

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD AGENDA LETTER



Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2240

Agenda Number:

Prepared on: June 12, 2003
Department: County Administrator
Budget Unit: 012
Agenda Date: June 24, 2003
Placement: Departmental
Estimate Time: 30 minutes
Continued Item: NO
If Yes, date from:

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Michael F. Brown, County Administrator

STAFF: John Jayasinghe, (805) 568-2246
Shawn Terris, (805) 568-3412

SUBJECT: Board of Supervisors' Response to the 2002-03 Grand Jury Report on "Criminal Justice Committee Detention Facilities"

Recommendation:

That the Board of Supervisors:

- A. Adopt the responses in Attachment (1) as the Board of Supervisors' responses to the 2002-03 Grand Jury Report on "Criminal Justice Committee Detention Facilities", and
- B. Authorize the Chair to sign the letter included in Attachment (1) forwarding the responses to the Presiding Judge.

Alignment with Board Strategic Plan:

The recommendations are primarily aligned with Goal #7: A County Government that is Accessible, Open, and Citizen-Friendly.

Executive Summary and Discussion:

This Grand Jury report requires responses from five of the County's departments: District Attorney, Probation, Public Works, Sheriff, and the Board of Supervisors.

The Grand Jury Report on Criminal Justice Detention Facilities is issued each year with findings and recommendations regarding detention facilities within the County. The report contains a total of 25 findings and 26 recommendations that affect the County. It is recommended that the

Board agree with 18 of the 25 Findings and implement 14 of the 26 Recommendations. Details are outlined in Attachment (1). The recommended board actions are aligned with the departments' responses.

Mandates and Service Levels:

The grand jury report was released on April 3, 2003. In accordance with California Penal Code Section 933(b), the governing body of the agency (Board of Supervisors) must respond within 90 days after issuance of the Grand Jury report. Consequently, the Board of Supervisors' responses must be finalized and transmitted to the Presiding Judge of the Courts no later than Wednesday, July 2, 2003. Section 933c requires that comments to Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations be made in writing.

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:

The estimated cost to implement all 26 recommendations in the grand jury report is \$103,416,000. However, the estimated cost of those recommendations that are proposed to your Board for implementation is \$403,000 (\$306,000 in one-time costs plus \$97,000 in annual on-going costs):

RECOMMENDED TO BE IMPLEMENTED		
Recommendation	Estimated Cost (\$)	Description
9	\$10,000	Remodel Carp Police Dept front office
12	\$1,000	Upgrade wiring in the Santa Maria Sheriff Substation breathalyzer room
13	\$135,000	Enlarge women's locker room at Santa Maria Sheriff's Substation
18	\$160,000	Remodel the Coroner's Office
19	\$97,000/year	Hire an investigator for the Coroner's Office

The estimated cost of the remaining recommendations not being proposed to your Board for implementation is \$103,013,000 (\$88,126,000 in one-time estimated costs plus \$14,887,000 in annual on-going estimated costs):

RECOMMENDED <u>NOT</u> TO BE IMPLEMENTED		
Recommendation	Estimated Cost (\$)	Description
1	\$84,000,000	Build a North County Jail (annual operating costs = \$14.5 million/year)
2 & 3	\$10,000	Purchase exercise equipment - Honor Farm
7(b) & 24	\$210,000/yr	Clean up Isla Vista using Honor Farm and Juvenile Hall inmates
10	\$113,000	Purchase space and equipment for a Carpinteria Police Dept. exercise room
15	\$200,000	Secure Figueroa Street Holding Facility parking lot
16	\$20,000/year	Purchase & install video arraignment system for the Figueroa Street Holding Facility
17	\$3,000,000	Purchase a helicopter
21	\$76,000/year	Add staff at the SB Juvenile Hall
22	\$803,000	Install sink & toilet in 9 dry rooms at SBJH
26	\$81,000/year	Operate the shop facility at the Camps

Special Instructions:

The response of the Board of Supervisors must be transmitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court no later than July 2, 2003. The Clerk of the Board is requested to return the signed letter to Jennie Esquer, County Administrator's Office, for distribution to the Superior Court. The signed letter, written responses, and a 3 1/2" computer disc with the response in a Microsoft Word file must be forwarded to the grand jury.

