



MIMI DUZENSKI
Clerk of the Board

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

44 NORTH SAN JOAQUIN STREET, SUITE 627
STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA 95202
TELEPHONE: 209/468-3113
FAX: 209/468-3694

MOSES ZAPIEN
Chair
Third District

BOB ELLIOTT
Vice Chair
Fifth District

CARLOS VILLAPUDUA
First District

KATHERINE M. MILLER
Second District

CHUCK WINN
Fourth District

August 23, 2016

Honorable José L. Alva, Presiding Judge
San Joaquin County Superior Court
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 303
Stockton, CA 95202

Dear Judge Alva:

2015-2016 Grand Jury Final Report

Pursuant to Section 933.05 of the California Penal Code, please find attached the Board of Supervisors' responses to the 2015-16 Grand Jury Final Report for the following cases:

- A. San Joaquin County Registrar of Voters – Case #1503 – “Make Every Vote Count”
- B. San Joaquin County Public Defender Fees – Case #1506 – Collection of Fees from Indigent Defendants
- C. San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors – Case #1507 – Homelessness in San Joaquin County “Time for Collaboration, Commitment, and Communication”
- D. San Joaquin County Probation - Juvenile Justice Detention Facilities

If you have any additional questions regarding these responses, please contact Monica Nino, County Administrator at 468-3203.

Sincerely,

Moses Zapien, Chair
Board of Supervisors
County of San Joaquin

MZ:DW:ag

Attachment

BOS08-01



Attachment

Responses to the 2015-16 Grand Jury Final Report

A. San Joaquin County Registrar of Voters – Case #1503 – “**Make Every Vote Count**”

1.0 Counting of Ballots

Finding F1.1:

There is no documentation to verify when and by whom VBM ballots are picked up by Registrar of Voters (ROV) staff from the Postal Service.

Response to F1.1:

Agree.

Information Systems Division concurs with the Grand Jury’s finding.

Finding F1.2:

The public was not informed for 328 days after election certification about the unusually high number of late ballots from the 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Election, June 3, 2014.

Response to F1.2:

Agree.

Information Systems Division concurs with the Grand Jury’s finding. The Information systems Division acknowledges that a press release was not generated notifying news organizations of the large number of VBM ballots received by San Joaquin County the day after the 2014 Gubernatorial Primary Election. It should be noted that the late receipt of VBM ballots was fully disclosed to the Secretary of State’s Office on June 4, 2014 (the same day the late VBM ballots were received).

Recommendation 1.1:

By September 1, 2016, ROV develop written policies and procedures for daily tracking of the VBM ballots picked up at the post office. Tracking should include who picked up the ballots, when they were picked up, how many were received and when they arrived at the ROV office.

Response to R1.1:

This recommendation has been implemented.

The recommended policies and procedures for the daily tracking of the VBM ballots picked up at the post office by the ROV staff were developed in April 2016. A complete copy of the procedures and associated forms were provided to the Grand Jury on April 21, 2016. The new procedures and associated forms were fully utilized by the ROV staff during the 2016 Gubernatorial Primary Election (held on June 7, 2016).

However, it should be noted that the day after the 2016 Gubernatorial Primary Election (June 8, 2016), ROV received over 1,400 VBM ballots that were post marked on June 7 (Election Day). **This is the same situation experienced by San Joaquin County in 2014 when ROV received 799 VBM ballots from the post office the day after the election.** Even with ROV's implementation of detailed record keeping at the behest of the Grand Jury, the County still has no control over the timeliness of the VBM processing/delivery by the post office. Fortunately, the Legislature now allows ROVs statewide to process VBMs postmarked on or before Election Day, as long as the VBMs are received by ROV within three days of the election. This change in California Election Code became effective on January 1, 2015; a direct response by the Legislature to the late delivery of VBMs to ROVs that occurred across California.

Recommendation 1.2:

By September 1, 2016, ROV develop and implement a written policy to publicize election discrepancies before election certification.

