

ADDING INSULT TO INJURY: THE SYSTEMATIC FAILURE OF THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY BATTERER'S TREATMENT PROGRAM

May 28, 2025



SUMMARY

The goal of the Batterer's Treatment Program is to stop violence; but is this being met?

For over 30 years, California Penal Code section 1203.097 has required defendants who are convicted and granted formal probation in felony domestic violence cases to complete a 52-week certified Batterers' Treatment Program (BTP). The goal of the BTP is to stop domestic violence by educating and rehabilitating the offender; changing the offender's beliefs, thoughts, and/or behaviors; enhancing victims' safety; and reducing the likelihood of further violence. State law requires that the Probation Department oversee and supervise the BTP and establish standards for batterers treatment providers to ensure that they comply with state law and operate effectively.

The BTP of the Sacramento County Probation Department (Probation), which is housed in the Family Violence Unit, is not fulfilling its mission due to inadequate management and an outdated, ineffective approach to treatment. The BTP has remained virtually unchanged since its inception 30 years ago.

The Grand Jury has found supervision of offenders and contracted providers by the Family Violence Unit is severely lacking, undermining the program's goals and effectiveness. Probation officers are not performing provider site visits and the process of collecting, storing, and analyzing data is deficient, resulting in unreliable data that cannot be trusted to provide a true picture of how the program is doing.

In California, the funding for domestic violence programming relies primarily on the individual who committed the crime; the state provides no funding to the BTP. This approach derives from the retribution goal of the "Offender Pays Model" as identified by California State Association of Counties (CSAC). Domestic violence offenders are expected to pay for the program on a sliding scale pay model, contributing to sporadic attendance and a high dropout rate.

In the process of investigating the BTP, the Grand Jury discovered there is a pilot program currently being tried in six other California counties to assess the effectiveness of alternative approaches to the standard BTP methodology. The pilot program places the emphasis on risk assessment for more accurate direction of services, treatment, courses, and monitoring.

The original concept of the BTP was that domestic violence would be reduced by having offenders attend classes and group counseling. Effective rehabilitation of domestic violence offenders is imperative to reduce recidivism and to provide offenders with the tools to reduce their propensity towards repeated violence.

But the reality is that after 30 years, the failure rate is extremely high and there is little evidence that the original concept reduces domestic violence.

BACKGROUND

Domestic violence is one of the most complex issues facing society today. According to the CDC, one in four women and one in seven men will be victims of domestic violence. It is prevalent in every community, regardless of socioeconomic status, gender, race, religion, or nationality, and can result in physical injury, psychological trauma, increased healthcare costs, increased homelessness of women and children, and even death. In the US alone, on average, nearly 20 people per minute are physically abused by an intimate partner, and in California, domestic violence makes up 20% of all violent crime.

California Penal Code Sets BTP's in Motion

The Batterers Treatment Program (BTP) was established over 30 years ago with the enactment of California Penal Code section 1203.097. As a condition of probation, the statute requires courts to order offenders convicted of domestic violence (DV) to

complete a 52-week program of classes within 18 months, which includes counseling and group therapy. County probation is required to establish and maintain the BTP. The statute has detailed requirements that county probation departments must meet.

Sacramento County's BTP

The BTP's therapy approach has not changed for 30 years in Sacramento County. The BTPs in Sacramento County primarily use an educational model approach in group settings. This model focuses on education, accountability, and community coordination. It is not based on academic research and has been widely debated with mixed reviews as to its effectiveness to change behavior and reduce recidivism. Sacramento County does not administer a risk assessment tool to determine the offender's risk of reoffending. Each offender must complete the 52-week course regardless of the offender's threat to the community, as is required by the statute.

The Family Violence Unit of the Sacramento County Probation Department oversees domestic violence offenders and the BTP. According to Probation in September 2024, they supervised approximately 2800 individuals. Of that number, about 770 (28%) are BTP participants. Probation keeps statistics on all DV offenders in the Family Violence Unit, but it does not keep separate statistics for the BTP participants.