- Attachments:**
- (1) Letter to the Presiding Judge with Board of Supervisors Responses
 - (2) Sheriff Department's Responses
 - (3) Probation Department's Responses
 - (4) Public Works Department's Responses
 - (5) District Attorney Department's Responses
 - (6) Copy of 2002-03 Grand Jury Report on "Criminal Justice Committee Detention Facilities"

CC: Jim Anderson, Sheriff
Tom Sneddon, District Attorney
Ron Cortez, General Services Director
Sue Gionfriddo, Chief Probation Officer

Board of Supervisors Response to the 2002-03 Grand Jury Report "Criminal Justice Committee Detention Facilities"

Agenda Date: June 24, 2003

Page 4

Phil Demery, Public Works Director

Tuesday, June 24, 2003

Honorable Clifford R. Anderson, III
Presiding Judge
Santa Barbara County Superior Court
P.O. Box 21107
Santa Barbara, California 93121-1107

**Board of Supervisors' Response to the 2002-03 Grand Jury Report on:
*"Criminal Justice Committee Detention Facilities"***

Dear Judge Anderson:

During its regular meeting of Tuesday, June 24, 2003, the Board of Supervisors adopted the following responses as their responses to the 2002-03 Grand Jury's report on "Criminal Justice Committee Detention Facilities". The Board of Supervisors appreciates the efforts of the Grand Jury.

MAIN JAIL FACILITY

FINDING 1: Due to overcrowding in the Main Jail it is necessary to use the early release program.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 1: To alleviate overcrowding in the Main Jail, resulting in the early release of inmates, a jail needs to be constructed in North County.

Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but may be implemented in the future. At present, a timeframe for construction and operation of a jail in the North County cannot be definitively established due to the scope of the project and its cost. The project is included in the current Five year Capital Improvement Program with an estimated cost of \$84 million and an annual operating cost of \$15 million. The Sheriff is working with the General Services Department to locate and acquire suitable land for a jail in the North County. It should be noted that, the March 2000 ballot measure U2000, which proposed a sales tax to build a North County Jail and Juvenile Hall, failed with 61% voting against it and only 39% voting for it. Funding sources for construction and operation of this project are being pursued by the Sheriff's Department but have not yet been identified.

HONOR FARM

FINDING 2: There is limited aerobic training equipment.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Partially disagrees with the finding. Although there are no aerobic apparatus available there is space and aerobic training videos provided to conduct aerobic exercises).

RECOMMENDATION 2: Through donations and/or fundraisers, provide stationary bicycles, stair steppers, striders or other such equipment.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Has not yet been implemented), with the additional comment:

The Sheriff's Department is exploring the possibility of establishing a donation program to purchase the equipment.

FINDING 3: The female inmates appear not to exercise.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Partially agrees with the finding), with the additional comment:

It is up to inmates whether or not they choose to exercise with the equipment that is available.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Encourage all inmates in the Honor Farm to perform aerobic exercise and provide adequate equipment to do so.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Has not yet been implemented), with the additional comment:

The Sheriff's Department provides opportunity for all Honor Farm inmates to

exercise aerobically and is exploring the possibility of establishing a donation program to purchase the equipment.

ISLA VISTA FOOT PATROL

FINDING 4: Loud amplified music at night causes large crowds to gather and become disorderly.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 4: Enforce local noise ordinances and disturbing the peace laws.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (The recommendation has been implemented).

FINDING 5: The zero tolerance law is not being enforced.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Disagrees with the finding. Although there are no "zero tolerance" laws for drugs and alcohol in Isla Vista, the officers assigned to the Foot Patrol do enforce State drug and alcohol statutes).