Response to R1.2:

Agree.

To determine if a "best practice" already exists for publicizing election discrepancies, San Joaquin County canvassed ROVs statewide. San Joaquin County was unable to find any county in California that has a written policy addressing this matter.

San Joaquin County ROV strives to be exceptionally transparent during each and every election. With that continuing goal in mind, ROV will develop a written policy to publicize all noteworthy election discrepancies before the certification of an election. The new written policy will be developed and implemented by September 1, 2016.

2.0 Security of Ballots

Finding F2.1:

The ballots were moved from a secured 24-hour surveillance facility to a less secure location.

Response to F2.1:

Agree.

Information Systems Division concurs with the Grand Jury's finding. The Stockton Metropolitan Airport warehouse (the warehouse temporarily used by the ROV) is not equipped with either a security system or camera system. However, it should be noted that unrestricted access to the Stockton Metropolitan Airport warehouse does require a background check and the Airport grounds (including the area surrounding the Airport warehouse) are patrolled 24-hours per day.

Also, it is important to note that the ballots for the June 3, 2014 election were moved from a warehouse previously leased by ROV, to an interim warehouse facility located on the Stockton Metropolitan Airport grounds nearly a year after the June 2014 election process was completed. The ROV stored election materials at the Airport warehouse facility for approximately 10 months while the new ROV warehouse was prepared for occupancy (installation of a security system, electrical and other construction activities required for occupancy).

Finding F2.2:

The warehouse video was not viewable because the system overwrites itself every three to four months.

Response to F2.2:

Agree.

Information Systems Division concurs with the Grand Jury's finding.

Finding F2.3:

There is no documentation of material and equipment movement between ROV and the storage facilities.

Response to F2.3:

Partially Disagree.

Information Systems Division partially disagrees with the Grand Jury's finding. ROV does utilize automated asset tracking for certain equipment and materials that move between the ROV warehouse and other locations during the election process. Automated asset tracking occur each election for key election equipment and materials. For example the movement of Voter Touch Screens and the rolling boxes (used for distribution of materials) are documented via the asset tracking software during the election process. However, it is accurate to say that the movement of ROV materials and equipment outside of the election process are not documented.

Recommendation 2.1:

By September 1, 2016, ROV store all ballots and equipment in a secured location with 24-hour surveillance.

Response to R2.1:

This recommendation has been implemented.

The San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors approved a lease agreement for a new ROV warehouse in October 2015. Tenant improvements were required for the new warehouse to meet ROV's operational and security needs. The landlord made the required tenant improvements to the facility and the improvements were completed in March 2016. Tenant improvements made to the new ROV warehouse include implementation of a 24-hour video camera system that records the activities in the new warehouse, as well as installation of a monitored security alarm system. In April 2016, ROV ballots and equipment were moved from the Airport warehouse facility to the new ROV warehouse. As a result of these actions taken by the County, this Grand Jury recommendation was addressed in April 2016.

Recommendation R2.2:

By September 1, 2016, ROV develop and implement a policy to keep and store all surveillance data per canvass procedures for the storage of all ballots.

Response to R2.2:

This recommendation will be implemented by September 1, 2016.

Information Systems Division / ROV will develop and implement a policy for the retention of surveillance video related to the storage of ballots. The surveillance video that is retained will cover the critical periods in the election process. The County will retain this video for a period of time that will correspond with the retention period for the related ballots and voting materials. The new written policy will be developed and implemented by September 1, 2016.

Recommendation R2.3:

By September 1, 2016, ROV develop and implement a chain of custody for all materials brought into and removed from the storage facilities.

Response to R2.3:

This recommendation will be implemented by September 1, 2016.

For the last several years, Information Systems Division / ROV has utilized automated asset tracking to monitor the chain of custody of critical equipment and materials that move between the ROV warehouse and other locations during the elections process. As noted previously, ROV does not currently document the "chain of custody" for some election materials that move between the ROV facilities once an election is complete. San Joaquin County ROV will modify its existing chain of custody practices so that the movement of critical election materials between the ROV facilities after an election is

documented. The revised procedures will be developed and implemented by September 1, 2016.

