

Report Calls For Closing SF Examiner Folsom, Q

SACRAMENTO — (AP) — A preliminary report under consideration by the State Board of Corrections proposes closing California's two famed top security prisons — San Quentin and Folsom — state officials confirmed today.

It also would revamp the state's probation and parole system, doing away with the current State Adult Authority.

News accounts of what was in the report, being assembled under contract by prison authority Robert E. Keldgord of San Francisco, circulated in Southern California.

Not Accepted

Secretary James Hall of the Human Resources Agency and chairman of the corrections board, said "The final report had not been accepted yet by the board.

"We have been aware that someone who had access to the draft reports delivered some to the press for their own reasons," Hall said.

Folsom, designated as the state's maximum security

—Turn to Page 16, Col. 1

—From Page 1

prison, was built in 1880 about 20 miles southeast of Sacramento with granite quarried by convicts.

The Oldest

San Quentin, the state's oldest prison, was established on San Francisco Bay in Marin County in 1852.

Hall said he expects recommendations made in the current draft would be contained in the final report, but he said he had not finished reading the bulky document.

"The Board of Corrections has to review the report and concur or disagree with the recommendations of the report. That will be done here, hopefully by the end of November," Hall said.

Delayed

Hall explained that the report first ordered in July, 1970, was to have been reviewed this month but that was delayed by the board's special study on the abortive escape attempt at San Quentin in which six persons — three convicts and three guards — were killed.

"It is conceivable that the board will concur in those and so recommend to the Governor to do those things," said Hall. "But that is far out in front of us."

In urging the closure of San Quentin and Folsom, the report called for most correctional programs to be handled at the local level, terming such programs the only ones showing significant success in rehabilitation.

Current penal institutions concentrating on custody and discipline are so likely to make an offender less suitable for society that "the system should always choose the least restrictive alternative," the report stated.

In using force inside a pris-

on, the study went on, "minimization of force is called for, not out of leniency, but simply for best results in maintaining order."

"Control by force and threat of force foster rebelliousness" rather than order in prisons, the report stated, even though it acknowledged that force cannot always be avoided.

The study's stated reporting date — late last July — places its recommendations as predating the major disturbances at San Quentin and New York's Attica State Prison.

Federal Funds

The 650-page, three-volume report was financed by \$250,000 in federal funds after Governor Reagan asked the Board of Corrections to commission the study. Sources described the study, undertaken by 57 penology experts, as the most extensive on a corrections system since the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967.

Parts of it are extremely critical, calling California's often highly regarded penal system a "non-system" in some respects with "an over-elaborate administrative structure filled with too few competent administrators."

Most probation and parole procedures are "paper programs," the study said, "to deal with and move paper, interspersed with brief moments of contact with individual offenders."

Major recommendations suggested that future penal institutions be small and located within the community, reserving the state prison for special cases and the incorrigible and violence prone.

Prisons should as much as

possible duplicate outside conditions, necessary regulation should be eliminated and most sentences should be shorter, the report suggested.

Parole consideration should be made after one year, regardless of offense, and authorities should prove why the inmate shouldn't be released, rather than requiring the inmate to prove why he should be.

"Ultimately it is the way inmates are treated — no more, no less than that — which is important . . . uniformity is sometimes a necessity; it should never be made an ideal," the report said.

Bigger use should be made of such facilities as honor camps and half-way houses, the report urges, stating: "It is a mistake to bring a convicted man to prison if that can be avoided."

State officials, to shape up the system, should act as "gadfly, critic, motivator and general prodder of local correctional organizations," the study declares.