Sacramento County Probation selects counseling providers who apply and meet specific requirements to be BTP providers. These providers conduct classes and hold group sessions in a classroom setting. Each provider decides on the instructional schedule of its program within the state mandated framework. Probation is required to oversee the providers by confirming adherence to the State mandated minimum requirements. Probation is allowed to set additional requirements that the providers must follow. For example, in Sacramento County, Probation requires that the providers conduct only in-person meetings. Any type of a video conference meeting is not allowed for the counseling sessions.

The providers set their rates based upon a standardized sliding scale. Offenders can choose providers based on location, driving time, and the rate that providers charge. There are currently six providers in Sacramento County.

Probation is required to design and implement an approval and renewal process of Batterer's Programs, in addition to soliciting input from criminal justice agencies and domestic violence victim advocacy programs, as per the statute. Probation's standards and procedures also require unannounced monitoring of sessions and auditing of client's files and supporting records, in order to confirm program adherence.

All providers are required to obtain an initial approval from Probation. Thereafter, they have the opportunity to re-apply annually in order to remain in the BTP. By paying a renewal fee and submitting required documents such as proof of training, licenses, insurance, office leases, a Provider may automatically remain with the program.

Per the Penal Code and the Sacramento County Probation Department, Batterer's Program Standards and Procedures, each BTP is required to submit weekly statistics to the Probation Department, which consist of a list of new client referrals and terminated cases with the reasons for termination.

Participants Must Pay Per Statute

The costs that offenders must pay to participate in the BTP include registration and set up fees, program costs per session, fines, and court fees. Offenders pay providers directly for each session they attend. This is commonly referred to as the "Offender Pays Model". The total annual program cost to the offender, including counseling, court fees, and fines is over \$2,000. This is the only court mandated program that requires the offender to pay.

State Review Found Current System is Ineffective

Following a 2022 review by the Auditor of the State of California, a letter was sent to the California Governor and State Legislators that identified the current system of Batterer's Intervention Programs as failing. The report found that probation departments, courts, and providers had limited impact in reducing domestic violence, and that the program could improve significantly with "statewide guidance and oversight."

In 2012, a Crime and Justice Institute report questioned the effectiveness of a court-mandated BTP, due to the high rates of domestic violence recidivism. That report noted, "Domestic violence is a complicated community problem, and we have yet to figure out what works for effectively intervening with batterers to reduce recidivism or altering batterers' attitudes about violence".

In 2021, the Little Hoover Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy found that California lacked a coordinated cohesive strategy to prevent domestic violence. It identified problems with the BTP, including language barriers, availability, and cost that make it difficult for offenders to attend. The Commission called on the State to begin a process to determine how to tailor rehabilitative services to individual needs.

Based on the problems counties had experienced with the BTP, the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) received permission to initiate a pilot program in 2019

to try a new approach. This pilot program is authorized by California Penal Code section 1203.099, which was added by Assembly Bill 372 (AB 372) in 2018. Six counties were enrolled in the pilot project and they were given flexibility in how they programmed and engaged with batterers, in the hopes of reducing the rates of reoffending. The participating counties are Napa, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Yolo.

Each county in the pilot program took a different approach, but in general they classified offenders into risk categories and allowed low risk offenders to attend the BTP 26 weeks or less, rather than the 52 weeks set in statute. Overall, 43% of the offenders were allowed to attend BTP for 26 weeks, and sometimes even shorter periods of time.

METHODOLOGY

The Grand Jury conducted research and collected data to better understand the nature of the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to the procedural operations of the BTP including, but not limited to:

- California Penal Code sections 1203.097 and 1203.098
- California Assembly Bill 372
- California State Association of Counties publications
- California Family Code section 6211

The Grand Jury reviewed numerous academic reports on domestic violence and treatment options.

The Grand Jury reviewed numerous documents pertaining to the BTP and the pilot program including, but not limited to:

Documents from Sacramento County Probation Department, including:

- Sacramento County Probation Department Batterer's Program Standards and Procedures, 2023
- Sacramento County Probation Department's List of Approved Providers as of October 2024
- Batterer's Program Provider Certification
- Batterer's Standards and Procedures (2023)
- Tailoring Domestic Violence Programs to Reduce Recidivism

Documents from BTP providers, including:

- Sacramento County Probation Department Domestic Violence Intervention Program Case File Audits (2021, 2022, and 2023)