B. San Joaquin County Public Defender Fees – Case #1506 – Collection of Fees from Indigent Defendants

1.0 Findings

Finding F1.1:

There are no established policies or procedures to assess indigent defendants’ ability to reimburse the Public Defender’s Office for court appointed counsel.

Response to F1.1:

Disagree.

There is a policy and procedure to assess fees. In March of 2010, the Department requested, and the Board of Supervisors approved R-10-95, which permitted San Joaquin County courts to assess a registration fee of up to \$50 upon appointment of counsel pursuant to Penal Code section 987.5(a.) The assessed fee was to be paid at the Office of Revenue and Recovery, a division of the Treasurer – Tax Collector. A survey of other counties’ procedures and policies also lead our Department to the generation of a flat fee, rather than an hourly rate. In August of 2010, a letter was sent to each judge, commissioner and court personnel requesting that the court assess a flat fee of \$125 for a misdemeanor case and \$175 for a felony case to every defendant who had the ability to pay. This amount included the registration fee pursuant to Penal Code section 987.5(d.) The location for payment was modified after it was determined that all fees paid by defendants for public defender services to the Office of Revenue and Recovery were to be applied to all other balances first to other county agencies before being credited to the department of the Public Defender. Other counties have also experienced this issue. For this reason, the court was notified that the location of payment was changed to the Public Defender’s Office. This procedure continued for a period of time until the court gradually stopped informing and assessing defendant’s registration fee or the flat fee. It is the intention of this Department to immediately resume the procedure by requesting that the court assess and order the indigent defendants to pay the flat fee of \$125 for a misdemeanor and \$175 for a felony to each client. The flat fee of \$50 would be payable at the Public Defenders’ office. The money collected would be tracked by the Public Defender’s fiscal staff. The Public Defender’s Office does not have the personnel to track whether every defendant has paid. The Department will monitor the ongoing assessment of the fee through the Courts.

Finding F1.2:

There is no communication and oversight among the Public Defender’s Office, the County Administrator’s Office and the Courts for the collection of the fees assessed to the indigent defendants.

Response to F1.2:

Disagree.

As stated in Response to F1.1 above, the Public Defender's Office established policies and procedures in 2010 to assess and collect fees from indigent defendants, which had also been communicated to the San Joaquin County Superior Court. The Department intends to resume such procedure by September 1, 2016.

In addition, County Administration reached out to other County departments to determine if a coordinated effort between several departments might make a County Evaluator position more cost effective. In short, the answer is no, primarily due to the differences in eligibility and the Department's ability to provide services and payment plans based upon existing legislation.

Finding F1.3:

Financial information required to determine indigence in the County is not being verified.

Response to F1.3:

Disagree.

Financial information, which includes household income, assets (real estate, vehicles, money in the bank) and debts, is currently obtained from the majority of defendants in custody, during a Pretrial Services Interview conducted by the Pretrial Services Unit, a branch of the San Joaquin County Probation Department. At that interview, the defendants are told that the information reported will be shared with the court to determine eligibility for pretrial release. A defendant has an incentive to disclose employment and asset information, as those are evidence of stability and support a pretrial release.

Penal Code section 987.8 states that the court can order a defendant to appear before a county officer to make inquiry into the ability to pay all or a portion of legal assistance, impose liens, preside over noticed hearing to determine ability to pay and set amounts to be reimbursed and order the sum reasonable and compatible with defendant's financial ability. Penal Code section 987.8(e) outlines the defendant's rights at a hearing. This process requires additional court appearances.