RECOMMENDATION 5: Enforce the zero tolerance law for drugs and alcohol.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Will not be implemented, as there is no "zero tolerance" law regarding drugs and alcohol within the State of California).

FINDING 6: The Foot Patrol roll call was held in a room with glass doors and a large window facing the street.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 6: Hold the Roll Call in the back room or in the upstairs assembly room.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The Isla Vista Foot Patrol, in reality, is an expanded storefront operation, which balances law enforcement services with community relations. The supervisors at the Isla Vista Foot patrol are experienced and hand selected. They must be given discretion on how to conduct their briefings).

FINDING 7: After the weekend parties and holiday celebrations there is a huge amount of rubbish to be cleaned up at taxpayer expense.

Response: The Board adopted the District Attorney, Probation, Public Works and Sheriff Departments' responses as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 7(a): Impose community service sentences on those arrested.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Has been implemented in part. Community Service work hours are ordered by the Courts or probation officers to adults and juveniles in lieu of fines or as a condition of probation. The Community Service Work Program is operated by the Probation Department and assigns offenders to public or non profit worksites including Goleta Beach, Isla Vista Parks and Recreation, Isla Vista Youth Project, Isla Vista Teen Center and Isla Vista Adopt a Block).

RECOMMENDATION 7(b): Use inmates from the Honor Farm and or Juvenile Hall to assist in the clean up. This would be an alternative to using County/private services.

Response: The Board adopted the Public Works, Probation and Sheriff Departments' responses as its response. (Will not be implemented since it is not warranted. The Sheriff's Work Alternative Program (SWAP) and Isla Vista Parks & Recreation District's Adopt-A-Block Program clean up trash at a lesser cost).

FINDING 8: The Isla Vista Foot Patrol has failed to maintain control of the community in which it serves.

Response: Disagree with the finding. (The Sheriff also disagreed with the finding. There is no evidence that the Isla Vista Foot Patrol is failing to maintain control of the community).

RECOMMENDATION 8: The Foot Patrol should initiate stronger tactics to regain control of the community. The Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff has the responsibility to see that this occurs.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Will not be implemented because no loss of control has occurred).

CARPINTERIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

FINDING 9: The facility urgently needs updating and remodeling.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 9: The facility would be improved by remodeling the front office and providing a more efficient support staff working area.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Has been implemented).

FINDING 10: There is no exercise room for the officers.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 10: Space and equipment need to be provided for an exercise room.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Will not be implemented at this time, due to budget restrictions).

FINDING 11: There is a wall of flimsy drywall in the lobby area of the facility which presents a potential security breach.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Disagrees with the finding. The wall is an interior wall that is only accessible after entry through the front security door and therefore does not present a potential security breach).

RECOMMENDATION 11: Replace this flimsy wall with a better constructed wall.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Will not be implemented because it is not warranted. Refer to response to finding eleven).

SANTA MARIA SHERIFF'S SUBSTATION

FINDING 12: There is an unreliable light fixture in the breathalyzer room.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 12: The wiring needs to be upgraded to accommodate a new light fixture.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Has been implemented).

FINDING 13: The women's locker area is inadequate.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 13: Enlarge the women's locker area.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the near future. The Sheriff's Department is currently looking at a modular building that would be used as a locker room and restroom).

FIGUEROA STREET HOLDING FACILITY

FINDING 14: There is no emergency equipment in the facility.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Disagrees with the finding. The Figueroa Street Holding Facility, as well as other Court holding facilities in the County, is currently equipped with emergency first aid equipment).

RECOMMENDATION 14: Medical emergency equipment to match the level of expertise of the personnel is needed.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Has been implemented).

FINDING 15: The parking lot where the inmate transporting vehicles are parked is not secured.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 15: The deficiency has been addressed but funding is a year or more away. Care must be taken to assure funding remains on line.