- Provider Certification of BTP from Sacramento County Probation
- Provider Annual Renewal Checklist
- Quarterly Report Format
- Statistics provided by providers regarding completion and failure rates
- Sample of work book curriculums and sample exit exam

The Grand Jury conducted in-person interviews with individuals who gave direct, first-person testimony and perspective in the operations of, problems with, and possible improvements to the BTP:

- Sacramento County Probation Department
- Sacramento County BTP providers
- Yolo County Probation Department
- A Yolo County pilot program provider
- The California State Association of Counties

DISCUSSION

The BTP Failure Rate is High

Probation estimates that the BTP failure rate could be as high as 95%. Statistics received from three Sacramento County providers were confusing and inconsistent, indicating that their completion rates were just under 20%, 43%, and 45%. The average completion rate among those three providers was 36%, making the overall failure rate 64%. In sum, over half of all offenders sentenced to the BTP fail to complete the 52-week regimen.

The BTP Focuses on Punishment Rather than Rehabilitation.

Sacramento Probation primarily uses the Duluth Model for domestic violence intervention, which was developed in the 1980's by a small group of activists in the battered women's movement. The Duluth program intervention is an educational approach administered through group-facilitated sessions using curriculum guides and various tools like journals, exercises, and video vignettes to facilitate this process. It is not considered to be an evidence-based intervention, meaning that it has not been proven to be effective through scientific research.

The theory underlying the Duluth model is that men use violence to assert power, control, and dominance over their partners. It views assault as a choice made by men acting in concert with patriarchal attitudes that normalize male dominance and aggression. The model assumes that domestic violence does not come from underlying causes, such as emotional and psychological problems, substance abuse, life stressors

or dysfunctional relationships. As a result, it tends to be more confrontational, focusing more on punishment rather than rehabilitation. The model also neglects women's violence and violence with same-sex partners.

The pilot program, which is discussed in detail later on in this report, is using a cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) model. CBT is a well-established and widely used psychological treatment that is based on research and clinical practice. Although primarily focused on present day problems and solutions, it takes into consideration an individual's past and early learning experiences, along with socioeconomic factors that shape present day thoughts, feelings, and behaviors.

Studies have shown that between 40%-60% of domestic violence involves alcohol or drug use and individuals with a drug use disorder are four to ten times more likely to perpetrate violence than non-drug users, and 33% of offenders experienced domestic violence as a child.

Antisocial and borderline personality disorder traits, PTSD, and depression are closely associated with the perpetration of domestic violence and are often predictive of who recidivates after completing a BTP program.

CBT treatments involve working to change harmful thinking and behavioral patterns. It focuses on how to help the offender understand their current state, and how to effectively cope with life moving forward. CBT works to engage offenders in skill-building in the areas of communication, social skills, non-violent assertiveness, and anger management techniques (e.g., time-outs, relaxation training), and learning how to build and maintain positive relationships.

Because batterers come from different walks of life, and have different life experiences, they cannot all be treated in the same way. To address this, there are different models and strategies under the CBT umbrella to personalize treatment for the offender and tailor it to meet the offenders' needs.

Sacramento BTPs do not have uniformed treatment approaches among providers. For example, one provider interviewed uses a Duluth educational approach while another uses mixed models of both the Duluth and CBT approaches.

The BTP Program is Stagnant and Has Failed to Evolve

The BTP program in Sacramento County has had virtually no change in treatment intervention (method, curriculum, and philosophy/approach) since its inception. There is

no standardized assessment tool to determine the offender's risk for reoffending at the completion of the program. On the other hand, Yolo County uses the Ontario Domestic Abuse Risk Assessment (ODARA) tool. This risk assessment focuses on the likelihood of the offender committing a future act of domestic violence on the same partner.

Sacramento County Probation admitted the current BTP is not successful. Probation indicated that the counseling curriculum is antiquated and mostly done by lecture with little interactive learning. In addition, it needs to be more intensive and CBT focused. Probation noted there also needs to be a change in the penal statute, to allow for more flexibility in the length of the program to accommodate risk factors and eliminate the Offender's Pay Model.