According to the Assistant Treasurer-Tax Collector, a position comparable to a County Evaluation Officer within San Joaquin County is a Senior Collection Clerk, which has a total cost of \$82,491 per year and the total cost of a Collections Supervisor is \$95,254 per year. It is anticipated that the County would need to hire six Senior Collections Clerks and one Collection Supervisor to staff San Joaquin County three courthouses (Stockton, Lodi and Manteca). In addition, the Office of Revenue and Recovery states that they would charge our Department their hourly rate to track down delinquent payments. It would also be ineffective to vet financial information through these positions. The majority of defendants appointed to the public defender's office have

low to no income, outside of public assistance. It is anticipated that the majority (estimated at over 80%) of defendants would be financially unable to pay any more than the flat fee that our Department has previously implemented. In addition, the majority of defendants accused of felony charges that remain in custody have lost any job that they may have had. A flat fee has a greater likelihood of being recovered, eliminates the need for county officers and ability to pay hearings and is an equitable cost for indigent defendants. At the completion of the defendant's case, the Court will be asked to access the full \$125 or \$175, minus the \$50 registration fee, payable to Public Defender's Office.

Recommendation R1.1:

By September 1, 2016 the Board of Supervisors conduct a feasibility study to determine if the County can support a Chief Financial Evaluation Officer or designee to vet defendants' ability to pay, and track and collect public defender fees.

Response to R1.1:

This recommendation was implemented by County staff.

As stated above, to vet defendant's ability to pay, track and collect public defender fees would be costly and ineffective due to most indigent client's modest income to no means. The ability to pay assessment to determine if defendants are able to pay the registration/flat fee can be conducted by the Court, using the Pretrial Services information and any follow up with the defendant in court. Fees can be collected at the Public Defender's office and tracked by the Public Defender's fiscal staff.

Recommendation R1.2:

By December 31, 2016 the Board of Supervisors develop policies and procedures to vet defendants, track and collect fees due the county from the indigent defendants for court appointed counsel.

Response to R1.2:

This recommendation will be implemented by September 1, 2016.

The Department will follow-up with all parties involved with the policies and procedures outlined in F1.1.

Recommendation R1.3:

By December 31, 2016 the Board of Supervisors implement a policy to vet defendants, track and collect assessed fees from the indigent defendants.

Response to R1.3:

This recommendation will be implemented as described in Response F1.1 above.

The Department will follow-up with all parties involved with the policies and procedures outlined in F1.1.

Recommendation R1.4:

By December 31, 2016 the Board of Supervisors develop a MOU with the court to inform all defendants of the assessable fees.

Response to R1.4:

This recommendation will be partially implemented.

The Board of Supervisors has approved the \$50 registration fee, and in the past the courts have worked with the County on the process of assessing the \$125 flat fee for a misdemeanor case and \$175 for a felony case (with credit given for the \$50 registration fee). The Public Defender’s office intends to re-implement this process by September 1, 2016 and will work with the Presiding Judge in reinstating the assessment procedure be a part of the court hearings going forward.

C. San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors – Case #1507 – Homelessness in San Joaquin County “Time for Collaboration, Commitment and Communication”

1.0 San Joaquin Urban County Consolidated Plan 2015-19/Annual Action Plan, Fiscal Year 2015-16

Finding F1.1:

The Consolidated Plan does not contain a clearly defined strategic plan to address homelessness. It does reference a “Homeless Prevention Plan.” (See Appendix 1).

Response to F1.1:

Disagree.

The Consolidated Plan is not intended to be a single document that contains the plan to address homelessness in the region. It identifies local needs and how funds given by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will help address these needs, and it addresses how the San Joaquin Urban County will use the funds for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME), and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) programs. The San Joaquin Urban County is comprised of the unincorporated San Joaquin County and the cities of Escalon, Lathrop, Manteca, Ripon, and Tracy. The cities of Lodi and Stockton operate their own programs through HUD and submit their own separate Consolidated Plans.

