

September 4, 2001

Honorable Judge Rodney Melville, Presiding Judge  
Santa Barbara County Superior Court  
312-C East Cook Street  
Santa Maria, California 93456-5369

**Board of Supervisor's Response to the 2000-01 Grand Jury Report on:  
*"Detention Facilities and Sheriff's Department Issues"***

Dear Judge Melville:

During its regular meeting of August 28, 2001, the Board of Supervisors adopted the following responses as their responses to the findings and recommendations in the 2000-01 Grand Jury's report on "Detention Facilities and Sheriff's Department Issues" to which the Board is required to respond. These responses are aligned with those provided by the Sheriff, and the Probation, General Services, and Alcohol Drug and Mental Health Services Departments.

---

**FINDING 3:**

**Finding 3:** Of the 2,261 male and female inmates early released in 1999 and 2000 due to the jail cap, only 1,242 (or 55%) were released into either a Sheriff-run program or a Probation-run program. While the Probation Department arranges for community coordination of medical, mental health, social services, housing, and oversight benefits for the inmates who are released into Probation-run programs (including Sheriff's Parole), not all inmates are released into Probation-run programs.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department's responses and the Probation Department's responses as its response. The Sheriff's Department responded primarily to the first sentence of the finding while the Probation Department responded only to the second sentence.

**Response to Finding 3:** The Sheriff's Department agrees partially with the finding.

There were actually 2,556 inmates released early during 1999 and 2000. It is true that 1,242 (49%) were released to programs administered by either the Sheriff or Probation. There is an

implication in this Finding that the other inmates were simply released to the street, which is not the case.

During 2000, which is the first full year of operating under the court-ordered male cap, 54% of the 1,137 male inmates released early were placed in Sheriff's and Probation's alternative programs. The remaining 46% were all released to another agency or institution (INS, State Parole, other County). No male inmates were early released "to the street."

The female inmate cap is governed by an earlier and separate court order. During 2000, 83 female inmates were early released into alternative sentencing programs, while 60 were released "to the street."

Although the Sheriff's Department mission does not include providing social services to inmates who are living in their own homes and serving their sentences in community release programs, such inmates may avail themselves of any of the same services for which they are eligible that are provided by various county, state, and federal agencies or non-profit organizations to any other eligible person living within the community.

**Response to Finding 3:** The Probation Department agrees with the finding that "...not all inmates are released into Probation-run programs."

The two jail release programs operated by the Probation Department are County Parole and Electronic Monitoring. Electronic Monitoring is actually a "stricter" level of service than parole and could be expanded. The resources to do an expanded parole process to relieve overcrowding at the jail would require almost daily Parole Board reviews. Currently the Parole Board meets once every two weeks. Should the parole process be expanded at the jail by having more frequent Parole Board reviews, the increased workload generated by the action would require additional probation officers to supervise the higher caseloads.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:**

**Recommendation 3:** The Sheriff's Department should model early release decisions, when they are necessary, on the Sheriff's Parole process. This will take significantly more personnel resources than the current early release procedures but may ultimately result in less social and economic costs to the County.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 3:** The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

To utilize the Sheriff's Parole assessment procedure for all inmates eligible for early release would be an unnecessary use of valuable staff resources. Any supposed "social and economic costs to the County" in not implementing this recommendation have not been defined, specified or documented.

One of the priorities of the current early release program is not just to reduce Main Jail population, but also to insure to the extent possible that those inmates released early from their sentences are not a significant risk to the community. The Sheriff's Parole process is

essentially focused on only those inmates who do not meet the established criteria for other alternative programs. Basically this means those with a history of felony charges and elements of violence in their criminal histories.

The purpose of the parole process is to subject these inmates to closer scrutiny and review to determine if, in spite of their history, they would constitute a continued risk to the community if released early. This degree of review is redundant and wasteful if applied to those inmates who already meet the current criteria for alternative sentencing programs and thus have already been determined to be a lower risk to the community.

**FINDING 6:**

**Finding 6a** A Special Medical Transport to the Main Jail is required if the inmate has medical issues, regardless of the length of detention the offense requires (e.g., DUI with pacemaker, public intoxicant with asthma).

**RESPONSE:** A response from the Board of Supervisors is not required. The Sheriff's Department's response is included because Recommendation 6 does require a Board response.

**Response to Finding 6a:** The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

While the Sheriff's Department concurs that inmates with health problems requiring medical treatment may be transported to the Main Jail, the finding as stated is misleading.

A Special Medical Transport to the Main Jail is determined only after the inmate has been assessed by local hospital staff and/or it was further determined by a phone consultation with Main Jail medical staff that the inmate will require continued medical monitoring.

**Finding 6b:** Regardless of the brevity of an inmate's sentence or pre-sentence booking, a transported inmate from Santa Maria into the Main Jail for medical reasons triggers the release of an inmate from the Main Jail if the jail cap is in effect.

**RESPONSE:** A response from the Board of Supervisors is not required. The Sheriff's Department's response is included because Recommendation 6 does require a Board response.

