

REALIGNMENT CHALLENGES IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY JAILS

Improving Long-Term Incarceration

SUMMARY

The passage of The Public Safety Realignment Act (referred to here as “AB109” or “Realignment”) constitutes the largest reorganization of the California penal system since 1994’s “Three Strikes” law. The 2011/2012 San Diego County Grand Jury produced a report titled “Public Safety Realignment: What it Means to the Citizens of San Diego County”; that report alerted county residents to the requirements of AB109 and commended “all those involved in implementing the Public Safety Realignment Act”¹. After four years of the county’s experience with Realignment, the 2015/2016 San Diego County Grand Jury has found it appropriate to examine the bill’s effect on the county jails.

This report identifies a continuing challenge for the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department: changing the culture and practices of jail administration to provide services to adult inmates incarcerated for much longer sentences than before. These services have the potential to make jails safer and assist in rehabilitation. This is consistent with the Sheriff’s Department’s stated goal, in the Community Corrections Partnership 2011 Vision Statement: “to reduce recidivism with the goal of transitioning offenders back into our communities as productive members.”²

For AB109 inmates (broadly speaking, those convicted of non-violent, non-serious, and non-sex offender crimes), county jails serve the function formerly fulfilled by state prisons. According to the Sheriff’s Department, about one-third of the approximately 5,700 inmates in county jails are serving their sentences locally in accordance with AB109. These sentences range from six months to several years, compared with an average stay of less than two months for the two-thirds of inmates incarcerated awaiting arraignment or trial. This means the Sheriff’s Department must shift from a short-term to a longer-term mentality, from warehousing prisoners to offering them opportunities that will enhance their ability to stay out of jail when they are released.

The Grand Jury has identified these areas for the Sheriff’s Department’s attention:

- Increase opportunities for physical exercise
- Implement contact visits
- Expand education, both academic and vocational
- Prepare a strategic three or five year plan

¹ Public Safety Realignment: What It Means to the Citizens of San Diego County, p. 111.

² County of San Diego Public Safety Realignment & Post-Release Community Supervision Preliminary 2011 Implementation Plan, p. 7.

The Grand Jury acknowledges that realizing these goals will be costly, requiring the Sheriff's Department to identify potential funding sources and prioritize their expenditure over several years. The Grand Jury suggests that, as a starting point, the Sheriff's Department consider the Inmate Welfare Fund (approximately \$15,000,000) and the reserve accumulated from state-supplied AB109 funds over the past four years (\$25,000,000).

The evidence-based practices³ this report recommends can improve jail safety and reduce recidivism. Yet there is also something more fundamental at stake: the county's basic responsibility for humane incarceration. This responsibility, mandated at the state prison level by federal courts, brought AB109 into being. Therefore, these practices need to be available to as many prisoners as possible throughout their sentences, not just in the final six months they serve.

INTRODUCTION

The Grand Jury has statutory authority to inquire into all jails within San Diego County. Jurors who visited the facilities the Sheriff's Department oversees heard repeatedly from staff about Realignment's impact. It became clear that to fulfill its responsibility the jury must investigate some of the incarceration issues AB109 raises. There remain many aspects of realignment for future Grand Juries to consider.

PROCEDURE

Grand Jurors visited the following county-operated adult detention facilities:

- San Diego Central Jail (SDCJ)
- Las Colinas Detention and Reentry Facility (LCDRF)
- George F. Bailey Detention Facility (GBDF)
- Facility 8
- South Bay Detention Facility (SBDF)
- East Mesa Reentry Facility (EMRF)
- Vista Detention Facility (VDF)

At each location, senior staff first presented facts, figures, and an overview of programs, policies, procedures, and needs; then the jurors toured the facility, speaking with various staff, and, when possible, inmates.

To learn how the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the U.S. Bureau of Prisons deal with long-term incarceration, the Grand Jury toured the Robert J.

³ Evidence-based practices: corrections interventions "demonstrated by scientific research to reduce recidivism" (P.C. sections 17.5, 1229(d), & 3450) www.cibhs.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/presentation_criminogenic_needs__principles.pdf

Donovan Correctional Facility in Otay Mesa (state) and the Metropolitan Correctional Center in San Diego (federal).

