

July 17, 2001

Honorable Judge Melville, Presiding Judge
Santa Barbara County Superior Court
312-C Cook Street
Santa Maria, California 93456

**Board of Supervisors' Response to the 2000-01 Grand Jury Report on:
"Juvenile Probation"**

Dear Judge Melville:

During its regular meeting of July 17, 2001, the Board of Supervisors adopted the following responses as their responses to the 2000-01 Grand Jury's report on "Juvenile Probation". The Board of Supervisors appreciates the efforts of the Grand Jury.

FINDING 1: Continuity of service of the Juvenile Probation staff is important.

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

RECOMMENDATION 1: The Probation Department should consider salary increases for institutions-based Probation staff to parity with Probation Field Service levels as a factor in maintaining continuity of service.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (will not be implemented).

FINDING 2: Many new juvenile institutions staffers leave institutions work within two years.

RESPONSE: Disagree. For calendar year 2000, the Juvenile Institution Officer (JIO) turnover rate was 9.7% (5 resignations, 1 retirement + 1 failed probation out of 72 officers) whereas the turnover rate for all county departments was higher at 11.2%. Additionally, the JIO turnover rate for calendar year 2001 so far is less than the countywide turnover rate (5.6% versus 7.9%).

RECOMMENDATION 2: The Probation Department should consider rotating Juvenile Probation staff between institutions-based duty and field duty to deal with perceived differences in status between the two Probation services and to provide cross training.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (will not be implemented).

FINDING 3: More foster homes and group homes are needed now in Santa Barbara County, and more undoubtedly will be needed in coming years.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Department of Social Services' responses as its response (agree).

RECOMMENDATION 3a: The Probation Department should continue to share resources with the Social Services Department to recruit additional foster families and host families.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Department of Social Services' responses as its response (has been implemented).

RECOMMENDATION 3b: The Probation Department should continue collaborations with professionals in the County Departments of Public Health, Social Services, and ADMHS, as well as County and municipal schools and community-based non-profit organizations, to develop and enhance female-specific programs.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department, Alcohol, Drug & Mental Health Services (ADMHS), Public Health Department and Department of Social Services' responses as its response (has been implemented).

FINDING 4: Many extra-parental placements of juveniles are out-of-County, making family support and reunification harder and denying access to community-based resources.

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

RECOMMENDATION 4: In view of the increased numbers of female juvenile offenders, the Probation Department should develop more female-specific placement and treatment programs.

Response: The development of more female-specific placement programs will not be implemented due to a lack of funding. In the meantime, the Probation Department will conduct further analyses to determine the most appropriate and effective programs should financing become available. Additionally, as mentioned in the response to Recommendation 6, the Probation Department has implemented additional female-specific treatment programs as a result of funding provided by the Challenge II Grant.

FINDING 5: Many of the issues that lead to delinquent behavior among female offenders—for example, high rates of physical and sexual victimization—are not effectively addressed in coeducational or English-only settings.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Public Health Department’s responses as its response with the clarification that the Board partially agrees.

RECOMMENDATION 5: The Probation Department should establish and maintain links with female-specific community-based services for non-English-speaking female juveniles.

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

FINDING 6: More placement and treatment programs—particularly female-specific programs—are needed for female juveniles in view of the increased numbers of female juvenile offenders.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department, ADMHS and Public Health Department’s responses as its response (agree).

RECOMMENDATION 6: The Probation Department should identify and develop female-specific treatment programs with, as well as without, housing.

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

FINDING 7: An additional 30 beds were provided at the Santa Maria Juvenile Hall in December 2000, and 90 more beds are planned by 2004. The 90 additional beds should accommodate the anticipated increase in juvenile hall housing needs for the County to the year 2015.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department’s response as its response with the additional comment that the County match for the additional 30 beds was \$668,000 and the annual operating costs for the new facility is estimated at \$3,300,000 (agree).

RECOMMENDATION 7: The Board of Supervisors and the Probation Department should assure that the planned addition of 90 beds at the Santa Maria Juvenile Hall is fulfilled in order to accommodate the County's needs for juvenile institutional housing to the year 2015.

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

FINDING 8: The building needs to be updated in a variety of ways that probably would cost less than replacement of the entire facility.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response with the clarification that replacement of the facility is estimated to cost between \$15 – 20 million depending on the scope of work while the total cost to renovate is \$4.4 million (agree).

RECOMMENDATION 8a: Assess the fuel supply to the emergency generator.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response (has been implemented).

RECOMMENDATION 8b: Assess the emergency generator's capacity to supply adequate emergency power.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response (has been implemented).

RECOMMENDATION 8c: The electronic security system should be upgraded.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response (will not be implemented).