**Response to Finding 6b:** The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

Although the Sheriff's Department concurs that early release of inmates at the Main Jail may be triggered by the transport of an inmate from the Santa Maria Branch Jail to the Main Jail, again, we would like to clarify that the Main Jail Cap is always in effect. However, unless the Main Jail population is at or above the court ordered cap and /or flex cap, early release mechanisms are not implemented.

**Finding 6c:** Special Medical Transported inmates put an additional strain on the population control and management at the Main Jail because their arrival cannot be anticipated nor their beds arranged for during daylight hours. This transport of a medically needy detainee to the Main Jail during a jail cap often triggers the concurrent release of inmates with earlier release dates from the Male and Female Honor Farms.

**RESPONSE:** A response from the Board of Supervisors is not required. The Sheriff's Department's response is included because Recommendation 6 does require a Board response.

**Response to Finding 6c:** The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

This finding appears to be a restatement of Findings 6a and 6b. The Sheriff's Department concurs that any inmate booked into the Main Jail, when the Main Jail population is at the court ordered capacity, will trigger the implementation of early release procedures.

Regardless of a jail cap, the arrival of any inmate cannot be anticipated. However, the Main Jail is always given advance notice from the Santa Maria Branch Jail staff of the number of inmates being transported. Whether or not an inmate is booked into a facility during daylight hours has no relevance as we operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, as does our contract medical provider.

**RECOMMENDATION 6:**

Recommendation 6: Hire medically trained professionals at the Santa Maria Jail to allow medically needy inmates to stay up to 96 hours in the Santa Maria Jail.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 6:** The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable.

This issue was addressed during the negotiations for the current medical contract with PHS (the medical provider for Sheriff's Custody). We determined such service to be cost prohibitive.

**FINDING 8:**

Finding 8a: Even if the subsequent emergency medical treatment of the inmate moved after the 9-1-1 calls is deemed to be unnecessary by the medical staff at Marian Hospital, emergency medical costs are borne by the Sheriff's Department, and, ultimately, the taxpayers of Santa Barbara County.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 8a:** The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

This finding is an inaccurate and misleading statement. There are no unnecessary emergency medical calls to 9-1-1. The responding medical personnel (County Fire and AMR), not jail staff, determine whether an inmate must be transported to a hospital via ambulance. Inmates whose medical needs have been reviewed via phone calls to PHS and are deemed to be in need of immediate but non life-threatening medical treatment are transported to the hospital for further review using Sheriff's personnel. Again, cost is not an overriding consideration for determining appropriate medical care for inmates.

Finding 8b: Medically untrained personnel cannot discern many inmate health issues (for example, HIV, TB, lice, etc.). These undetected medical conditions are a potential hazard to the health of Sheriff's personnel and other inmates. In addition to the Jail Deputies, all persons involved in all the Sheriff's Transports (regular and Special)

from the Santa Maria Jail to the Main Jail are exposed to the detected and undetected health issues of inmates during the hours in transport.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 8b:** The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

We agree that undetected medical conditions may be a potential hazard to the health of Sheriff's personnel and other inmates. However, the risk of exposure to communicable diseases is not limited to transports from the Santa Maria Branch Jail to the Main Jail. This risk occurs on a daily basis for each and every officer involved in the detention of inmates.

In compliance with Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations Section 1207, trained correction officers medically screen all inmates booked into the Santa Barbara County Jail. This screening includes, but is not limited to, medical and mental health problems, developmental disabilities, and communicable diseases. Although, inmates may occasionally withhold information during the screening process, every effort is made to assess the medical/mental health needs of the inmate and provide for appropriate care, as well as appropriate cautionary measures to prevent spread of communicable disease.

Finding 8c: There is potential financial liability to the County for inmate health issues that are unrecognized and, hence, untreated.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 8c:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

In fact, every aspect of the care and custody of inmates involves potential financial liability.

**RECOMMENDATION 8:**

Recommendation 8: Nursing staff should be hired and stationed in the Santa Maria Jail, on a schedule compliant with California Medical Association standards for Type II Jail Facilities. The nursing staff could administer pharmaceuticals and identify and treat non-critical medical needs, for the health of all professionals and detainees at the Santa Maria Jail.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 8:** The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted and not reasonable.

The Santa Maria Branch Jail is not a Type II Jail Facility. The Sheriff's Department is in full compliance with Title 15 CCR Section 1200 (Responsibility for Health Care Services). The issue of on-site medical care at this facility has been addressed (see Response to Recommendation 6).

**FINDING 9:**

Finding 9: The Santa Maria Jail facility has sufficient space for a nurse's station.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 9:** The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

The Sheriff's Department is unable to determine the criteria the Grand Jury used in determining there is sufficient space at the Santa Maria Branch Jail for a nurse's station. Title 24 CCR Section 470A.2.12 regulates space requirements for Medical Examination Rooms. The Santa Maria Branch Jail is so crowded that a closet had to be remodeled so that the Corrections Lieutenant could have a small private office to conduct confidential business and counseling without being overheard by inmates or the public.

**RECOMMENDATION 9:**

**Recommendation 9:** The cost of providing nursing capability at the Santa Maria Jail should be analyzed against the costs of the Special Medical Transports, AMR responses, and Marian Hospital emergency visits. The potential health risks to inmates and staff and the possibility of financial liability should also be factored into this analysis.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 9:** The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

As stated in Response to Recommendation 6, this issue was addressed during the negotiations for the current medical contract with PHS (the medical provider for Sheriff's Department Custody), and it was determined to be cost prohibitive.

