A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

Board of Supervisors

1195 Third St.
Suite 310
Napa, CA 94559
www.countyofnapa.org

Main: (707) 253-4421
Fax: (707) 253-4176

Bill Dodd
Chairman

March 15, 2011

The Honorable Steven T. Kroyer
Presiding Judge
County of Napa, Superior Court
825 Brown Street
Napa, CA 94559

SUBJECT: Response to the Grand Jury 2009-2010 Final Reports on: Napa County Criminal Justice Facilities: Juvenile Justice Center/Juvenile Hall; Napa Special Investigations Bureau and Napa County Criminal Justice Facilities: Napa County Department of Corrections/County Jail.

Dear Judge Kroyer:

The Board of Supervisors has reviewed the findings in the Grand Jury 2009-2010 Final Reports on: Napa County Criminal Justice Facilities: Juvenile Justice Center/Juvenile Hall; Napa Special Investigations Bureau and Napa County Criminal Justice Facilities: Napa County Department of Corrections/County Jail. As requested, and pursuant to Penal Code section 933(c), enclosed are responses to specified findings and revised responses to certain recommendations.

Grand Jury activity takes place over the course of a number of months. As such, their findings and recommendations often address issues that county departments have already identified as problems and to which solutions are in the process of being developed.

The Board acknowledges the members of the 2010-2011 Grand Jury for the time they have devoted.

Sincerely,

Bill Dodd, Chairman
Napa County Board of Supervisors

Enclosure
cc: Foreman, 2010-2011 Grand Jury

Napa County
Responses to the 2009-2010 Grand Jury Report
On Napa Special Investigations Bureau

Finding #1. The Napa Special Investigations Bureau was formally established on March 1, 1976, through a state grant funded by the California Office of Criminal Justice Planning.

Response, County Executive Officer. The County Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Finding #6. CPD and SHPD contribute funding in lieu of personnel.

Response, County Executive Officer. The County Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Finding #18. NSIB, in conjunction with the DA, Adult Probation Department and the California Department of Corrections Parole Unit, is involved in a cooperative effort to coordinate and pursue intensive supervision of adult probationers and parolees.

Response, Chief Probation Officer. The Chief Probation Officer disagrees partially with the finding. It is only the responsibility of the Probation Department to supervise adult probationers. The Probation Officer assigned to NSIB is responsible for intensive supervision of some drug offenders on probation. Anyone on State Parole is supervised by a state parole agent and does not coincide with the efforts of the Probation Department.

Response, Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors disagrees partially with this finding and incorporates by reference the response and explanation of the Chief Probation Officer.

Finding #19. The DEC Protocol was implemented four years ago and is a collaborative effort by NSIB, CWS, Napa County DA and QVMC.

Response, County Executive Officer. The County Executive Officer agrees with this finding.

Finding #20. State and County budget cuts have reduced the number of NSIB agents compared to past years.

Response, County Executive Officer. The County Executive Officer disagrees in part with this finding. NSIB is a multi-jurisdictional agency and all agencies in Napa County, the Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement and California Highway Patrol have contributed officers or funds to the task force in the past. Napa County serves as the fiscal agent of the task force and through the Sheriff's Department provides one Sergeant and two

Deputies to NSIB on a full time basis. Over the last few years, other law enforcement agencies, not the County/Sheriff's Office, have reduced the number of officers allocated to the task force on a full time basis. Napa County received grant funding from the California Methamphetamine Enforcement Team program that allowed for the allocation of additional officer overtime hours towards methamphetamine eradication throughout the County. Consistent with the Board of Supervisors' policy to not backfill reduced or depleted grant funds, the Sheriff's Office has eliminated the additional officer overtime once dedicated to methamphetamine enforcement due to a reduction in grant funds received.

Finding #21. The PO attached to NSIB, like all Napa County POs does not carry a firearm.

Response, Chief Probation Officer. The Chief Probation Officer agrees with this finding.

Response, Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Finding #22. NSIB has expressed the desire to have the County arm the PO attached to NSIB.

Response, Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding and incorporates by reference the August 10, 2010 response and explanation of the Chief Probation Officer.

Finding #23. The Probation Department Safety Committee currently has not recommended arming the PO attached to NSIB.

Response, Chief Probation Officer. The Chief Probation Officer agrees with this finding.

Finding #25. Other than a list of "guidelines" provided by the California Attorney General in 2008, the State does not provide the County or NSIB with any clear regulation for the cultivation and/or distribution of medical marijuana.

Response, Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.