RECOMMENDATION 8d: Toilets and wash basins should be installed in nine rooms in Unit 2 and seven rooms in Unit 3.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response (will not be implemented).

RECOMMENDATION 8e: In concert with the bathroom construction, the water supply and sewer lines to the mains on the north side of Highway 101 should be replaced with new lines to the mains on nearby Hollister Avenue.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response (will not be implemented).

RECOMMENDATION 8f: Construct an additional classroom now to enable this facility to handle current needs and prepare for anticipated growth.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response (will not be implemented).

FINDING 9: The same entrance from the parking lot into the facility is used by visitors and personnel, as well as for the intake and release of juveniles.

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

RECOMMENDATION 9: A separate, secure entrance solely for the intake and release of juveniles should be constructed.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (will not be implemented).

FINDING 10: All food preparation for juveniles is contracted for and prepared off-site.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Public Health Department's responses as its response (partially agrees).

RECOMMENDATION 10: A dishwashing machine should be acquired to enable the existing kitchen facilities to be utilized for vocational training of the juveniles.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (will not be implemented).

FINDING 11: A full industrial kitchen (except for a dishwashing machine) is unused at the facility, except to store packaged foodstuffs for off-hour snacks for the detainees.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (partially agrees).

RECOMMENDATION 11: Part of this 1600-square foot space should be reorganized so that it can serve some daily space needs—for example, for juvenile programs and staff meetings—while being available for vocational training.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (will not be implemented).

FINDING 12: The industrial kitchen is a resource that could serve for emergency meal preparation for staff and residents in this facility, in the nearby La Morada Sheriff's facility, and in the Santa Barbara Main Jail. Emergency food supplies are available at the

Food Bank of Santa Barbara County, a short distance from the Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department, Sheriff Department and Public Health Department's responses as its response (disagree).

RECOMMENDATION 12: An analysis should be made to determine the feasibility of setting up this kitchen for use in emergencies and as a vocational venue.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response with the clarification that it will not be implemented.

FINDING 13: The November 1996 NEPA/CEQA report noted a loss of water from the supply loop serving the five housing units at the Los Prietos Boys' Camp site.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department, General Services and Planning & Development's responses as its response (agree).

RECOMMENDATION 13: The Camps should continue programs to economize on their use of water, a precious resource in this fire-prone area. Water leaks should be promptly identified and repaired.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response (has been implemented).

FINDING 14: In the report it was noted that, of the 11,000 gallons average pumped per day for use by the camps and the houses, the five Probation staff houses were metered at 7,000 gallons per day, suggesting a serious leak in the system.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and General Services' responses as its response (agree).

RECOMMENDATION 14: The Camps should immediately carry out their proposed plan to re-sleeve the existing water lines.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department, General Services and Planning & Development's responses as its response (requires further analysis).

FINDING 15a: The Forest Service plans to begin construction bidding of the expanded project at the First Crossing site on July 1, 2001.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department and Planning & Development's responses as its response (agree).

RECOMMENDATION 15a: The Probation Department should renew its efforts to

retain use of the five houses.

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

FINDING 15b: Court-mandated rehabilitation programs at Los Prietos Boys' Camp and the Tri-Counties Boot Camp are at risk of being compromised by the close presence of recreational revelry possibly within sight and almost certainly within hearing range of the inmates.

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

RECOMMENDATION 15b: The Probation Department should present to the Board of Supervisors a status report listing anticipated problems stemming from the Forest Service's First Crossing development plans.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (has not yet been implemented).

FINDING 15c: The current number of day-use sites (five) and picnic seating (804) in the Los Padres National Forest along Paradise Road appears to be sufficient for the current number of visitors even without the addition of the eight to 12 planned and permitted picnic sites for an additional 128 to 288 people at First Crossing, let alone the expanded 15-site development plan for 240 to 360 people.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (partially agree).

RECOMMENDATION 15c: The Probation Department should encourage the Board of Supervisors to request that the Forest Service stay within the (environmentally assessed) original number of 12 picnic sites.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Planning & Development's responses as its response (has not yet been implemented).

FINDING 15d: The current recreational uses of the site (for fishing and bicycle trip staging) could be impacted adversely by the traffic and noise of the intended First Crossing picnic area.

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

RECOMMENDATION 15d: The Probation Department should request the Board of Supervisors to express its views concerning the problems related to the proposed expansion in a letter to the Forest Service's Los Padres District Ranger.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response with the clarification that it has not yet been implemented.

FINDING 15e: The Forest Service's July 1998 signed Environmental Assessment for the First Crossing picnic area was based on a maximum of 12 picnic sites serving 16 to 24 people each.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Planning & Development's responses as its response (agree).

