

Response to Santa Barbara County Grand Jury Report:

Detention Facilities Report

Report Summary

- Published May 24, 2016
- The Grand Jury released their “Detention Facilities Report”, which contains the results of inspections of the jails, detention facilities, and the coroner's facility by the 2015-2016 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury.
- The Board of Supervisors is named as a responder to Finding 2, as well as Recommendation 2.

Finding 2

- “The Coroner's Office urgently needs a new facility”.

The Board partially disagrees with the finding:

- In 2015, the County responded to the Grand Jury's report titled, “Santa Barbara Sheriff-Coroner's Bureau –Still an Unhealthy Environment”. In that response, it was noted that a consultant's (MEC) report identified tasks necessary to update the building ventilation (HVAC) system. Improvements to the facility would be made for continued safe use of the existing facility.

Finding 2, continued

- Bids have been received, and work on the improvements to the ventilation system is scheduled to begin in July 2016 with an estimated completion by the end of October 2016.

Recommendation 2

- “That the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors immediately allocates funding for a new facility.”

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable:

- Repairs to the facility are not significant enough to require replacement of the facility; funding has been allocated for the recommended building improvements as identified in the MEC report. The upgraded HVAC system will address the concerns noted from the Grand Jury and a new facility is not warranted or reasonable.

Recommended Actions:

- a) Consider and adopt responses in Attachment A as the Board of Supervisors' response to the 2015-2016 Grand Jury report entitled "Detention Facilities Report", Attachment B;
- b) Authorize the Chair to sign a response letter and forward the responses to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court (Attachment A); and
- c) Determine pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15378(b)(4) that the above actions are not a project subject to CEQA review, because it is a government fiscal activity that does not involve any commitment to any specific project which may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment.