

VENTURA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

- BOB BROOKS SHERIFF
- CRAIG HUSBAND UNDERSHERIFF

800 SOUTH VICTORIA AVENUE, VENTURA, CA 93009 PHONE (805) 654-2380 FAX (805) 645-1391

June 24, 2004

Honorable Bruce A. Clark, Presiding Judge Superior Court of California, Ventura County 800 S. Victoria Avenue Ventura, CA 93009



Dear Judge Clark:

Re: Response to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury report entitled, *Ventura County Proposition 36 Implementation*

In accordance with California Penal Code Section 933 (c), this report is a response to the findings and recommendations of the 2003-2004 Grand Jury report entitled, *Ventura County Emergency Operations Center*. The following are my responses:

Recommendations

- R-0. The Board of Supervisors undertakes the reorganization of Prop 36 implementation within Ventura County in order to better accomplish the statutory mandates and scheme intended under Prop 36.
 - Response to R-01: Although, as Sheriff, I agree with the spirit and intent of this recommendation, this is a policy decision of the Board of Supervisors.
- R-02. The Board of Supervisors withdraws the Lead Agency designation from BHD/ADP and designates the County Executive Officer (CEO) as the Lead Agency for Prop 36 management and oversight functions.
 - Response to R-02: This is a policy decision by the Board of Supervisors.
- R-03. Having assumed responsibility for leading Prop 36 treatment programs in the past, BHD/ADP may function as the county's expert in recommending treatment methods and the standards of successful treatment program completion.
 - Response to R-03: Support the recommendation.

RE: Prop 36 Implementation

June 25, 2004 Page 2 of 3

R-04. The county should address the issue of "unamenability," as described in the statute and case law, with a view toward bringing the concept to bear in county practice.

Response to R-04: This recommendation is an issue of law and/or medical determination. I support the intent, but am not qualified to comment.

R-05. In order to organize and provide actionable information to the probationary supervision, top priority should be given to implementing an integrated information system designed for that purpose.

Response to R-05: Agree with and support this recommendation.

R-06. Probation develops a basic risk management system or protocol to look at key indicators of a client's profile to determine the risk to society.

Response to R-06: This is an issue of law and statute.

R-07. The immediate establishment of a meaningful treatment completion standard in accordance with the spirit and intent of Prop 36.

Response to R-07: Support this recommendation.

R-08. The Operations and Oversight Committee be reconstituted as the representative body for all stakeholders.

Response to R-08: No position on this recommendation.

R-09. The drug testing protocol should be tightened immediately.

Response to R-09: Although I support this recommendation, it remains a policy decision by the Board of Supervisors.

R-10. Though, by policy, drug testing is to be used for treatment purposes, public safety concerns require that Probation continue to conduct drug testing.

Response to R-10: This is an issue of operation by the Probation Agency.

R-11. A goal of early and positive supervision experience should be pursued to initially set the tone for Prop 36 treatment.

Response to R-11: This is a policy decision by the Board of Supervisors.

RE: Prop 36 Implementation

June 25, 2004 Page 3 of 3

R-12. The Operations and Oversight Committee should institute thoughtful and allowable sanctions for offenders who fail in treatment, submit positive drug tests, or who miss treatment classes.

Response to R-12: I support this recommendation.

Thank you again for allowing me to respond to your recommendations.

Sincerely

BOB BROOKS Ventura County Sheriff