The Grand Jury interviewed senior Sheriff's Department staff and a representative of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG).

DISCUSSION

PHYSICAL EXERCISE

Almost all the Sheriff's detention facilities have severely limited opportunities for exercise. Cement cages with inadequate to non-existent exercise equipment are the norm at most of the male detention centers. Inmates do not receive footwear conducive to exercising. Given the increasing length of time AB109 inmates remain in county custody, there needs to be a reevaluation of exercise options.

The value of cardiovascular exercise has been known for decades. The Mayo Clinic⁴ has a list of seven benefits that are obtained through moderate exercise, five of which are particularly relevant to maintaining inmate health long term: exercise controls weight; combats health conditions and diseases; improves mood; boosts energy; promotes better sleep. Other research has shown that even low levels of exercise confer health benefits.

In a 2013 study on the benefits of physical exercise in detention centers⁵ the authors found, "Both cardiovascular plus resistance training and high-intensity strength training protocols produced significant gains in the functional capacity (cardio-respiratory capacity and cardiovascular disease risk decrease) of incarcerated males. The significant gains obtained in functional capacity reflect the great potential of supervised exercise interventions for improving the health status of incarcerated people."

In addition to the positive effects on cardiovascular health, exercise obtained through team sports has positive psycho-social benefits on inmates. A 2015 *Washington Post* article⁶ describes the Utah Department of Corrections' success in making sports part of rehabilitation by incorporating team games and regular exercise into a coordinated therapy program. Belonging to a team, showing up for practice and games, and interacting as a group are all life skills that build personal responsibility.

⁴ <http://www.mayoclinic.org/healthy-lifestyle/fitness/in-depth/exercise/art-20048389>

⁵ Battaglia, C. et al., "Benefits of Selected Physical Exercise Programs in Detention: A Randomized Controlled Study", *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **2013**, *10*, 5683-5696. See also Gallant, D., et al., "Recreation or rehabilitation? Managing sport for development programs with prison populations," *Sport Management Review* **2014**.

⁶ "In the Utah prison system, when other support programs fall short, some prisoners find solace in sports" <http://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/sports/wp/2015/07/02/run-on-sentence/>

The increasing health costs associated with an aging population should be paramount for county officials who now are responsible for long-term inmate care. The Sheriff's Department needs to investigate inexpensive methods that mitigate medical care costs such as ever-increasing expenses for maintenance drugs associated with cardiovascular disease.

There are no jogging paths, no sports fields, and no functional basketball courts at the male detention facilities (except for VDF, which does have several basketball courts on the roof). While the jury is aware that the male facilities were built as jails, not prisons, AB109 has changed their function and mission. It does not appear the Department has made any attempt to revise policies, beyond what is required under Title 15, so as to allow all inmates more time for exercise, or to allocate additional funding to remodel and expand exercise areas. The land surrounding Facility 8, George Bailey, and the East Mesa Reentry Facility in Otay Mesa could be repurposed for exercise fields, particularly given that the county will be repossessing the facility now under lease to Corrections Corporation of America, adjacent to George Bailey and Facility 8.

There appears to be resistance to expanding options for sports and exercise from detention facility staff, who gave injury and safety concerns as the reason for not increasing exercise options: twisted ankles can occur from basketball games, and bats can be weapons during softball games.

The Grand Jury found a significant contrast at Donovan State Correctional Facility. Most inmates at Donovan are serving sentences for crimes considerably more violent than county inmates. Yet Donovan features sports fields (baseball diamonds, soccer and football fields) and numerous dip and chin bar exercise stations for inmate use. Bats and balls are provided for team sports, and inmates are given shoes conducive to exercising, as opposed to the backless plastic sandals issued to county inmates. While guards do patrol the central exercise quadrangle at Donovan, staff reported that instances of violence or injury are rare. When violence occurs, there are consequences to participating inmates, usually entailing severe loss of privileges.

Appropriate shoes would mitigate potential ankle injuries in county facilities. If violence occurs from using exercise equipment as a weapon, consequences can be imposed. Sanctions against most types of exercise should not be the blanket policy. Exercise forms an essential part of the county's responsibility for humane incarceration.

FACTS AND FINDINGS

Fact: Exercise offers significant health and well-being benefits to incarcerated adults.

Fact: Inmates do not have appropriate shoes and equipment for physical exercise, including team sports.

Finding 01: Exercise opportunities, facilities, and equipment at county detention facilities need significant improvement.

CONTACT VISITS

In San Diego County Jails, “social visits are normally non-contact, conducted through a visit window using telephone handsets”, and “inmates are allowed two 30 minute social visits per week.”⁷ Only Las Colinas Women’s Detention and Reentry Facility (LCDRF) offers qualifying inmates the opportunity for contact visits with children, family, and friends (although male inmates may receive court-mandated Child Protective Service contact visits with their children).

Common sense would suggest that, in a majority of cases, family provides the foundation for inmates’ emotional and financial support, and this is borne out by research. More studies have focused on prisons than on jails, and there is not yet post-Realignment data for San Diego County. Nevertheless, there is clear consensus that greater family contact and support increases inmate compliance and reduces recidivism.⁸ For example, a major study by the Minnesota Department of Corrections concludes, “Consistent with the results from prior research...prison visitation can significantly improve the transition offenders make from the institution to the community...The results also suggest that the more sources of social support an offender has, the lower the risk of recidivism.”⁹ The summary of several studies reviewed in *Prison Legal News* states, “Studies have consistently shown that prisoners who maintain close contact with their family members while incarcerated have better post-release outcomes and lower recidivism rates.”¹⁰

There is very little research comparing non-contact and contact visits, so the added benefits of meeting face to face must be inferred from several factors. First, in the Minnesota prisons study, in which most visits were contact visits, “Any visit reduced the risk of recidivism by thirteen percent for felony reconvictions and twenty-five percent for technical violation revocations...”¹¹

Second, in 1974 (forty years ago!) the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals stated that corrections facilities should provide “...appropriate rooms for visitation that allow ease and informality of communication in a natural environment as free from institutional or custodial attributes as possible.”¹²

Third, California Penal Code §6400 requires any visitation policy to “recognize and consider” these factors:

⁷ www.sdsheriff.net/jailinfo/visiting.html

⁸ <http://www.vera.org/files/the-family-and-recidivism.pdf>

⁹ <http://www.doc.state.mn.us/PAGES/files/large-files/Publications/11-11MNPrisonVisitationStudy.pdf>

¹⁰ www.prisonlegalnews.org/news/2014/apr/15/lowering-recidivism-through-family-communication/

¹¹ <http://www.doc.state.mn.us/PAGES/files/large-files/Publications/11-11MNPrisonVisitationStudy.pdf>

¹² <http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015031448056;view=1up;seq=92>

- The value of visiting as a means to improve the safety of prisons *for both staff and inmates* (emphasis added)
- The important role of inmate visitation in establishing and maintaining a meaningful connection with family and community
- The important role of inmate visitation in preparing an inmate for successful release and rehabilitation

Fourth, our state prisons have made contact visits an integral part of correctional practice for decades. Grand Jury members who toured the Donovan Correctional Facility were told that Saturday and Sunday contact visits take place in rooms large enough for several dozen prisoners and visitors each, with two staff on duty, one in the room and one at the room's entrance. The staff member leading the tour confirmed both the challenges (e.g., intercepting contraband) and the value (e.g., giving prisoners compelling reasons for compliance in prison and hope after release) of the current visitation policy.

There are, of course, obstacles to adopting the state prisons' visitation policy in county jails. One, with the exception of the two-year-old LCDRF, no county jail is constructed to facilitate contact visits. This was mentioned repeatedly by various jail administrators and staff. Contact visitation rooms would require significant repurposing and remodeling of jail space; Sheriff's Department unappropriated AB109 funds (approximately \$25,000,000) and the Inmate Welfare Fund (approximately \$15,000,000) are potential sources of project funds.

Two, contact visits require a myriad of changes in Sheriff's Department practice, such as staffing, procedure, vetting inmates for visits, and contraband searches. Three, contact visits represent a major shift in Sheriff's Department culture. The ongoing transition, from focusing on incarceration to focusing on rehabilitation, asks the entire department, particularly the front-line jail staff, to change their thinking as well as their actions. Specifically, according to LCDRF staff, overseeing contact visits requires a somewhat different attitude and skill set than usual. Four, Grand Jury members heard more than once that "women are different from men," implying that contact visits would be more difficult to implement and supervise for male inmates, and perhaps even less effective.

These obstacles, while real (leaving number four aside), can be surmounted with effort and commitment. The Sheriff's Department staff's oft-stated standard of adopting evidence-based practices leads logically to the conclusion that contact visits are an essential part of jail administration. And contact visits form an essential part of the county's responsibility for humane incarceration.

FACTS AND FINDINGS

Fact: Only Las Colinas Women's Detention and Reentry Facility offers qualifying inmates the opportunity for contact visits with children, family, and friends.

Fact: Upon receipt of a court order by Child Protective Services, male inmates may receive face-to-face visits with their children.

Fact: The Sheriff's Department has stated that reducing recidivism is a fundamental goal.

Fact: The Sheriff's Department has committed itself to adopting evidence-based practices in order to reduce recidivism.

Fact: Corrections-based research strongly suggests that close family connection decreases recidivism.

Fact: With the exception of LCDRF, no county detention facility has space devoted to contact visits.

Fact: The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation has a long-standing, successful program of contact visits for qualifying inmates.

Fact: The Sheriff's Department has responsibility for the Inmate Welfare Fund (approximately \$15,000,000), which must by law be used for inmates' benefit, and unappropriated AB109 funds (approximately \$25,000,000).

Finding 02: In the area of contact visits, the Sheriff's Department is not following evidence-based practices to reduce recidivism.

Finding 03: Funds exist that could be devoted to remodeling and staffing jail facilities to make contact visits possible.

CORRECTIONS BASED ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

A recent U.S. Department of Justice-funded RAND Corporation report, *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Correctional Education*, analyzed more than 50 research studies.¹³ It reached the following conclusions:

- Correctional education improves inmates' chances of not returning to prison. Inmates who participate in correctional education programs had 43 percent lower risk of recidivating than those who did not
- Providing correctional education can be cost-effective in reducing recidivism
- Those who participated in vocational training were 28% more likely to be employed post-release than those who did not
- Inmates exposed to computer-assisted instruction learned slightly more in reading and substantially more in math in the same amount of instructional time

¹³ www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR200/RR266/RAND_RR266.appendixF.pdf

- Online prison education programs were found to be cost-effective, with direct costs of \$1400 to \$1744 per inmate, \$8700 to \$9700 *less* than re-incarceration costs per inmate
- Prison inmates have a lower level of education than the general population¹⁴

Academic Education in San Diego County jails

Correctional education in county jails concentrates on helping inmates finish high school (either a diploma or HiSET [formerly GED] test preparation), taught by instructors from the Grossmont Union High School District Adult School, and computer literacy¹⁵. An inmate may receive permission to take correspondence school classes, but as of now there is almost no post-high school instruction in the jails, either with teachers on-site or with computer-aided self-instruction. According to staff, the Sheriff's Department is in discussion with Southwestern College to offer courses at South Bay detention centers.

Online education, which reduces costs and, according to RAND, may facilitate faster and better comprehension, has become commonplace in K-12 schools, and in county juvenile detention facilities (overseen by the San Diego County Department of Probation, not the Sheriff's Department). Online education could be implemented within the adult detention facilities, yet, when asked, facility staff stated that it would be too difficult to control access to inappropriate websites, even though the necessary screening software is widely available. Computer-based offline educational programs which allow inmates to work at their own pace are also widely available.