**FINDING 14:**

**Finding 14a:** Restating the finding of the 1999-2000 Grand Jury, the roof of the latrine at the Male Honor Farm is termite-infested and has dry rot.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the following response:

**Response to Finding 14a:** The Board of Supervisors disagrees with the finding. The finding may have been true when the Grand Jury inspected the facility. However, according to the General Services Department, as of August 13, 2001 the roof has been replaced. The entire project will be completed by August 31, 2001.

**Finding 14b:** There is frequent and heavy condensation on the interior of windows of the Male Honor Farm.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the following response:

**Response to Finding 14b:** The Board of Supervisors disagrees with the finding. The finding may have been true when the Grand Jury inspected the facility. However, according to the General Services Department, as of August 13, 2001 a new exhaust system has been installed which will prevent the buildup of condensation in the latrine area. The entire project will be completed by August 31, 2001.

**Finding 14c:** The tunnel between the Male Honor Farm and the Main Jail is inadequately ventilated.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the following response:

**Response to Finding 14c:** The Board of Supervisors disagrees with the finding.

While this was true six months ago, General Services Maintenance personnel fixed the ventilation problem earlier this year when the large exhaust fan servicing the tunnel was repaired.

Finding 14d: The passive solar panels used to heat water at the Male Honor Farm are in need of restoration or replacement.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the following response:

**Response to Finding 14d:** The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.

The solar panels were removed as a result of the latrine reconstruction project. The solar panels on the Honor Farm roof will be reconnected (restored) when the latrine project is completed. As explained by the General Services Department: The County does not own these solar panels; they are on a 20-year lease/purchase contract which has 5 years remaining to be fully paid off. The vendor checks the panels monthly and the contract includes free maintenance. Any problems with these panels are reported to the vendor for immediate repair.

**RECOMMENDATION 14:**

Recommendation 14: Correct by repair, retrofitting, or replacement all of the facility problems listed in Findings 14a, 14b, 14c, and 14d.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted a combination of the Sheriff's Department response and the General Services Department response as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 14:** The recommendation has been partially implemented and will be fully implemented by August 31, 2001.

The County is currently completing a total reconstruction of the Honor Farm latrine. This includes replacing the roof and ventilation system. This repair is expected to be complete by August 31, 2001. General Services fixed the ventilation fan in the tunnel early this year.

The solar panels have been removed due to the reconstruction and will be reconnected when the construction is complete. The vendor owning the solar panels conducts monthly inspections and all requests for repair are reported to the vendor.

**FINDING 16:**

Finding 16a: Substance abuse often results in physiological medical conditions, in addition to psychological conditions, and so requires the professional services of a medical doctor as well as a psychologist.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the response of the Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Services (ADMHS) Department as its response.

**Response to Finding 16a:** ADMHS disagrees partially with this finding. Substance abusers typically do require the attention of medical doctors for conditions directly related to their substance abuse (AIDS, hepatitis, bronchitis, etc.) as well as other medical conditions. However, their psychological needs are best addressed by a variety of mental health and substance abuse professionals, not only by psychologists.

Finding 16b: The La Morada facility is located some distance from the centralized medical facilities at the Main Jail and there are no medical services available at the La Morada Female Honor Farm. Because of the lack of medical care at La Morada, no woman with any medical conditions (e.g., asthma, diabetes, allergies, sensitivity to bee stings, etc.) is eligible for placement at the La Morada Female Honor Farm facility even though she might otherwise qualify for, and benefit from, such classification and therapeutic programming.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 16b:** The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

We would like to clarify that the medical restrictions placed on inmates housed at the La Morada facility only include medical conditions that are potentially life-threatening if not treated immediately. For example, an inmate diagnosed with diabetes could be housed at La Morada if her condition did not require regular insulin injection.

While the inmates at La Morada, (note: this means "safe haven" in Spanish) do not have on-site medical care, they are transported to the Main Jail for non-emergency physician visits and sick calls.

Finding 16c: As a result of La Morada's distance from the medical facilities at the Main Jail, a smaller percentage of County women detainees have the option of Honor Farm placement and therapeutic programming than do their male counterparts.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 16c:** The Sheriff's Department agrees partially with the finding.

It is true that, due to the distance from medical facilities at the Main Jail, a smaller percentage of sentenced female inmates qualify for housing at the female honor farm. However, neither of the minimum-security facilities is considered to be a therapeutic programming facility. Inmate Services also offers a variety of vocational, educational, and counseling programs to inmates housed at the Main Jail.

Finding 16d: Federal legislation mandates equality in the administration of male and female honor farm detention facilities in the same county.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 16d:** The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

Actually, state legislation regulates county detention facilities. The Sheriff's Department is in compliance with California Penal Code Section 4029 (equal facilities and programs for prisoners of both sexes).



**RECOMMENDATION 16:**

**Recommendation 16:** The stringent medical qualifications for females should be removed for Female Honor Farm classification. This would result in more placements into the Female Honor Farm, allow more therapeutic rehabilitation of County female substance abusers and, at the same time, release beds in the Main Jail for other women detainees. This may mean identifying a different facility. (See Recommendation 19b.)