Programs covered under the Consolidated Plan do not solely address the homelessness issue. The ESG program is the only program that is operated for the benefit of the homeless by providing funds to sub-recipients who offer emergency

housing, permanent housing, and supportive services to the homeless. The CDBG program targets programs that benefit low and moderate income households and communities, and the HOME program is used to assist low income persons in housing acquisition and rehabilitation.

The Homeless Prevention Plan is part of the Continuum of Care program that is just one tool for helping to address the homelessness issue. The Continuum of Care covers the whole County including all the seven incorporated cities, but only in relation to the homelessness issues that pertain to Community Development and the agencies and nonprofits who work with us. The Homeless Prevention document is a guideline that contains general goals and objectives of the homeless prevention plan. It states what the programs can do for the target population, who qualifies for the benefits, and how the benefits can be implemented.

Finding F1.2:

County staff members responsible for addressing homeless programs were not involved in the creation of the Consolidated Plan and have limited working knowledge of the report. Some statements in the Plan, i.e. expanding of the number of beds available, are not substantiated.

Response to F1.2:

Agree.

There has been turnover at the top of the Neighborhood Preservation Division of the Community Development Department, which administers the various HUD programs. Vast institutional knowledge in the programs and operations were lost in this change in personnel. This happened abruptly and was not anticipated. As such, it was a difficult process just to get the required annual documents and reports submitted to HUD on time (March, 2015 through March, 2016). Vacant positions are being filled, and once fully staffed, the programs will run more efficiently. With the help of consultants, staff is becoming more knowledgeable of the programs.

Finding F1.3:

No upper management County staff member is involved with the “Community Coalition on Homelessness Interagency Council.”

Response to F1.3:

Agree.

The Community Coalition on Homelessness Interagency Council is a presidential cabinet level organization for the federal government. This Council reference was erroneously used by consultants for CDD in the Consolidated Plan to describe the local jurisdictions, agencies, and nonprofit organizations who meet to discuss the various issues affecting the community. The Community Development Department (CCD) is in the process of reevaluating the operations of the Continuum of Care to

ascertain improvements to the efficiencies and communications among the local jurisdictions, agencies, nonprofit organizations, and community groups to enhance the coordination and operations of the programs funded. After this reevaluation (still underway), it is anticipated that there will be an increase in the number of times that all of these interested organizations will meet to discuss and plan strategies to address homelessness, and have a more efficient coordination among all those involved.

Currently under consideration by the County's Homelessness Taskforce, upon such time that its members have determined that the Taskforce has fully realized its purpose and intent of its original work plan, the Task Force may transition into becoming and serving as the Continuum of Care program. The Homelessness Taskforce's outcomes are subject to change due to the aforementioned factors.

Finding F1.4:

The scope of the problem is compounded by a lack of accurate and comparable data.

Response to R1.4:

Agree.

There is an annual count and a bi-annual count of the homeless. Both counts are done by Stockton based, Central Valley Low Income Housing Corp. (CVLIHC). The annual count is for the sheltered homeless, but CDD is not involved with it. The bi-annual count is for sheltered and unsheltered homeless and CDD takes part in this count. Both counts are required by HUD. The counts are all done in January. The next biannual count will be in January 2017.

Recommendation R1.1:

By Jan. 1, 2017, the County develop and implement a strategic plan to address homelessness in San Joaquin County that includes measureable long-and short-term goals and objectives with an established timeline and an annual evaluation process.

Response to R1.1:

This recommendation will be implemented but not by Jan 1, 2017.

It may take longer than six months for the current Homelessness Task Force to establish a strategic plan. The County does not intend to implement this recommendation on its own. In February of 2016 the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors recommended the addition of the Homelessness Task Force with two Board members assigned. The Homelessness Task Force is a discretionary committee. The role of the Board members is to be a convener among the local non-profit organizations and governmental bodies in yielding positive outcomes and best practices in reducing homelessness in San Joaquin County. The County has a commitment to the development and implementation of a strategic plan to address homelessness in San Joaquin County though extensive involvement and leadership of the Homelessness Task Force, which is a county-wide collaboration of representatives

from a cross-section of public and private organizations dedicated to addressing homelessness. The County does not intend to implement this recommendation on its own. There have been 8 meetings of the Homelessness Task Force so far. In addition to the full Task Force, there are work groups in the following areas:

1. Outreach/Temporary Housing Work Group
2. Data Collection Work Group
3. Diversion Court/Law and Justice Work Group
4. Prevention Work Group

Each of these work groups is working on short term actions but keeping long-range vision in mind.