The Six County Pilot Programs Offer Hope

The AB 372 pilot program authorized by state law became operative on July 1, 2019, and will be repealed on July 1, 2026, unless extended by the Legislature. The program allows six pilot counties to provide an alternative new treatment tailored to offenders' risks, their likelihood of reoffending, and personal needs. Sacramento County is not one of the counties participating in the pilot program.

AB 372 allows pilot counties, such as Yolo County, to have flexibility to tailor the length and intensity of batterers treatment programs using the principle of Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR). RNR is an assessment tool, which can be used both before and after completion of treatment, to evaluate the risk of reoffending, identify factors that contribute to criminal behavior, and determine the most appropriate and effective intervention based upon the offenders' characteristics. RNR maximizes the offender's ability to learn from a rehabilitative intervention by providing cognitive behavioral treatment and tailoring the intervention in the learning style, motivation, abilities and strengths of the offender. The principle of RNR suggests that interventions be tailored to an offender's individual risk level, with high-risk individuals receiving more intense services than low-risk offenders.

The long-term goal of the participating pilot counties is to develop new perspectives on what works to change program participant behavior. Recent data from the pilot counties show nearly 60% of offenders are high to medium risk to re-offend, with 40% at low risk. Understanding these risk factors helps to determine tailored services, level of inter-agency support, and levels of supervision needed.

When batterers intervention programs are effective, they can help reduce recidivism, stop generational cycles of abuse, support victim safety, and give offenders a path back to society and family.

Certification Requirements and Monitoring of the Providers Are Inadequate

Probation approves enrollments and referrals of Probationers to providers pursuant to the Penal Code 1203.097. Probation is the sole authority for the approval, denial, suspension or revocation of a provider. State law requires county probation departments to design and implement a provider approval and renewal process that suits their needs. Sacramento County Probation Department requires the absolute minimum monitoring of the providers.

The only provider requirements implemented by the Sacramento County Probation Department for facilitators are:

- a 40-hour basic training
- a 104-hour supervised group facilitator
- continuing education of 16 hours each year, with a minimum of eight hours in domestic violence

State law also requires that if Probation finds a provider to be out of compliance, Probation must notify the provider in writing with a required response time of 14 days. Based on interviews with three BTP providers and Probation, the Grand Jury is unaware of any provider being terminated for the past several years. This allows for very minimal oversight and verification that a current program is effective.

A formal Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is a process that includes a written request for proposals based on qualifications, expertise, and the ability to perform a specific project or service provided by vendors. Many governmental entities utilize an RFQ process to ensure the most qualified individuals are providing services. During the investigation, the Grand Jury learned that Probation does not utilize any such formal type of procurement process for providers, but rather maintains the same providers year after year. Only if a provider chooses to exit the program entirely does Probation entertain the selection of a new provider.

The Grand Jury has found that in the past year Probation has conducted little or no monitoring of providers. Although it is the duty of Probation Officers to go to the homes of Domestic Violence offenders on a regular basis, Probation does not practice the same diligence in monitoring the providers of the BTP. It was noted during the investigation that there is no annual report from Probation for the BTP or the providers. The providers monitor themselves and are the sole reporters of the completion and certification of an offender in the program.

Probation conducts a quarterly meeting for BTP providers. Prior to the quarterly meeting, the providers are required to provide data documenting the participation and

failures of each enrollee. Providers should be entering this information into the Sacramento County Domestic Violence portal on a weekly basis, as called for in the Sacramento County BTP Standards and Procedures. The Grand Jury has learned that this is not occurring and that data storage and record keeping procedures are lacking.

Due to staffing constraints, monitoring of the providers consists only of an annual visit by the Probation Department to ensure that all of the documentation is in order. There were no records of any visits for at least one year; however, the Grand Jury did learn that moving forward, Probation plans to conduct two site visits per year.

The Offender Pays Model is a Barrier to Completion

Penal Code section 1203.097 requires offenders sentenced to the BTP to pay a fee for each weekly session. This is called the "Offender Pays Model". The batterer is responsible for all fees associated with the program. It is the only State mandated program for which the offenders are required to pay for their own treatment.

