Response to Grand Jury Report Form



Report Title: Detention Facilities and Related Law Enforcement Issues

Report Date: June 1, 2015

Response by: Sylvia Muñoz Schnopp Title: Mayor

FINDINGS

• I (we) agree with the findings numbered: FI-01, FI-07

• I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the findings numbered: FI-05

(Attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed; include an explanation of the reasons therefore.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations numbered <u>R-10</u> have been implemented.

(Attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)

 Recommendations numbered <u>R-02</u> have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.

(Attach a timeframe for the implementation.)

Recommendations numbered ______ require further analysis.

(Attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.)

 Recommendations numbered R-09 will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.

(Attach an explanation.)

Date: 08-31-15

Signed

Number of pages attached 3



City of Port Hueneme

August 31, 2015

The Honorable Donald D. Coleman Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California County of Ventura 800 S. Victoria Ave. Ventura, CA 93009



Subject: Detention Facilities and Related Law Enforcement Issues

Dear Judge Coleman:

The City of Port Hueneme received the 2014-2015 Ventura County Grand Jury report, "Detention Facilities and Related Law Enforcement Issues." In accordance with Penal Code section 933.05, the City of Port Hueneme submits this response to the Grand Jury findings and recommendations.

The Grand Jury requires a response to Findings FI-01, FI-05, FI-07, and Recommendations R-02, R-09, R-10.

Findings

FI-01: The Grand Jury rated all holding cells or equivalent physical facilities in the County as satisfactory or better for the areas reviewed, except for the lack of raised seating in the Oxnard police station holding cells, lack of tamper proof lavatory fixtures at the Moorpark police station area serving detainees, and an inoperative water tap in one holding cell in the Port Hueneme police station.

Response to FI-01: The City agrees with this finding. The Port Hueneme Police Department (PHPD) goes to great lengths to ensure that it is in compliance with all areas governing the department's Temporary Holding Facility. PHPD consistently meets or exceeds the standards set forth in each of the statutorily required inspections, which are conducted every year by various state and local agencies. The Interim Chief of Police submitted a Work Request to the Facilities Maintenance Department and a Work Order has been issued to inspect the water tap and make any necessary repairs.

RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY: DETENTION FACILITIES

August 31, 2015

Page 2

<u>FI-05</u>: The Port Hueneme Police Department officer availability is below authorized levels, which limits its ability to respond to detainee and city needs.

Response to FI-05: The City disagrees partially with this finding. At the time of the Grand Jury's inspection, the Police Department was budgeted for twenty-two (22) Full-Time Sworn Police Officer positions, all twenty-two of which were filled or in the process of being filled. Two officers were on paid medical leave pursuant to California Labor Code 4850 and one officer was placed on Modified Duty, all due to industrial injuries. A fourth officer was on paid administrative leave, pending the outcome of an Administrative Investigation. The department also has a written minimum staffing policy in place that dictates how many officers will be assigned to each shift. Very rarely, if ever, is minimum staffing not maintained.

FI-07: Proposition 47's consequences, both intended and unintended, are only beginning to be evaluated. Early indications are that it may be successful in reducing the State prisoner population, but the effects on local law enforcement agencies and communities are yet to be understood.

Response to FI-07: The City agrees with this finding.

Recommendations

R-02: The Grand Jury recommends that the Sheriff's Office, Probation, and city councils closely track and evaluate the impact of Proposition 47 on local law enforcement agencies and communities and report findings to the Board of Supervisors.

Response to R-02: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. PHPD will develop and implement a procedure by which to collect and analyze the information necessary to accurately track and evaluate the impact of Proposition 47 on the City of Port Hueneme. Their findings will be reported to City Council by January 1, 2016.

R-09: The Grand Jury recommends that the Port Hueneme City Council increase police availability consistent with that city's needs.

Response to R-09: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is unwarranted. PHPD already has in place a mechanism by which to control police availability. Police availability during a shift is largely controlled by the on-duty Supervisor, who can grant or deny planned absences and overtime, as well as authorize staffing levels beyond minimum staffing requirements if warranted. PHPD is also in the process of increasing its Reserve Officer personnel in order to supplement patrol staffing levels.

RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY: DETENTION FACILITIES

August 31, 2015

Page 3

R-10: The Grand Jury recommends that the Port Hueneme City Council ensure that all water fixtures in the holding cells are operational.

Response to R-10: This recommendation has already been implemented. The Interim Chief of Police submitted a Work Request to the Facilities Maintenance Department and a Work Order has been issued to inspect the water tap and make any necessary repairs.

This report response was authorized by the Port Hueneme City Council on August 31, 2015. The Council commends the Grand Jury on its efforts in looking into this matter.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Muñoz Schnopp

Mayor

Cynthia Haas City Manager

cc: Foreperson, Ventura County Grand Jury 800 S. Victoria Avenue Ventura, CA 93009