In addition, the Board of Supervisors has scheduled an evening Study Session on the topic of Homelessness for November 16, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in the Board Chambers at 44 North San Joaquin Street, Stockton, CA 95202.

Finding F2.1:

Departments within the County’s organizational structure have no consistent or focused strategies to work together in addressing homelessness.

Response to F2.1:

Agree.

HUD disperses funds separately to CDD and to the cities of Stockton and Lodi. These funds are to be used for specific purposes according to strict requirements from HUD. When submitting annual reports to HUD regarding the usage of the funds, there are guidelines and milestones that each County department must reach in order to continue receiving funds. CDD files one report with HUD that covers the unincorporated County and the five cities we represent. These requirements from HUD are unique to the program funds received. The HUD requirements are the first priority to be achieved. Therefore, to reach the goals and objectives for the program funds related to each department, coordinating with agencies and nonprofits that have direct involvement with the funds granted is a higher priority than coordinating with other County departments. Also, because there is a limited amount of time and money that can be used to administer these programs, (based on the number from 2014-15, CDD gets approximately 14% of the HUD funds to cover administrative costs, this number was approximately \$476,000, which did not fully cover the salary portion for the Neighborhood Preservation Division). There are also very limited resources that can be devoted to coordination with other departments.

Finding F2.2:

There is no lead County department or agency coordinating efforts directed toward the homeless.

Response to F2.2:

Agree.

Recommendation R2.1:

By Jan 1, 2017, the Board of Supervisors should appoint one individual within County government to oversee all matters related to homelessness reporting directly to the County Administrator. That person needs the authority and resources to bring together the necessary entities to develop and implement the County's Strategic Plan on Homelessness.

Response to R2.1:

This recommendation will not be implemented.

Homelessness is a broad problem which requires community based solutions through a collaboration of committed public and private partners. Focus from a variety of sources, such as those public and private organizations contributing to the ongoing collaborative effort of the Homelessness Task Force, is necessary. The Board of Supervisors is acting in a leadership role on this matter and will coordinate as appropriate with other government entities, including City Leadership, non-county organizations, the County Administrator, and County Department Heads to help develop a Strategic Plan on Homelessness.

Recommendation R2.2:

By Jan. 1, 2017, the Board of Supervisors fund a position to oversee this initiative, even if it requires reprioritizing and reallocating other resources.

Response to R2.2:

This recommendation will not be implemented for the reasons stated in Response to R2.1.

2.0 Coordination with Cities and others

Finding F3.1:

The City of Lodi along with private individuals and agencies have taken encouraging steps to address the homeless issue. The success Lodi has achieved can be attributed to the coordinated efforts of public agencies, non-profit groups and churches (See Appendix 2).

Response to F3.1:

Agree.

The County agrees with the finding that the success the City of Lodi has achieved can be attributed to the coordinated efforts of public agencies, non-profit groups and churches.

Finding F3.2:

The County's "2010-2015 Consolidated Plan" listed seven "Weaknesses in Organizational Structure" to address the homeless population and actions necessary to eliminate those weaknesses. The County's "2015-2019 Consolidated Plan" provided no evidenced the issues were addressed.