A study by California State Association of Counties (CSAC) found nonpayment of fees was frequently cited as a reason for termination from the BTP. This is problematic because 40% of offenders are unemployed. This leads to the concern that offenders may be unable to afford BTP services. It also increases the risk of offenders selecting providers based on cost rather than the ability to meet the offender's specific needs

In Sacramento County, as is the case in most other counties in California, providers require offenders to pay all fees to receive their certification of completion. The inability to pay may cause some offenders to be unable to obtain certificates of completion which are required by the court, therefore risking incarceration for violating conditions of probation.

In the six-county pilot program, 90% of providers require that all fees be paid prior to the offenders' receiving a proof of completion. A 2023 survey conducted by CSAC of 40 counties found that 56% of the counties surveyed offered a county-funded fee payment waiver. The pilot programs in Santa Cruz and Santa Clara have taken steps to subsidize providers for indigent offenders. Counties that offered subsidies obtained funding from the Community Corrections Performance Incentive Act (SB 678) and The Community Corrections Partnership (CCP).

Penal Code section 1203.097 allows the Court to waive or reduce a provider's fee if it finds the Offender does not have the ability to pay even a nominal fee. With a reduced fee the provider or the county have to absorb the full cost to attend the program. In Sacramento County, it is up to the Provider to ultimately accept the lower payment. Below is the sliding fee scale from Probation's Standards and Procedures Manual.

Gross Monthly Household Income	Weekly Counseling Fee	Gross Monthly Household Income	Weekly Counseling Fee
\$00-\$250	\$0	\$750-\$799	\$17
\$251-\$449	\$10	\$800-\$999	\$20
\$450-\$499	\$11	\$1000-\$1199	\$25
\$500-\$549	\$12	\$1200-\$1399	\$30
\$550-\$599	\$13	\$1400-\$1599	\$35
\$600-\$649	\$14	\$1600-\$1799	\$40
\$650-\$699	\$15	\$1800-\$2000	\$45
\$700-\$749	\$16		

Sliding Fee Scale

The Grand Jury was unable to verify the frequency of waivers allowed by the Sacramento Superior Court since the Superior Court declined to be interviewed. However, Probation estimates that the Sacramento Superior Court authorizes two to three waivers a week of which the cost is born by the providers. This amounts to approximately 20% of the total number of offenders. These fee waivers or subsidies increase the likelihood of an Offender completing the program but they also place a financial burden upon the providers.

Online Meetings May Improve Participation

Fifty-two percent of the counties in California allow offenders in the BTP to complete the curriculum online. According to CSAC, in the pilot program 30% of offenders attend classes in-person, 40% of offenders participate online exclusively, and the remaining 30% of offenders use a hybrid combination of in person and online. This means that in the pilot program 70% of offenders use some form of video conferencing, at least part of the time.

Sacramento County discontinued an online or hybrid option after the Covid pandemic. Probation now requires offenders to attend all BTP sessions in person. Online meetings would relieve some of the financial burdens associated with attending in person meetings. They are especially helpful for those offenders who do not live in Sacramento County and incur the costs of travel to get to in person meetings. Probation addresses this concern by allowing offenders to participate in in-person meetings in other counties. However, this is not a realistic option since nearby counties (for example, Yolo and Placer) use on line meetings not allowed by Probation for Sacramento County Offenders.

To alleviate privacy concerns and ensure participation, Yolo County has set specific rules for offenders when attending online. The offender is required to pan the room prior

to the meeting to show that he or she is alone and during the meeting the offender must show his/her face and be engaged the entire time.

Online meetings are also more cost effective for providers. One provider has recently left Sacramento County due in part to Probation's refusal to allow online meetings. This same provider participates in BTPs in Yolo and Placer Counties which allow online meetings.

Probation Is Making Positive Improvements

During the course of its investigation, the Grand Jury learned that Probation has taken the initiative to make several positive changes to the BTP. The Grand Jury would be remiss without mentioning these improvements. They are as follows:

- The first improvement Probation initiated was to address the offenders' practice of providing the Court with fake provider enrollment forms. Probation met with the Court, the District Attorney, and the Public Defender to develop a system to eliminate offender submission in its entirety. Now all documents dealing with the BTP are submitted to the Court by Probation rather than by the offender.
- Probation has instituted a sanction of three days on the Sheriff's Alternative Work Program (AWP) for an offender's first termination from a BTP, due to unexcused absences. Prior to this modification, the offender would be referred back to the Court on a violation of probation. The offender is now not referred to the Court but rather required to complete the AWP prior to his or her being re-admitted into the program.
- In the past, Probation would seldom, if ever, appear in court to advise the judge of its recommendations on violations of probation. Probation now attends court at least once a week to advise the Judge of its recommendations on any particular case and to verify the accuracy of an offender's statements to the Court.
- In the past, meetings between the providers and Probation have been sporadic to non-existent. Probation plans to double the number of site visits from one to two per year, in addition to re-instituting quarterly provider meetings.

