

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

Nathaniel Roberts, et al., *
*
Plaintiffs, *
*
vs. *
*
County of Mahoning Ohio, et al., *
*
Defendants. *
-----*

CASE NO. 4:03 CV 2329
Sixth Report of the Special Master--
Report on Days Elapsed Between
Sentencing of Felons and
Transportation to Prison

Introduction

On September 26, 2005, the Court directed the special master in this cause to prepare a report concerning the number of days elapsing between the following dates and events as they affected felony defendants: (a) the date of sentencing; (b) the date of the issuance of a warrant to convey to the Sheriff by the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas; and (c) the date of actual transport of the prisoner from the jail to prison.¹ The Court directed that all prisoners sentenced to prison on or after June 1, 2005 be included in the study and that all such individuals be incarcerated in the Mahoning County Justice Center (“jail”) at the time of their sentencing.

Methodology

The special master assigned primary responsibility for gathering, entering, and analyzing data for this report to Cory L. Nafziger, the special master’s graduate assistant.

¹ A “warrant to convey” is an order directing the Sheriff to transport the convicted defendant to a prison facility operated by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

Mr. Nafziger contacted Alki Santamas, the jail administrator, and obtained the following information with respect to 103 inmates Mr. Santamas concluded met the criteria the Court established for the study: name, gender, date of birth, social security number, charge code, charge, case number, arrest date, date of conveyance of the warrant to convey by the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas to the Sheriff, the date the Sheriff received the warrant to convey, and the date of the prisoner's transport to prison.

According to Mr. Santamas, all of the prisoners for whom information was provided were housed in the jail at the time of their sentencing. The first eight items of information were intended to be descriptive and to assist in the identification of the individual on the docket maintained by the Mahoning County Court of Common Pleas on its website at <http://courts.mahoningcountyoh.gov>. The remaining items were directly relevant to the substance of the report.

The list Mr. Santamas provided contained the names of 103 prisoners. Of this number, two were not in jail at the time of their sentencing and surrendered after their date of sentencing.² As a result, Mr. Nafziger excluded these prisoners from the data base, reducing that base 101. In addition, Mr. Nafziger identified 13 inmates who were sentenced on the same dates on multiple charges and transported to prison on one date following the issuance of a warrant to transport. Mr. Nafziger collapsed these multiple charges and sentences into single events, thus reducing the data base to 88. There were two prisoners for whom Mr. Nafziger could not obtain a sentencing date from any file on the Court of Common Pleas' website, and he excluded these prisoners from the data base, reducing the base to 86. Finally, the list from the jail contained the names of 11 inmates who were sentenced before June 1, 2005, and Mr. Nafziger excluded these inmates from

² Jail officials refer to these prisoners as "walk-ons."

the data base. As a result of these deletions, the data base ultimately contained the names of 75 prisoners.

In order to obtain a date of sentencing Mr. Nafziger entered the prisoners' case number into the database on the website cited above. In a number of cases the date of sentencing did not appear on the "docket" section on the website. All sentencing dates, however, were available in another section ("events"). Mr. Nafziger learned from Court Administrator Robert Rupeka that the courtroom bailiff entered the sentencing dates in the "events" section and this date was several days earlier than the date entered in the "docket" section by a deputy clerk. Mr. Rupeka recommended, and Mr. Nafziger and the special master agreed, that all dates should be drawn from a single source, which – of necessity – was the "events" section on the website.

All data, as amended, were entered into an Excel[®] file. See Exhibit, below.³ Using this database, Mr. Nafziger was able to compute the days elapsing between the date of sentence and the clerk's issuance of a warrant to convey, the days elapsing between the clerk's issuance of a warrant to convey, and the date of the prisoner's actual transport to prison. These calculations, in turn, also permitted Mr. Nafziger to measure the time elapsed between the date of sentencing and the date of transport to prison.

Findings

Mr. Nafziger's analysis of the final data base permitted him to make findings regarding the length of time elapsing between the critical events of sentencing, issuance

³ The exhibit does not contain all information in the original data base. Some data useful only for identifying an inmate on the docket (date of birth, social security number, ORC charge number, and arrest date) has been omitted. Should the Court or any party wish to review any of the deleted information, the special master will provide it.

of a warrant to transport, and transportation of the inmate to prison. The following charts set forth those findings:

Table 1
Days Elapsing Between Sentencing and Issuance of a Warrant to Convey

Total Days	Mean (average)	Median	Range
693	9.24	7.00	0-54

Table 2
Days Elapsing Between Issuance of a Warrant to Convey and Transport to Prison

Total Days	Mean (average)	Median	Range
439	5.85	5.00	0-88

Table 3
Days Elapsing Between Sentencing and Transport to Prison

Total Days	Mean (average)	Median	Range
1132	15.09	13.00	1-102

Conclusions

Table 1 reflects that a total of 693 days elapsed between the sentencing and the issuance of a warrant to transport for the 75 prisoners in the refined data base. Using a \$68 per-prisoner-per-day cost for calculation, the total cost of these delays was \$47,124. The mean or average number of days elapsing between these two events was 9.24, at a cost of \$628.32 per prisoner. The median number of days between these two events was 7.00 at a cost of \$476 per prisoner, and the range of days was 0 days to 54 days at costs ranging from zero to \$3,672.

Table 2 reflects that a total of 439 days elapsed between the clerk's issuance of a warrant to convey and the transport to prison of the 75 inmates included in this study. The total cost of these delays was \$29,852. The mean or average number of days elapsing between these two events was 5.85, at a cost of \$397.80 per prisoner. The median number of days between these two events was 5.00, at a cost of \$340 per prisoner, and the range of days was 0 to 88, at costs ranging from zero \$5,984.

Table 3 reflects that a total of 1132 days elapsed between sentencing and the date of the 75 prisoners' transport to prison. The total cost of these delays was \$76,976. The mean or average number of days elapsing between these two events was 15.09, at a cost of \$1,026.12 per prisoners. The median number of days between sentencing and transport was 13.00, at a cost of \$884 per prisoner, and the range of days was 1-102, at costs ranging from \$68 to \$6,936.

These numbers support two conclusions. First, increased efficiency between the events this report describes will significantly relieve population pressures on the jail. Second, speeding up the pace at which sentenced prisoners leave the jail for prison will result in a cost saving to the County.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Cory L. Nafziger

Cory L. Nafziger
Graduate Assistant

/s/ Vincent M. Nathan

Vincent M. Nathan
Special Master