Vocational Education

The overall goal of vocational training is to reduce inmates' risk of recidivism by teaching them marketable skills they can use to find and retain employment following release from jail. Vocational and technical training programs can also reduce institutional problem behavior by replacing inmates' idle time with constructive work. In addition, some vocational training programs can assist in the operation of prisons by having inmates assist in institutional maintenance tasks.¹⁶

In the California state prison system, the Office of Correctional Education Programs offers Career Technical Education Programs in these fields: building trade and construction, finance and business, public service, manufacturing and product development, and transportation.¹⁷ (The most commonly reported trade certifications nationally were construction, occupational safety, plumbing or electrical apprenticeships, automotive service and welding.¹⁸) These programs comply with industry recognized certification. The training lasts three to six months for basic employment skills and six to

¹⁴ <http://rand.org/news/press/08/22.html>

¹⁵ Funded by the Inmate Welfare Fund for \$3,711,242 in 2014-2015, with \$1,367,463 in contract costs and \$2,343,779 for county program staff.

¹⁶ <http://jrc.sagepub.com/content/37/4/347.short>

¹⁷ www.cdcr.ca.gov/rehabilitation.docs/

¹⁸ http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR266.html

twenty-four months for the development of more advanced skills.¹⁹ Each of the programs is targeted to provide a “living wage.”²⁰

At East Mesa Reentry Facility, the following vocational skills are now taught: certificate programs in food handling, industrial laundry operations, and printing press operations; non-certificate programs in bicycle repair, park landscape maintenance, and building janitorial services (these last two involve county operations outside the jails). All these programs prepare inmates only for entry-level positions which fall short of a living wage.

The following table shows a sample of Spring 2016 San Diego Community College Continuing Education Division certificate programs, with the number of course hours required and projected income on completion.²¹

Programs	Total Hours	Hours Per Week	Income Per Hour
Auto Technician	920	25 for 37 weeks	\$20
Web Server Technology	875	25 for 36	\$31
HVAC (Heating/AC)	72	7 for 11	\$17
Plumbing	120	7 for 18	\$14
Welding	600	25 for 24	\$19

Certification in any of these fields could allow inmates the opportunity to earn a living wage on release. The courses could be offered to inmates in jail for a minimum of a year. The part-time course format would allow inmates to participate in other programs. The courses offered should be dependent on inmate interests, available teaching staff, funding and job opportunities within the community.

Clearly, there are neither funds nor space for every vocational program at every jail (the Otay Mesa campus, which already houses the East Mesa Reentry Facility, appears to have the most potential for expanding education). Online education, however, requires only a small area, and could be implemented more easily. Education forms an essential part of the county’s responsibility for humane incarceration.

FACTS AND FINDINGS

Fact: Incarcerated men and women generally have a lower level of education than the general population.

Fact: Inmates who participate in vocational training are 28% more likely to find employment after release.

¹⁹ www.cdcr.ca.gov/rehabilitation.docs/

²⁰ The 2016 San Diego County living wage calculation for a single adult working full-time (2080 hours per year) is \$12.72/hr, and for one adult with one child, \$25.43/hr (<http://livingwage.mit.edu/counties/06073>).

²¹ San Diego Continuing Education Class Schedule, Spring 2016

Fact: Inmates who participate in correctional education programs have a 43% lower chance of returning to prison.

Fact: Computer-based self-paced learning costs less than traditional instruction and may be more effective.

Fact: Online education is cost-effective compared with incarceration; software that prevents access to inappropriate web sites is available and in use in county juvenile detention facilities.

Fact: Grossmont Union High School District Adult School currently has the contract to teach classes in the High School Equivalency Exam and Computer Literacy.

Fact: The Sheriff's Department is in discussion with Southwestern College to offer post-high school courses at South Bay detention centers.

Fact: The county jails offer the following vocational training programs, which vary by facility: food preparation, laundry, printing, sewing, janitorial, landscaping, bicycle repair.

Finding 04: Academic education in county jails is geared to completion of high school, with almost no opportunity for post-high school coursework.

