



City of Port Hueneme

RECEIVED

MAY 29 2012

VENTURA COUNTY
GRAND JURY

May 21, 2012

Ventura County Grand Jury
Honorable David H. Gale, Foreman
800 South Victoria Avenue, L#3751
Ventura, CA 93009

California Superior Court
Honorable Vincent J. O'Neil, Jr.,
Presiding Judge
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009

**SUBJECT: 2011-2012 VENTURA COUNTY GRAND JURY REPORT
VEHICLE IMPOUND FEES IN VENTURA COUNTY**

The Honorable Vincent J. O'Neil, Jr., Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California:

The Honorable David H. Gale, Foreman:

In accordance with California Penal Code 933.05, the City Council offers the following responses for itself and behalf of the City Manager to the subject Grand Jury Report dated March 16, 2012:

- With regard to the Report's findings, the City Council currently lacks the resources to confirm or dispute the various statements, references, and conclusions regarding the Sheriff, the other nine cities within the County, and the CHP. However, we have no reason to believe the Report's findings requiring response from Port Hueneme (FI-04, FI-05, and FI-06) are incorrect and therefore accept them without further comment.
- With regard to the Report's recommendations requiring response from Port Hueneme (R-02 and R-03), the following is offered:

Recommendation R-02: Representatives of all law enforcement agencies within the County should meet and identify a standard set of tasks, labor hours and overhead items to cover the full spectrum of administrative costs for violations of Vehicle Code Sections 12500, 14601, and 23152.

Response: This recommendation requires further analysis.

The City's Police Chief has met with the other Chiefs in Ventura County and agreed to standardize the process. Commander Andrew Salinas of the Oxnard

Police Department has been tasked with creating a unified policy. The goal is to draft a standard set of tasks, labor hours, and overhead items to cover the full spectrum of administrative costs for violations of Vehicle Code Sections 12500, 14601, and 23152 (driving without a license, driving with a suspended/revoked license, or driving a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or drugs). We estimate the task to be concluded by August/September 2012.

Recommendation R-03: All Cities should apply their local rates and factors and their targeted cost recovery goals to calculate their individual vehicle release fees using the standardized cost category list from Recommendation R-02. It should be recognized that categories not included in the cost basis for approved fees represent costs to be borne by the general public and not the violator at a time of reduced public safety budgets. As necessary, new resolutions authorizing any revised vehicle release fees should be passed and the basis for the fees should be available to the public.

Response: This recommendation requires further analysis.

Based upon Commander Andrew Salinas' work, the draft-standardized process will be returned to all the chiefs for review, discussion, and approval as submitted or revised. The City would then apply the standardized process to its method of cost allocation and reflect it by updating its User Fee Determination Worksheets and include the updated costs in its annual Master Fee Schedule for consideration at a future meeting of the City Council estimated in November/December 2012. Updates to the City's Master Fee Schedule are considered annually by the City Council and adopted by resolution of the Council. The City resolution, User Fee Determination Worksheets, and Master Fee Schedule are all available to the public.

In closing, should the Grand Jury have any specific questions regarding this response letter, please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Greg Brown, Community Development Director, at (805) 986-6553.

Sincerely,



Douglas A. Breeze
Mayor

c: City Council
City Manager
Police Chief

Response to Grand Jury Report Form

Report Title: VEHICLE IMPOUND FEES IN VENTURA COUNTY

Report Date: MARCH 16, 2012

Response by: GREG BROWN Title: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

FINDINGS

- I (we) agree with the findings numbered: 4, 5, 6*
- I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the findings numbered: _____
(Attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed; include an explanation of the reasons therefor.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendations numbered _____ have been implemented.
(Attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)
- Recommendations numbered _____ have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
(Attach a timeframe for the implementation.)
- Recommendations numbered 2 and 3 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 _____ will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.
(Attach an explanation.)

Date: 5/22/12 Signed: 

Number of pages attached 2