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 16:** The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented by September 30, 2001.

In September 2000, upon the suggestion of a staff member, Custody Operations assigned a work group to study the feasibility of relocating La Morada (female) inmates to the male Honor Farm. The work group determined the concept was feasible and Sheriff's administration approved the plan. The relocation is expected to be complete by September 30, 2001. Once the relocation is complete, the qualifications for housing at the Female Honor Farm will be the same as the qualifications for housing at the Male Honor Farm. Throughout their visits to custody facilities, the Grand Jury was made aware of these plans.

**FINDING 20:**

**Finding 20:** There is more need for substance-abuse programming for County women than can be delivered at the current Female Honor Farm facility.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the response of the Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Services (ADMHS) Department as its response.

**Response to Finding 20:** ADMHS agrees with this finding. Substance abuse programming needs at the current (and future) Female Honor Farm facilities are limited by available funding, not by inherent limitations of the facilities.

**RECOMMENDATION 20:**

**Recommendation 20a:** Designate part of the first three-year's funding from Proposition 36 to additional women's substance abuse treatment programs, modeled on existing Sheriff's Department programs.

**RESPONSE:** This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable.

The Substance Abuse Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (Proposition 36) has a very broad target population. The Proposition mandates probation and drug treatment for defendants convicted of "non-violent drug possession offense(s)." The intent of the Proposition is to divert these non-violent drug offenders from incarceration to community based treatment programs. The intent is not to fund treatment for persons in jail due to substance abuse problems.

This response is based on the Probation Department's response, attached, which is mislabeled in their document as a response to recommendation 19b.

**Recommendation 20b:** Once the Female Honor Farm is moved to the Main Jail campus, the La Morada facility should be rededicated to serve the therapeutic needs of women diverted from jail using the funding of Proposition 36. As with any County program, the effectiveness of the programming should be assessed based on County performance measurements, using appropriate behavior modification criteria.

**RESPONSE:** This recommendation will not be implemented because of other needs for this facility. In order to implement the Grand Jury's recommendation 38, "Build a reception area in the Coroner's office" the Sheriff's Department plans to move the toxicology lab to a portion of the La Morada facility. The balance of the La Morada facility will be used to relieve significant overcrowding at the Sheriff's main administration building.

**FINDING 21:**

Finding 21: Proposition 36 programs and the associated facility, by statute, must be administered by a qualified agency other than the Sheriff's Department.

**RESPONSE:** The Board disagrees wholly with the finding. Instructions sent to counties by the State of California regarding implementation of Proposition 36 indicated that any county department could be selected as the lead agency to administer the local county program. Also, there is no specific facility associated with local Proposition 36 administration.

**RECOMMENDATION 21:**

Recommendation 21: The Probation Department should administer Proposition 36 funds in the County.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 21:** This recommendation will not be implemented for the following reason. On February 13, 2001, the Board of Supervisors designated the Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Department as the lead agency with responsibility to administer Proposition 36 funds received by the County. At the same meeting the Board acted to form a multi-agency, collaborative Policy Council to advise on the use of funding received by the County for implementation of Proposition 36. The Probation Department is a part of the policy council charged with designing the implementation plan.

**FINDING 22:**

Finding 22: Office efficiency of the [Carpinteria] sub-station is compromised by the inefficient design of the facility.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 22:** We disagree partially with this finding. We agree that additional improvements can be made which will improve the efficient use of the workspace, however we do not agree that efficiency has been compromised by the current design. The interior space of the station, although certainly not ideal, does allow for the efficient running of the station.

**RECOMMENDATION 22:**

Recommendation 22: Management should act on its many ideas to improve office efficiency, which can be implemented at reasonable cost by better partitioning of space.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 22:** The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented to the best of our ability within the next fiscal year.

The Sheriff's Department leases the Carpinteria Station from the City of Carpinteria as part of our contract for law enforcement services. The City of Carpinteria must approve changes to the building. Since 1992, we have made several improvements to the interior space of the building.

We have spent the last several months analyzing the workspace in the station and several changes and improvements are already planned which will expand some office space, relieve some of the congestion in the booking area, and create additional storage. However, our ability to implement certain improvements are limited by several factors. The physical plant structure prohibits certain changes without incurring extraordinary costs. For example, we have already examined the possibility of reducing the size of the interview room and we have decided this is not a viable option due to the placement of the multiple doors and air conditioning/venting systems.

Our ability to remodel the interior space of the building is limited by the costs associated with the labor and materials needed to make the improvements. We must carefully examine each suggested improvement for its cost effectiveness and feasibility. We intend to implement some reasonable changes during FY 2001-2002 as our resources and funding allow.

**FINDING 23:**

Finding 23a: Both emergency and non-emergency Sheriff's Department back-up personnel are dispatched by helicopter from Santa Ynez, and land at the New Cuyama airstrip.

**RESPONSE:** A response from the Board of Supervisors is not required. The Sheriff's Department's response is included because Recommendation 23 does require a Board response.

**Response to Finding 23a:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding. However, the dispatching of emergency personnel via helicopter to the Cuyama area occurs infrequently.

