## RESPONSE FORM

RE: Report Titled: ARE WE TALKING YET?	
Report Dated: February 8, 2011	
Response I	Form Submitted By:
Carmel Any Mendocino 501 Low G Ukiah, CA	County ap Road
Response M	AUST be submitted, per Penal Code §933.05, no later than: July 26, 2011
I have revi	ewed the report and submit my responses to the <u>FINDINGS</u> portion of the report as
	I (we) agree with the Findings numbered:
	1, 7-12, 16, 21-24
Q	I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the Findings numbered below, and have <u>attached</u> , as required, a statement specifying any portion of the Finding that are disputed with an explanation of the reasons therefore.  2-6, 13-15, 17-20, 25
I have revi the report o	ewed the report and submit my responses to the <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u> portion of as follows:
	The following Recommendation(s) have been implemented and <u>attached</u> , as <u>required</u> , is a summary describing the implemented actions:
	The following Recommendation(s) have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, <u>attached</u> , <u>as required</u> is a time frame for implementation:

The following Recommendation(s) require further analysis, and <u>attached as required</u> , is an explanation and the scope and parameters of the planned analysis, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared, discussed and approved by the officer and/or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed: (This time frame shall not exceed six (6) months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury Report)  6	
<ul> <li>         \[             \text{The following Recommendations will NOT be implemented because they are not warranted and/or are not deemed reasonable, \( \frac{attached, \text{ as required}}{\text{ is an explanation therefore:} \\</li></ul>	
I have completed the above responses, and have attached, as required the following number of pages to this response form:	
Number of Pages attached:2	
I understand that responses to Grand Jury Reports are public records. They will be posted on the Grand Jury website: <a href="www.co.mendocino.ca.us/grandjury">www.co.mendocino.ca.us/grandjury</a> . The clerk of the responding agency is required to maintain a copy of the response.	
I understand that I must submit this signed response form and any attachments as follows:	
First Step: E-mail (word documents or scanned pdf file format) to:	
<ul> <li>The Grand Jury Foreperson at: grandjury@co.mendocino.ca.us</li> <li>The Presiding Judge c/o Sally Nevarez: sally.nevarez@mendocino.courts.ca.gov</li> <li>The County's Executive Office: angeloc@co.mendocino.ca.us</li> </ul>	
Second Step: Mail all originals to:	
Mendocino County Grand Jury P.O. Box 939 Ukiah, CA 95482	
Printed Name: <u>Carmel J. Angelo</u>	
Title: Chief Executive Officer  Signed: Date:	

<u>Findings #2, 3:</u> The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer has no specific information regarding these findings and therefore incorporates by reference herein, the response prepared by the Assessor.

<u>Findings #4, 5, 6:</u> The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer incorporates by reference herein, the response prepared by the Department of Planning and Building Services.

<u>Finding #13:</u> The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer has no specific information regarding these findings and therefore incorporates by reference herein, the response prepared by the Assessor and the Sheriff.

Findings #14, 15: The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer has no specific information regarding this finding and therefore incorporates by reference herein, the response prepared by the Assessor and County Counsel.

Finding #17: As presented, this finding seems to imply that Planning and Building Services currently reviews the tax rolls on a regular basis to identify unpermitted structures. For reasons outlined in the response of Planning and Building Services, this review does not currently occur.

<u>Finding #18:</u> The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer incorporates by reference herein, the response prepared by the Department of Planning and Building Services.

<u>Finding #19:</u> The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer has no specific information regarding this finding and therefore incorporates by reference herein, the response to this finding prepared by the Assessor and the Sheriff.

<u>Finding #20:</u> The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer has no specific information regarding this finding and therefore incorporates by reference herein, the response prepared by the Sheriff.

Finding #25: While it is certainly possible that fees generated through increased code enforcement could allow the creation of an enterprise fund division, the Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer feels a comprehensive review of the code enforcement process would be necessary to reach any defensible conclusions. It should be recognized that any increased code enforcement activity could dramatically impact the workload and staff in County Counsel's office. A final note is that the primary purpose of code enforcement is not to impose and collect fees, but to achieve compliance. Many cases are resolved without imposing fees because of voluntary compliance, much of which results from education of codes and regulations of the violator by code enforcement division personnel.

<u>Recommendation 1:</u> The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer (CEO) does not have the legal authority to require the Assessor to implement this recommendation. However, the CEO finds that the proposed recommendation is valuable, and will suggest to the relevant department that they implement these recommendations.

<u>Recommendations 2 – 4:</u> The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer does not have legal authority to require the Sheriff or Assessor to implement these recommendations. However, the CEO finds that the proposed recommendations are valuable, and will suggest to the relevant departments that they implement these recommendations.

Recommendation 5: Given current staffing and budgetary constraints throughout the County, it will not be possible for Planning and Building Services to clear all backlogged nuisance abatement cases within the foreseeable future. Given the current lack of resources, the Executive Office is supportive of efforts to prioritize health & safety concerns in the identification and prioritization of the most egregious cases.

**Recommendation 6:** The Mendocino County Chief Executive Officer will review this recommendation with the appropriate departments, and ensure the Board of Supervisors receives a report of findings and a recommendation within 6 months.