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented due to a lack of funds, low security risk, and a cost that outweighs the benefits. The parking lot has three driveways, the building next door has an easement to it, and the California Highway Patrol, all city police officers, the public, and employees from four different County departments use the lot. It should be noted that the prisoners and the vehicles that transport them, are secured when debarking and embarking at the Superior Court Building.

FINDING 16: The facility is overcrowded at times.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 16: Crowding may be alleviated by having another transportation van available. This would allow for staggered arrival and departure times. Another possibility for addressing the shortcomings in this unit is for the County to develop a system of video arraignment of prisoners. The potential economy and safety of this system appears to be well worth considering.

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is warranted. As indicated in the Sheriff's response, this is a scheduling problem and not a transportation problem. Video arraignment has been considered and has not been implemented due to outstanding issues among the Courts, District Attorney and Public Defender.

FINDING 17: The helicopters now in use are inadequate for some tasks.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 17: There is a strong need for a newer and larger helicopter with cable harness and stretcher lifting capability.

Response: As indicated in the Sheriff's response the recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented if the Sheriff secures outside funding.

CORONER'S OFFICE

FINDING 18: The Coroner's office/facility is cramped and too small for the workload.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 18: A remodeling program is essential and long overdue. This remodel would provide adequate workspace.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (The main Coroner's Office remodel is underway and should be completed during fiscal year 2003-04.)

FINDING 19: The workload is too heavy for the investigators who are on staff.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 19: Hire and train at least one more investigator.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response

(Has been implemented).

SANTA BARBARA JUVENILE HALL

FINDING 21: Two staff members must accompany a dry room occupant to the bathroom at night leaving only one staff member available.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 21: Increase the staff on that shift by at least one.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The staffing is within Title 15 California Code of Regulations for local juvenile facilities).

FINDING 22: Nine rooms have no toilet or sink.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Partially disagrees with the finding. Unit II at the Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall (SBJH) has nine dry rooms; Unit III at SBJH has seven dry rooms with no toilet or sink).

RECOMMENDATION 22: Make every effort to install a sink and toilet in these rooms.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Will not be implemented due to a lack of funds and the pending completion of the Santa Maria Juvenile Hall expansion. Approximately 75% of the minors regularly detained at the SBJH are from the North County and will be detained at the Santa Maria Juvenile Hall after June 30, 2004 which will greatly reduce the need to utilize the dry rooms in Santa Barbara).

FINDING 23: At least one sign is in Spanish only [in the visitation room].

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 23: Ensure all signs are in English and Spanish.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Has been implemented).

FINDING 24: Outside work crews have been discontinued.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its

response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 24: Reinstate outside work crews. A suggestion would be to utilize these crews to assist with the Isla Vista trash cleanup. Also see Recommendation 7(b).

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Will not be implemented due to a lack of funds. See response to Recommendation 7(b)).

TRI-COUNTIES BOOT CAMP and LOS PRIETOS BOYS' CAMP

FINDING 25: The Camps should try to retain the cabins that are on government leased land.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 25: The Probation Department should meet with the U.S. Forest Service/U.S. Congressional Representatives and seek a solution to keep these cabins for the enhancement of the security at the facility and for the protection of surrounding neighbors.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Has been implemented, but not with a positive outcome for the retention of the staff residences.).

FINDING 26: The well-equipped shop for the use of the boys at the Camps is closed.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

RECOMMENDATION 26: The Grand Jury recommends that a sincere effort be made to either publicly or privately fund the reopening of the shop program. Perhaps the Probation Department could apply for a grant, an auxiliary could be formed or a benefactor could be found to seek funds from the private sector to sustain the shop. A volunteer shop teacher might be willing to donate his/her time to keep the shop open.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Will not be completely implemented because it is not warranted. However the Probation Department will continue to monitor grants opportunities and will reinstate the Carpentry Crew).

Sincerely,

Naomi Schwartz
Chair, Board of Supervisors

Attachments

cc: William M. Andersen, Grand Jury Foreperson 2002-03, Grand Jury room, County
Courthouse, Santa Barbara, Ca 93101