

- I. 2000-2001 Grand Jury report on JUVENILE PROBATION
- II. Published April 30, 2001
- III. The goal of the juvenile probation system in Santa Barbara County is rehabilitation rather than punishment. This report examined preventive programs through multi-agency collaborations; the need for female specific probation programs; the Santa Maria Juvenile Hall expansion; facility needs at Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall; and the relationship of the Los Prietos Boys' Camp and the Tri-Counties Boot Camp with the Forest Service.
- IV. Key Grand Jury Recommendations where there is disagreement or need for follow up:

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

Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services (ADMHS), Probation, County Education Office and Social Services Response: Agencies impacted (ADMHS, Probation, County Education Office and Social Services) will conduct a further analysis of this recommendation and report to the Grand Jury within the 6 month time frame legislated and report to the Grand Jury.

2001-2002 Grand Jury comment: This response does not comply with the requirements of Section 933.05 (b) (3) of the California Penal Code in that the parameters for analysis or study are not described nor is the timeframe for the matter to be presented to the relevant decision maker identified. The maximum time allowed by law for this process is six months from the report publication date. As of January 2, 2002 no report has been received.

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

General Services Planning and Development, and Probation Response: General Services, Planning and Development, and Probation will undertake a study to determine the feasibility and report back to the Grand Jury within the 6 month time frame allowed by law.

2001-2002 Grand Jury comment: This response does not comply with the requirements of Section 933.05 (b) (3) of the California Penal Code in that the parameters for analysis or study are not described nor is the timeframe for the matter to be presented to the relevant decision maker identified. The maximum

time allowed by law for this process is six months from the report publication date. As of January 2, 2002 no report has been received.

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.

Probation and Sheriff's Department Response: Agencies involved agree this recommendation will require further analysis and will study the issue and report back to the Grand Jury within the 6 month time frame allowed by law.

2001-2002 Grand Jury comment: This response does not comply with the requirements of Section 933.05 (b) (3) of the California Penal Code in that the parameters for analysis or study are not described nor is the timeframe for the matter to be presented to the relevant decision maker identified. The maximum time allowed by law for this process is six months from the report publication date. As of January 2, 2002 no report has been received.

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).

Board of Supervisors, Probation and Sheriff's Department Response: Agencies involved agree this recommendation will require further analysis and will study the issue and report back to the Grand Jury within the 6 month time frame allowed by law.

2001-2002 Grand Jury comment: This response does not comply with the requirements of Section 933.05 (b) (3) of the California Penal Code in that the parameters for analysis or study are not described nor is the timeframe for the matter to be presented to the relevant decision maker identified. The maximum time allowed by law for this process is six months from the report publication date. As of January 2, 2002 no report has been received.

V. Synopsis:

Number of responses to recommendations required – 64

Number of responses to recommendations in which the respondent agreed with or implemented the recommendation – 29

Number of responses to recommendations in which the respondent disagreed with the recommendation – 21

Number of responses to recommendations in which the respondent requires analysis or study to finalize position – 13

Number of responses to recommendations where respondent answered as being not responsible -- 1