COUNTY OF ALPINE
Board of Supervisors

October 18, 2011

The Honorable Judge David Devore, Presiding Judge
Alpine County Superior Court
P.O. Box 518
Markleeville, CA 96120

RE: County Response to Final Grand Jury Report-2010

Dear Judge Devore:

The Alpine County Board of Supervisors is in receipt of the Final Grand Jury Report for 2010.

After special consideration of the findings and recommendations, the Board of Supervisors respectfully submits the prepared responses in accordance with the California Penal Code Section 933.05.

Sincerely,

Pamela Knorr
County Administrative Officer

RECEIVED
SUPERIOR COURT
OF ALPINE COUNTY
2011 OCT 18 PM 3: 19

Grand Jury Response Matrix
2011Room For Justice

Final Report for 2010-

Findings

Finding	County Response	Narrative
F1	Partially Agree	Alpine County does not provide secure interview/interrogation rooms within the county, thereby risking safety and the integrity of investigations.
F2	Partially Agree	Alpine County does not provide temporary holding facilities within the county, thereby risking safety and costing manpower during the criminal justice process.

Recommendations

Recommendation	County Response	Narrative	Related to Finding
R1	Has not yet been implemented	The County agrees that the interview/interrogation rooms are not adequate. As with most all of the county facilities, operations require additional space and updated facilities. In August 2011, the architectural firm Collaborative Design Studio, conducted a Facility Assessment and Master Plan for the County. The study included the Sheriff's Office space needs. The County is collaborating with the Administration of the Courts to address our combined space needs and is exploring the feasibility of a shared facility. The County will continue its efforts to resolve the facility needs of County operations with the most responsible and economically reasonable approach.	F1
R2	Has not yet been implemented	The County agrees that the holding facilities are not adequate. In August 2011, the architectural firm Collaborative Design Studio, conducted a Facility Assessment and Master Plan for the County. The study included a holding facility. The County is collaborating with the Administration of the Courts to address our combined space needs and is exploring the feasibility of a shared facility. The County will continue its efforts to resolve the facility needs of County operations with the most responsible and economically reasonable approach.	F2

Alpine County
District Attorney's Office
Terese Drabec, District Attorney

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT
COUNTY OF ALPINE
SEP 30 2011
BY [signature]
COURT CLERK

September 28, 2011

Honorable David L. DeVore
Presiding Judge
Alpine County Superior Court
PO Box 518
Markleeville, CA 96120

Ernestine Fogarty
Kris Hartnett
Co-Forepoersons
Alpine County Civil Grand Jury
PO Box 102
Markleeville, CA 96120

RE: Grand Jury Final Report 2010-2011

The Honorable Judge DeVore, Ms. Fogarty & Mr. Hartnett:

In response to Grand Jury Report 2010-2011, I submit the following in writing for Grand Jury Report Title "Room For Justice" dated 2010-2011:

I agree with findings numbered: F1, F2, R1, and R2. .

Recommendation R1 has not been implemented. The District Attorney budget does not include funding for a victim/witness interview room at the District Attorney's Office.

Thank you very much for your work and your well written, concise report.

Sincerely,

Terese Drabec
District Attorney

TD:slw

Sharon L. Warkentin, Legal Services Specialist; Valerie Bolton, Administrative Legal Assistant III
P.O. Box 248, Markleeville, CA 96120 (530) 694-2971 / Fax (530) 694-2980
Internet Address: http://www.alpinecountyca.gov

Response to Grand Jury Report Form

Report Title: ROOM FOR JUSTICE

Report Date: 6-30-10

Response by: DOUG RUBLAITUS **Title:** CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

FINDINGS

- I (we) agree with the findings numbered: F1 - F2 - R1 - R2
- 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 _____ 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: 9-26-11 Signed: Doug Rublaitus

Number of pages attached ____