Response to F3.2:

Partially disagree:

The seven actions that should be considered to improve effectiveness, what the Grand Jury refers to as the "Weaknesses in Organizational Structure," are some of the drawbacks to the HUD program as a whole. The weaknesses listed in the Consolidated Plan are:

- Coordinate decision making: Each jurisdiction makes their own funding decisions because they are separately responsible for the funds they receive.
- Expansion of outreach: New nonprofit organizations may not be aware of the HUD funds available to become involved.
- Improve timely implementation of projects: Some problems that cause implementation issues are funding from multiple sources, loss of staff, banking of funds for larger projects, and the length of time and permitting requirements to develop housing projects.
- Expand availability of technical assistance: Developers need outreach and technical training for project implementation.
- Advocate for changes in Federal regulations that discourage interagency cooperation: The way that HUD funds are disbursed encourages agencies to be grant-driven in their approach.
- Partnerships needed: Need to find ways to encourage public/private partnerships in developments.
- Expand interagency communication: Communication with and among nonprofit organizations needs to be enhanced.

This discussion of the strengths and gaps or weaknesses in the delivery system is a requirement of HUD as part of the Consolidated Plan report. These "weaknesses" are institutional in nature, and thus, do not have a readily available solution. They are a part of the system because of the way HUD operates and oversees each program.

They cannot be addressed as an action item in one document from one jurisdiction and be expected to be solved by the next report cycle. By acknowledging it in the Consolidated Plan, it is a way to document the inherent deficiencies in the program that will need to be addressed sometime in the future by HUD. San Joaquin County does not have timeframe for when HUD may address these issues.

Recommendation R3.1:

The County should use Lodi's efforts as a framework to start the strategic planning process.

Response to R3.1:

This recommendation will be implemented but not by January 1, 2017.

The Homelessness Task Force includes representatives of public and private agencies involved in the Lodi effort and a presentation summarizing Lodi's effort has been made to the Homelessness Task Force. This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be proposed to the Homelessness Task Force.

Recommendation R3.2:

By Jan. 1, 2017, the Board of Supervisors formulate a plan to eliminate its self-identified "Weaknesses in Organizational Structure".

Response to R3.2:

The recommendation will not be implemented for reasons explained in Response to F3.2.

D. San Joaquin County Probation – Juvenile Justice Detention Facilities

Finding F1.1:

Carpeting throughout the facility was extremely dirty and stained. It presents as a health hazard not only for clients, but also for staff and visitors.

Response to F1.1:

Agree.

Finding F2.1:

Audio, intercom and video cameras, especially in high risk and suicide prevention rooms and hallways are outdated.

Response to F2.1:

Agree.

Recommendation R1:

By December 31, 2016, remove, replace or clean carpeting throughout facility.

Response to R1:

The recommendation is in the process of being implemented.

The Probation Department is currently in the process of replacing the carpet throughout Juvenile Hall and Camp Peterson: Unit 1, Unit 2, Unit 3, Unit 4 and classrooms, Unit 5 and classrooms, Unit 6, Camp Peterson, In-Custody Intake Office, and Detention Administration.

The San Joaquin County Plant Engineering Division is overseeing the carpet replacement project. All materials and supplies are scheduled to be delivered during the last week of July, with installation beginning during the first week of August.

There are four areas that will not be re-carpeted at this time because they were deemed to be in viable condition and did not meet the rate (age and wear) to be replaced at this time. Those four areas are Visiting, Court Transportation, the hallway outside door 9-9 and Intake/Booking.

The Probation Department is working with Purchasing and Support Services to have the carpet that is not being replaced professionally cleaned. The cleaning will be completed in the next 30 days.

Recommendation R2:

By December 31, 2016, upgrade audio, intercom and video cameras throughout facility.

Response to R2:

The recommendation requires further analysis.

Implementing this recommendation will require fiscal resources from San Joaquin County ("County") not currently budgeted. The County will initiate the process to determine an estimated cost to replace the audio, intercom and video camera systems throughout Juvenile Hall as well as the video system at Camp Peterson. Once the cost is known, the County will explore options to determine a timeline for funding the project in its entirety or in phases. It is anticipated that a rough estimate will be received within 60 days with a tentative decision made within 90 days.