



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 27, 2000

Honorable Charles W. Campbell, Jr.
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
County of Ventura
800 S. Victoria Avenue
Ventura, California 93009

Re: Response to 1999-2000 Ventura County Grand Jury Report
Ventura County Ordinance No. 4088

Dear Judge Campbell:

As required by California Penal Code section 933.05, this letter is a response to the findings and recommendations of the 1999-2000 Ventura County Grand Jury's Report entitled *Ventura County Ordinance No. 4088*. The following are my responses:

Findings

In general, I concur with the findings of the Grand Jury. However, I disagree with the following finding on page 3 of the Report:

- "No other county in California removed its law enforcement agencies from the annual budget process as a consequence of Proposition 172."

The budget for the Sheriff's Department has never been removed from the annual budget process. The Department's budget is, and always has been, subjected to the same procedural guidelines and review by the Board of Supervisors as the budgets of other departments and agencies. The Chief Administrative Office has never calculated specific, formula-driven, total budgets for the County's law enforcement agencies that receive Proposition 172 monies and asked the Board of Supervisors to simply adopt those budgetary amounts. There has always been discussion and review, by both the CAO and the Board, of the budgetary submissions prepared by all departments, including the Sheriff's.

SPECIAL SERVICES

South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009
(805) 654-2315 FAX (805) 650-4079

PATROL SERVICES

2101 East Olsen Road
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
(805) 494-8261 FAX (805) 494-8295

DETENTION SERVICES

800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009
(805) 654-2305 FAX (805) 654-3500

SUPPORT SERVICES

800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009
(805) 654-3926 FAX (805) 654-2109

Grand Jury Response -- Ord. 4088
June 27, 2000
Page 2 of 3

Recommendations

1. The budgets of the public safety departments and the allocation and proposed use of Proposition 172 moneys should be reviewed annually by the Board of Supervisors as part of the overall budget process and in accordance with the California Budget Act.

Comments/Response:

Please see my response to the Findings above.

2. The Sheriff's Department should budget more accurately so that excess funds, now included in its budget and returned to the General Fund at the end of the year, are available to other agencies during the course of the fiscal year. If necessary, the County's contingency fund should pay Sheriff's Department overruns caused by unforeseen emergencies.

Comments/Response:

Any excess funds remaining in the Sheriff's Department's at the end of a budget year are the result of the fiscal responsibility shown by my managers, and not because of inaccurate budgeting. As stated in my response to the Findings above, the Department budget calculations are reviewed by both the CAO and the Auditor/Controller's Office for accuracy and validity of the assumptions prior to final adoption by the Board of Supervisors. Handling "unforeseen emergencies" is a primary function of the Sheriff's Department, and having budgetary flexibility to respond to such occurrences is critical to the successful completion of our mission.

3. The Board of Supervisors should rescind the constraints of Ordinance No. 4088 and reconsider the allocation of Proposition 172 funds to public safety agencies during their *annual* budgeting process.

Comments/Response:

District Attorney Michael Bradbury, in his June 21, 2000, Comments on 1999-2000 Ventura County Grand Jury Report Regarding Ventura County Ordinance 4088, concludes that, based upon his legal analysis of the initiative, "...the Board of Supervisors has no authority to unilaterally abandon that position and purport to now rescind Ordinance 4088 without voter approval." I agree with the District Attorney. Ordinance 4088 represents the will of the people of Ventura County to spend the monies derived from the increase in the sales tax for public safety. It was an appropriate matter for the initiative process, and the Board of Supervisors cannot rescind the Ordinance, thereby going back on the commitment they made to the citizens of our county in adopting the Ordinance in lieu of placing it on the ballot.

Grand Jury Response -- Ord. 4088
June 27, 2000
Page 3 of 3

4. The public safety departments should work together with the CAO and Board of Supervisors to ensure availability of funding for staffing of the Juvenile Justice Complex when it is completed.

Comments/Response:

I agree. At the time of the notification of the awarding of the \$40.5 million grant for the Juvenile Justice Complex, District Attorney Bradbury and I clearly stated our belief that new, allocated Proposition 172 funds should be used to fund the staffing requirements for the facility. I continue to support such utilization of Proposition 172 monies.

Respectfully



BOB BROOKS
Ventura County Sheriff