Finding 23b: At the New Cuyama airstrip, there are no facilities to refuel or even a safe place to store a cache of emergency aircraft fuel. Pilots low on fuel after a long mountain patrol have to go to Santa Maria or Santa Ynez, a distant and possibly dangerous diversion that limits patrol time and increases operational costs. A small concrete helipad can easily be built on ample County property immediately adjacent to the New Cuyama Sheriff's Department facility.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 23b:** The Sheriff's Department partially disagrees with this finding. While having a refueling and landing site near the Cuyama sub-station would be an asset to our air operations, the placement and construction of such assets will have to go through State and local permitting processes.

**RECOMMENDATION 23:**

Recommendation 23a: A simple 20 x 20 ft. (or smaller) concrete pad, requiring approximately \$1000 for materials (a frame is already in place), should be built.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff’s Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 23a:** This recommendation requires further analysis. The construction of a designated landing area for our helicopters would be a benefit to our air operations. However, a permitting process is required through CalTrans. A cost analysis and permitting process will be conducted within six months.

The framed area referred to in the report is not for a designated landing area.

Recommendation 23b: Fuel should be stored at the Sheriff’s Department facility, in an existing small above-ground tank located near the proposed pad, and hosed to the helicopter as needed. It can be replenished occasionally from jerrycans brought from the Santa Ynez home base.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff’s Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 23b:** This recommendation requires further analysis. The Sheriff’s Department is in possession of a 300-gallon fuel tank that could be placed at the Cuyama Station. However, prior to storing jet fuel at this location, approval and permitting from County Fire will be required. The Sheriff’s Department will conduct a needs assessment and site survey on this recommendation and recommendation 23a, and report back to the Grand Jury within six months.

**FINDING 24:**

Finding 24: The Sobering Center is an excellent, innovative program to get drunks off the street without the expense and trouble of taking them to jail. The paid civilian staff is comprised of former offenders who know how to relate to their clients. Of note: A special patrol program instituted by the new Santa Barbara Police Chief has put in place a law-enforcement detail which focuses on this area only. These officers, as their sole responsibility, will become well acquainted with bar owners, bartenders, patrons, and habitual offenders, and the bar personnel will become acquainted with the officers to reduce alcohol-related problems in the community.

**RESPONSE:** No response is required from the County. This finding is included as it relates to Recommendation 24, which does require a County response.

**RECOMMENDATION 24:**

Recommendation 24: The Board of Supervisors should consider a similar contract facility for Isla Vista.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff’s Department’s response to Recommendation 25b, “requires further analysis” as its response. This analysis will be completed within six months.

**FINDING 25:**

Finding 25: The Isla Vista Foot Patrol is a very well managed part of the Sheriff’s Department operating effectively in a difficult and special environment.

**RESPONSE:** A response from the Board of Supervisors is not required. The Sheriff’s Department’s response is included because Recommendation 25b does require a Board response.

**Response to Finding 25:** We agree with this finding.

**RECOMMENDATION 25:**

**Recommendation 25a:** The Sheriff's Department should increase its efforts to obtain more cooperation with UCSB campus police and administration. UCSB provides most of the campus policing needs, but tends to treat problems off-campus as outside of its responsibility, especially when a UCSB student is involved in an illegal activity and is not a victim.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 25a:** This recommendation has been partially implemented.

The Sheriff's Department, UCSB Police, and Administration have worked together very effectively since the Isla Vista Foot Patrol was created in 1970 and in general, cooperation has been excellent. Representatives from both agencies sit on several common committees dealing with public safety issues in Isla Vista. We enjoy frequent support from University officials for our efforts in Isla Vista, and they played an integral role in effectively reducing the violence and other problems which have been associated with the annual Halloween festivities.

During the last year, we have expanded our activities with the University. We have been jointly participating in a research project concerning alcohol-related incidents in Isla Vista, and we sit on several joint committees related to public safety issues in Isla Vista.

The issue of extending University jurisdiction for crimes committed off-campus by UCSB students is difficult and complex. UCSB is actively working on this issue, and we will continue to work with and encourage UCSB officials to hold students responsible for crimes they commit off-campus.

One area in which we will continue our efforts is in the development of a Cooperative Law Enforcement Agreement with UCSB. Since 1970, we have made several attempts to execute a written agreement with UCSB for staffing and operating the Isla Vista Foot Patrol, however UCSB has not acted on our requests. We will submit another draft of a written agreement to UCSB during FY 2001/2002.

**Recommendation 25b:** A sobering center, similar to the one in downtown Santa Barbara, would be a more cost-effective way of detaining alcohol-challenged students rather than routinely taking them to the Main Jail. Such a location should be established in this densely populated area.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 25b:** This recommendation will be studied further.

Although the Sobering Center in downtown Santa Barbara is functioning well, we have some concerns about the feasibility of such a facility in Isla Vista. Many of the individuals arrested for public intoxication in Isla Vista are not appropriate candidates for a sobering center environment. Some are so intoxicated that they require medical treatment and hospital

clearance prior to any incarceration. Others are arrested after also being involved in physical confrontations or other crimes. In addition, we are concerned about the security of a sobering center in Isla Vista, especially when associates may attempt to remove an intoxicated individual, or when a detainee chooses to walk away, causing a greater drain on our already limited law enforcement resources in Isla Vista.