Finding 05: Vocational education in county jails is not geared to preparing inmates for living wage employment.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Within months of the passage of AB109, the San Diego Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) Executive Committee²² issued the Public Safety Realignment & Post-Release Community Supervision Preliminary 2011 Implementation Plan. It lists these Realignment Goals:

- Efficiently use jail capacity
- Incorporate reentry principles into in-custody programming
- Incorporate evidence-based practices into supervision and case management of post release offenders; encourage the use of evidence-based practices in sentencing for felony offenders²³

²² Members included the County Probation Officer, the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, the District Attorney, the Public Defender, the Sheriff, the Director of the Health and Human Services Agency, and the Chief of the Oceanside Police Department.

²³p. 8. <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/probation/docs/CCP-SanDiegoPublicSafetyImplementationPlan.pdf>.9.16.11.pdf

Sheriff's staff has often referred to the 2011 Implementation Plan as their blueprint for dealing with Realignment. The CCP document, however, focuses on overarching principles rather than specific operational issues for individual departments. The County Probation Department, for example, produced its own strategic planning document quickly enough for it to be included in the Preliminary 2011 Implementation Plan.²⁴

To date, the Sheriff's Department has not constructed its own plan to give direction to its responsibilities. Such a plan could unify the Sheriff's Department's response to AB109. Further, it would help the Sheriff's Department, in collaboration with the CCP, prioritize the county's time, effort, and funds; incorporate evidence-based practices; and provide a solid foundation for the next several years of Realignment.

FACTS AND FINDINGS

Fact: In the past five years, to meet Realignment goals, the Sheriff's Department has made significant efforts, including repurposing the East Mesa Reentry Facility, strengthening its Reentry Services Division, and collaborating within the CCP.

Fact: The Sheriff's Department has not created a Strategic Plan to implement AB109.

Finding 06: The Sheriff's Department needs a document addressing Realignment in an integrated way that would coordinate custody, reentry, longer-term sentences and other issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2015/2016 San Diego County Grand Jury recommends that the San Diego County Sheriff:

- 16- 52:** **Improve inmates' access to physical exercise by:**
- **Providing athletic-type shoes to inmates**
 - **Improving exercise areas at county detention facilities, such as dip/chin bar stations and outdoor exercise fields**
 - **Increasing daily time and types of exercise afforded**
 - **Promoting participation by inmates in team sports**
- 16-53:** **Allow qualifying sentenced inmates contact visits.**
- 16-54:** **Repurpose areas in county detention facilities for contact visits.**

²⁴ Appendix B "San Diego County Probation Supervision Model"

- 16-55: Implement computer-based courses at all jail facilities, including installing appropriate hardware and software so that long-term inmates can earn college-level credits.**
- 16-56: Increase vocational training programs in multiple detention facilities in order to improve the likelihood of post-release employment, focusing on skills that could provide a living wage, such as welding/metal fabrication, HVAC (heating, ventilation and air conditioning), auto technician and server technology/web maintenance.**
- 16-57: Create an AB109 Implementation Strategic Plan, with specific goals for the next three to five years, and prepare annual reports on progress toward those goals.**

REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

The California Penal Code §933(c) requires any public agency which the Grand Jury has reviewed, and about which it has issued a final report, to comment to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the agency. Such comment shall be made *no later than 90 days* after the Grand Jury publishes its report (filed with the Clerk of the Court); except that in the case of a report containing findings and recommendations pertaining to a department or agency headed by an elected County official (e.g. District Attorney, Sheriff, etc.), such comment shall be made *within 60 days* to the Presiding Judge with an information copy sent to the Board of Supervisors.

Furthermore, California Penal Code §933.05(a), (b), (c), details, as follows, the manner in which such comment(s) are to be made:

- (a) As to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:
- (1) The respondent agrees with the finding
 - (2) The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor.
- (b) As to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:
- (1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
 - (2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.

(3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This time frame shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

(4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.

(c) If a finding or recommendation of the grand jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or department headed by an elected officer, both the agency or department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the grand jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision making authority. The response of the elected agency or department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency or department.

Comments to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court in compliance with the Penal Code §933.05 are required from the:

<u>Responding Agency</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>Date</u>
San Diego County Sheriff	16-52 through 16-57	8/1/16