

At our meeting on December 14, 1981, you may be present in person, or if you would like to submit something in writing, I will make that available to all members of the Board prior to the meeting. Thank you for your interest in my proposal.

Sincerely,



RAYMOND C. BROWN
Chairman



BOARD OF PRISON TERMS

545 DOWNTOWN PLAZA
SUITE 200
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

November 30, 1981

916/322-6366

The Honorable Lloyd G. Connelly
City Councilman
District 6
City Hall, 915 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Councilman Connelly:

Thank you for your letter of November 23, 1981, wherein you request a copy of the proposal that I will present to the Board at our meeting in Sacramento (545 Downtown Plaza, Suite 200) on December 14, 1981, at 10:00 a.m. The motion I will make is as follows:

Under the provisions of Penal Code Sections 3000f, 3052, 3053, the guideline for the residence of parolees being released from state prison will be that they reside in the county which committed that person to prison. In the case of a prisoner currently committed from two or more counties, any of the committing counties may be the county of residence. Parolees may not change the county of residence during their parole period without the advance written permission of the Board of Prison Terms. The guideline is not retroactive.

The existing procedure is that if the motion is seconded and adopted by the Board, we would hold hearings throughout the state relative to the proposal becoming Board policy. I recognize that the proposal may have to be modified as the result of subsequent public hearings at which time we will receive input from various state, city, county, and private agencies which have an interest in the implementation of a guideline for the placement of state prison parolees.