Unlike the City of Santa Barbara, a sobering center would probably not be cost effective for the Sheriff's Department or the County. Since we do not pay booking fees to ourselves, the only financial benefit would possibly be in the time saved by Deputies by reduced jail transports. This timesaving may be offset by the additional workload involved in maintaining security at the sobering center and locating intoxicated individuals who walk away. Capital and operating costs of a sobering center in Isla Vista are also a concern.

The concept of a sobering center in Isla Vista warrants further study, including an examination of the arrests for public intoxication to determine what percentage of these individuals may be eligible for a sobering center and what impact this would have financially and on jail overcrowding.

**FINDING 29:**

Finding 29a: The Superior Court of Santa Barbara County in Lompoc is currently constructing new Court Holding cells. These cells will be completed in 2001 and serve the short-term detention needs for inmates before and after their court hearing at the County Superior Court in Lompoc.

**RESPONSE:** No response is required from the County. This finding is included as it relates to Recommendation 29 which does require a County response.

Finding 29b: The seven cells currently used by the Superior Court at the Lompoc City Jail will no longer be available for Court use when the new Court Holding cells are completed and the current MOU expires.

**RESPONSE:** No response is required from the County. This finding is included as it relates to Recommendation 29 which does require a County response.

**RECOMMENDATION 29:**

Recommendation 29: The County should enter into a new MOU regarding the Lompoc City Jail to continue to receive jail services for

- County Sheriff's Deputy local arrests (inmates who would otherwise be transported and housed at the Main Jail), and for
- Main Jail and Santa Maria inmates who would otherwise be early released when additional housing is needed at the Main Jail due to the jail cap.

**RESPONSE:** The first part of this recommendation, holding Sheriff's Department local arrests in the Lompoc City Jail would require further analysis and discussions between the Sheriff's Department and the City of Lompoc to see if any agreement could be reached that would be mutually beneficial. This analysis will be completed within six months.

The second part of this recommendation, using the Lompoc City Jail for long-term housing of jail inmates will not be implemented because it is not reasonable. The Lompoc City Jail, like the

County's Santa Maria Branch Jail, is a Type I facility that cannot be used for Type II inmate housing.

**FINDING 30:**

Finding 30a: Security issues at the Figueroa Street Court Holding facility, particularly in the sallyport area, continue.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 30a:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Construction of an enclosed off-loading area at the Figueroa Court Holding facility is scheduled to begin in mid-July and should be completed by the first of August. Inmates will then step off a bus or van into a covered passageway. The passageway will secure the entrance and exit of the court compound and prevent the public from seeing the inmates.

Finding 30b: There is no emergency generator backing up the electrical system (hence ventilation system) in the facility.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 30b:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

**RECOMMENDATION 30:**

Recommendation 30: An automatic emergency generator should be installed to serve the Figueroa Street Court Holding facility.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 30:** The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

There are no plans in the General Services 2000/2005 Five Year Facilities Maintenance Master Plan book to install a generator at the Figueroa Street court compound. General Services, after consulting with the Sheriff's Department, has agreed to install adequate emergency lighting. The lighting will be of the type that is battery operated and activates when there is a power failure. Lighting would be available for at least 1½ hours. General Services will install emergency lighting in the holding facility within 3 months of this response.

Without a generator, there still is no ventilation. Taking this into consideration, the Sheriff's Transportation Unit has a contingency plan. When the source of the outage is determined, we can better estimate how long we will be without power. At that time we will decide whether to keep the inmates at the compound or return them to the Main Jail.

It should be noted that any power outage affecting the holding facility would likely affect the courts, causing the courts to close operation. In that case, all inmates would be transferred back to the Main Jail, rather than retained in the holding facility.

**FINDING 31:**

**Finding 31a:** Transporting the majority of County inmates into the downtown area of the largest city in the County for arraignments, sentencing, and court hearings makes security concerns (inmate escapes, public access, privacy from media) more acute.

**RESPONSE:** A response from the Board of Supervisors is not required. The Sheriff's Department's response is included because Recommendation 31 does require a Board response.

**Response to Finding 31a:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

It should be noted, however, than any movement of inmates outside of a secure jail facility creates security concerns. This concern is not confined to "the largest city in the County."

**Finding 31b:** Escorting chained inmates (many of whom have limited English language skills) through the non-English-speaking tourists and visitors at the Courthouse renders the Sheriff's deputies oral directives less effective, and could endanger the public, the inmates, or the Sheriff's personnel.

**RESPONSE:** A response from the Board of Supervisors is not required. The Sheriff's Department's response is included because Recommendation 31 does require a Board response.

**Response to Finding 31b:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

As stated above, any movement of inmates outside of a secure jail facility, particularly into non-secure public areas, is inherently risky.

**RECOMMENDATION 31.**

**Recommendation 31:** An alternate system of video arraignment, based on models adopted in other counties, between the Main Jail and the judges should be considered to reduce the volume of inmates transported to the downtown Santa Barbara facility.