RECOMMENDATION 15e: In the event of an inadequate response from the local Forest Service, the Board of Supervisors and the County Administrator should communicate directly with the 22nd Congressional District Representative. Additionally, the Forest Service officials listed below should be requested to review and, if necessary, investigate the issue:

Los Padres District Ranger
U. S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region
Chief, USDA Forest Service, Washington D.C.
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington D. C.

There is urgency because the bidding process on the project contract is scheduled to begin on July 1, 2001.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (has not yet been implemented).

FINDING 15f: Subsequently, the Forest Service has repeatedly stated that they plan for 15 sites, an increase of 25% over the maximum number of sites evaluated in the Environmental Assessment, apparently without further environmental assessment.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (partially agree).

FINDING 15g: The additional motor traffic destined for the First Crossing picnic area and the additional commuting that would be needed by the five relocated probation staff has not been factored into the 1995 Environmental Assessment.

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

FINDING 15h: No air quality assessments were done, nor were mitigation concerns formulated, for the additional traffic and the new barbecues planned for the First Crossing site.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Planning & Development's responses as its response (agree).

FINDING 15i: Under the original 1973 agreement, as amended, between the Forest Service and the County, the five staff houses are slated for demolition and the area cleared and returned to “near natural state” prior to December 31, 2003.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department, Planning & Development and Public Works’ responses as its response (agree).

FINDING 15j: The original 1973 agreement between the Forest Service and the County is amendable.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department’s response as its response (agree).

FINDING 15k: Draft Forest Service plans shown to the Grand Jury indicated that three of the 15 proposed picnic sites are to occupy the area where the five staff houses now stand.

Response: In accordance with Section 933.05 of the California Penal Code, the Board responds that it disagrees. However, this response is based on the fact that no County staff was in attendance when the Grand Jury was shown plans by the Forest Service and staff does not have this information.

FINDING 15l: Eliminating the three proposed picnic sites not evaluated in the Environmental Assessment would obviate the need to demolish the five houses and still provide sufficient numbers of picnic sites at that location.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department’s response as its response (partially agree).

FINDING 15m: The demolition and cartage of staff housing mandated by the Forest Service would be at County expense, estimated at \$36,000 to \$76,000, a range based in part on an estimate of tippage costs. These funds would have to be allocated well before the December 31, 2003 deadline for completion.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Public Works’ responses as its response (agree).

FINDING 15n: The loss of any housing within the County is regrettable.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department, Planning & Development and Treasurer’s responses as its response (agree).

FINDING 15o: The demolition of these houses would be an unfortunate loss of valuable and scarce County resources under the control of the Forest Service.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department, Planning & Development, and Treasurer's responses as its response (agree).

FINDING 15p: The buffer provided by the presence of the five staff families from the Probation Department in the existing houses enhances security in the area and also inhibits access between the proposed recreation area and the Camps.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Planning & Development's responses as its response (agree).

FINDING 15q: Expanding the area from 12 to 15 picnic sites would put added oversight responsibility on the existing Forest Service staff and could create a need for additional Sheriff's Department law enforcement, which could be costly to the County.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Sheriff Department's responses as its response (partially agree).

FINDING 15r: Rocky Mountain Recreation Company employees (as any Forest Service concessionaire employees) are not sworn peace officers.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Sheriff Department's responses as its response (agree).

FINDING 15s: The development proposed for First Crossing does not appear to be presently necessary. The Forest Service can encourage increased recreational use of the Santa Ynez River area of the Los Padres National Forest without the development proposed for First Crossing.

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

FINDING 16: In the event the First Crossing development goes forward as currently planned, the Sheriff's Department will need to augment its oversight of the enlarged picnic area.

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Sheriff Department's responses as its response (partially agree).

RECOMMENDATION 16: The Probation Department should complete the perimeter fencing, at least on the north side of the Camps facing the proposed picnic area. Plants should be established to screen and deter access. Also, sight lines from the picnic sites, parking area, and the Santa Ynez River should be fully blocked.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (requires further analysis).

FINDING 17: If Recommendations 15c, 15d, and 15e do not result in assurances that the concerns expressed will be mitigated, additional County funds needed in the first year are estimated at from \$200,000 to \$240,000.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response (partially agree).

RECOMMENDATION 17: The Board of Supervisors should plan to allocate County funds to provide for

- demolition and cartage of the five staff houses (estimated at \$36,000 to \$76,000),
- extra juvenile probation staff at the Camps (estimated at \$104,000/year), and
- additional Sheriff's Department law enforcement on Paradise Road (estimated at \$60,000/year).

Response: The Board adopted both the Probation Department and Sheriff Department's responses as its response with the clarification that it requires further analysis.

Sincerely,

JONI GRAY
Chair, Board of Supervisors

Attachments

cc: 2000-01 Grand Jury Foreperson: William L. Cathey, 1100 Anacapa Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93121.