**RESPONSE:** The recommendation requires further analysis. Any video arraignment mechanism will require agreement among the Sheriff's Department, District Attorney, Public Defender and the Superior Court which is not now a county entity. While video arraignment may reduce inmate transportation, there are also trial-related issues to be considered.

The need for agreement among the above named parties is illustrated by the Sheriff's Department's response which, in part, was as follows: The Sheriff's Department is in favor of video arraignment and has been for years. In January 1999, Custody Operations formed a work group to study video arraignment and make recommendations for implementation. The group was comprised of senior officers from the jail and the Bail Review Unit Supervisor. The group visited jails that were using the system and contacted vendors to get an estimate of the equipment cost and installation charges. At that time, the cost of purchasing units for Santa Barbara, Santa Maria and Lompoc was approximately \$150,000. When the information was presented to representatives from Superior Court and the Public Defender's Office, they expressed little support for the system. Re-review of the proposal, which will include potential staffing costs as well as savings, will be completed within six months.

**FINDING 32:**



Finding 32a: This facility [the East Wing of the Santa Barbara County Courthouse], directly above the District Attorney's Office, is well-located, well-built, and has striking architectural features.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the General Services response as its response.

**Response to Finding 32a:** The General Services Department agrees with this finding.

Finding 32b: The cost to convert this space would be less than the cost to purchase and build a new downtown office facility.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the General Services response as its response.

**Response to Finding 32b:** The General Services Department agrees with this finding.

The Sheriff's Department is still actively using some of this jail facility as a court staging area for inmates. Any project to renovate the wing would require an appropriate relocation of this function. The County CIP (Capital Improvement Projects Plan) contains an unfunded project to expand and renovate the Santa Barbara Street wing of the Courthouse to provide needed office space. The estimate in the CIP of \$2,850,000 does not include relocation of the Sheriff's court staging function.

**RECOMMENDATION 32:**

Recommendation 32: The Board of Supervisors should consider this well-located, abandoned jail for possible conversion to other Court-related real estate purposes.

**RESPONSE:** The recommendation has been implemented.

The East Wing of the Santa Barbara Courthouse includes four floors above the current District Attorney Offices, which occupy the basement and first and second floors of the building. As indicated in the response to Finding 32b, one floor of the old jail is still used as a court staging area for inmates. This function would have to be relocated, the elevator upgraded, and old jail cells removed, before the East Wing could be used for office space. The project to do this work is shown as a planned, but yet unfunded, project in the County's 2001-06 Capital Improvement Program.

**FINDING 33:**

Finding 33a: The four-seat helicopters currently in operation by the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department cannot accommodate a stretcher, or a rescue of more than two ambulatory people. They do not have a second engine to assure safe transport of a heavy load for any distance, or to fly safely over water to the Channel Islands.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 33a:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Finding 33b: The smaller helicopters carry only a small amount of fuel and refueling locations in the County are limited.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 33b:** Respondent agrees with the finding, but would like to include the following information: The fuel capacity of the current helicopters is adequate when the pilot and observer are the only passengers, on routine observer missions. When additional persons or loads are in the aircraft, then loss of range due to weight becomes an issue. A helicopter designed to carry more passengers and/or larger loads would extend the time between refueling, as it could carry the weight of additional fuel.

In regards to limited refueling locations in the County, there is fuel available at Santa Barbara, Santa Ynez, and Santa Maria airports. When operations occur in the Cuyama Valley, the nearest refueling location is in Santa Maria. This requires a 40-minute flight. The flight crews are very cognizant of fuel consumption, and plan their operations accordingly.

**RECOMMENDATION 33:**

**Recommendation 33:** The County should analyze the feasibility of purchasing and operating a larger helicopter. This would enhance the Aviation Bureau's ability to deliver emergency responders and equipment to back County rescues, as well as increase the range and carrying capacity of the helicopters.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 33:** The recommendation to analyze the feasibility of purchasing and operating a larger helicopter has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The Sheriff's Department has identified an Eurocopter EC135 helicopter as meeting the needs of our department and the citizens of Santa Barbara County. A helicopter of this type would be a true rescue helicopter that could carry 7-8 persons, and hoist rescuers and injured personnel. It would be able to safely fly water rescues, and could accommodate stretchers for injured persons. This would be of value operationally as a tactical team or group of rescuers could be flown to anywhere in the County, including the Channel Islands. The cost of this helicopter is \$ 3.8 million. Efforts have been underway for six months to identify potential funding sources.

**FINDING 34:**

**Finding 34a:** The location of the hangar at the Santa Ynez Airport is in a congested area. Emergency dispatch is compromised in the present location.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 34a:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding, except that while the emergency dispatch of helicopters from this location is not optimum, it does not compromise our abilities to respond.

**Finding 34b:** The County owns land at an uncongested area at the east end of the Santa Ynez Airport.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 34b:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

**RECOMMENDATION 34:**

Recommendation 34: The County should consider building a hangar on the County-owned land at the end of the airport. This may reduce response time to a critical emergency. Compare the cost of leased facility now used with inexpensive Quonset hut construction.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 34b:** The recommendation for the County of Santa Barbara to build a hangar at the east end of the Santa Ynez Airport requires further analysis.

The Sheriff's Department agrees that having our hangar in close proximity to the launching area for helicopters would decrease the time it takes to get the helicopter airborne in an emergency situation.

However, the manner in which this hangar is built requires further analysis. A study to determine the most cost effective means of constructing the hangar in a timely manner will be conducted within six months. It is possible that it may be more fiscally attractive to have a private vendor or the Airport Authority construct and/or manage the hangars. These are issues that will require fiscal review.

**FINDING 35:**

Finding 35: The Sheriff's Department communications at the Santa Ynez Airport are not cabled to the County system, limiting the data exchange of the Aviation Bureau with Sheriff's and other departments of the County government.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 35:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

**RECOMMENDATION 35:**

Recommendation 35: The Sheriff's computers at the Santa Ynez Airport should be linked to the County system. This should be done after a decision is made about relocating the hangar. (See Recommendation 34.)

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 35:** The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable. While the Sheriff's Department agrees that the computers at the Aviation Bureau at the Santa Ynez Airport should be linked to the Sheriff's Department and County computer networks, this recommendation will not be implemented due to the high cost. The current estimate to link these computers as recommended is \$22,000, with an on-going annual fee of \$15,000 per year. With the rapid technological advances in the area of computers and communications, it is hoped that a lower cost alternative will be available in the not too distant future. Until that time, the benefit of linking these computers does not justify the expense.

**FINDING 36:**

Finding 36: The autopsies performed for the Federal Bureau of Prisons facilities in Lompoc require substantial Sheriff-Coroner time in investigating, transporting, and clearance.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 36:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

**RECOMMENDATION 36:**

Recommendation 36: Federal Bureau of Prisons officials should be made aware of all costs associated with these Prison autopsy services, and agreement should be reached to provide full reimbursement to the County for all costs incurred in these services.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 36:** The recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department has already taken steps to improve this situation. We have prepared an agreement between the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department for autopsy services. This agreement was recently submitted to the Bureau of Prisons for review by their attorneys. Until such time that they approve this agreement, they have informally agreed to timely reimburse the County for all costs incurred in performing any autopsies involving any deaths occurring at the FCI-Lompoc facility.

**FINDING 37:**

Finding 37: Staff members are processing an ever-increasing number of drug tests with an extremely good turn-around time.

**RESPONSE:** A response from the Board of Supervisors is not required. The Sheriff's Department's response is included because Recommendation 37 does require a Board response.

**Response to Finding 37:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

**RECOMMENDATION 37:**

Recommendation 37: The Sheriff-Coroner should consider the addition of a third toxicologist to accommodate the County's drug-testing needs, so that there is no compromise of the accuracy, efficiency, and timeliness of the test results.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 37:** The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable. The responsibility for the County Toxicology lab was taken over by the Sheriff's Department in 1991. Its sole purpose was to provide services primarily for toxicology analysis for Coroner Investigations. Based on the qualifications of our past and present Forensic Toxicologists, as well as the capabilities of our lab equipment to handle a larger work load, our mission traversed into handling drug toxicology analysis' for our own Operations Division as well as for the needs of the Probation Department. However, with the quality of our analysis, coupled with quick turn around times, below competitive costs and no

charges incurred for court time, several other law enforcement agencies sought us out to handle their drug testing needs as well. Needless to say our small little lab became overrun with requests for their services, stressing the limits of our employees and adversely effecting our budget. An additional concern developed when it became apparent that we would have problems competitively recruiting for an additional Forensic Toxicologist based on salary compared with living conditions within Santa Barbara County.

Because of our ongoing costs, staffing problems, and facility limitations, we feel that the County of Santa Barbara and its Sheriff's Department would be better served by limiting the number of requests for services to our Toxicology lab. Effective July 1, 2001, the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department is discontinuing our Toxicology Laboratory Services to all local law enforcement agencies, as well as for other non-government affiliates. We will continue to provide quality services to Departments of the County of Santa Barbara.

We believe that this action will ensure that there is no compromise to the accuracy, efficiency and timeliness of any test results.

**FINDING 38:**

Finding 38: Few visitors come to the facility to identify bodies. For those who have cause to visit the center, however, there is no private room or space for consolation.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Finding 38:** The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

**RECOMMENDATION 38:**

Recommendation 38: Build a reception area at the Coroner's office.

**RESPONSE:** The Board adopted the Sheriff's Department responses as its response.

**Response to Recommendation 38:** The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. Currently the Department is discussing plans to move the current location of the Toxicology Lab to a building directly behind the County Morgue by the end of FY2001/2002. This building is currently being used by the La Morada Women's Honor Farm. Plans have been made to move these inmates over to the Main Jail Honor Farm facility, thus freeing up county buildings for other purposes. The building in question would double the size of our current lab. This would allow the lab employees a larger work space environment complete with a locker room and computer work stations. Once the lab is moved we plan on renovating the current Coroner facility. This renovation will include doubling the size of the investigators work space, a reception area for visitors, a conference/break room for employees and a bereavement room for families to spend time with their loved ones if they choose.

Sincerely,

Joni Gray  
Chair, Board of Supervisors

Attachments: Sheriff's Department's Responses  
Probation Department's Responses  
Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Services Department Responses  
General Services Department's Responses

cc: 2000-01 Grand Jury Foreperson