Finally, Probation is exploring options to offer in-house BTP for indigent offenders. Probation would waive any cost per session to the offenders. Probation would also provide bus passes so that indigent offenders could get to the session free of transportation cost. The Grand Jury was advised that the cost for this program would come out of Probation's current budget.

There is much improvement necessary to change the direction of domestic violence treatment in Sacramento County. A decades old system of dealing with violators, accompanied with the bare minimum effort of maintaining the program is not serving anyone well. The impending results of the Six-County pilot program may offer a mechanism for reshaping the BTP.

FINDINGS

- F1. The Grand Jury finds that as of December 2024, the Probation Department has failed to keep complete and accurate records resulting in an inability to track and evaluate data in the areas of offender recidivism, attendance, and completion/failure rates. (R1)
- F2. The Grand Jury finds the BTP in Sacramento County uses an antiquated, ineffective, one-size-fits-all approach, resulting in a high failure rate. (R2)
- F3. The Grand Jury finds Probation's failure to perform a risk assessment at the conclusion of the BTP prevents an accurate determination of the offender's potential to reoffend. (R3)
- F4. The Grand Jury finds Probation has failed to require that providers implement one type of an evidence-based program which has resulted in inconsistent counseling methods. (R4, R7)
- F5. The Grand Jury finds Probation's inadequate oversight of the certification of providers has resulted in providers being re-approved year after year without an assessment of their competency. (R5, R6)
- F6. The Grand Jury finds reliance on the Offenders-Pay- Model creates a financial barrier, thereby inhibiting the offender's ability to enroll and complete the program and creating a financial burden for some providers. (R8)
- F7. The Grand Jury finds Probation's refusal to allow online meetings under any circumstances serves as a barrier to BTP completion by offenders and presents financial hardships for some providers. (R9)
- F8. The Grand Jury finds Probation lacks an in-house BTP that would enable indigent offenders to avoid weekly fees and receive their certification of completion in a timely manner. (R10)

RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1. The Grand Jury recommends Probation and providers collect and record all data regarding offender's recidivism, attendance, participation, and completion and input it in the BTP portal on a weekly basis starting January 1, 2026. (F1)
- R2. The Grand Jury recommends Probation initiate a risk assessment evaluation for appropriate placement of offenders in a BTP tailored to meet individual needs by January 1, 2026. (F2)
- R3. The Grand Jury recommends Probation add a risk assessment at the conclusion of the BTP by January 1, 2026, to determine the effectiveness of the program and increase support and treatment opportunities for those likely to reoffend. (F3)
- R4. The Grand Jury recommends Probation require all providers follow an evidence-based model that addresses individual needs by January 1, 2026. (F4)
- R5. The Grand Jury recommends that Probation implement a provider application and approval process, to include a formal Request for Qualifications (RFQ), for the certification and re-certification of providers by January 1, 2026. (F5)
- R6. The Grand Jury recommends Probation solicit input from criminal justice agencies and domestic violence victim advocacy programs as required by statute for the development of the RFQ by January 1, 2026. (F5)
- R7. The Grand Jury recommends Probation collaborate with neighboring counties, especially those taking part in the pilot program such as Yolo County for shared knowledge and training of providers in the use of CBT by January 1, 2026. (F4)
- R8. The Grand Jury recommends Probation request funding from the Community Corrections Act (SB 678) and the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) and any state, federal, or other grant issuing entities to help subsidize payment of BTP fees for indigent offenders by June 30, 2026. (F6)
- R9. The Grand Jury recommends Probation initiate hybrid video conference BTP meetings for offenders by January 1, 2026. (F7)
- R10. The Grand Jury recommends Probation initiate an in-house BTP for offenders that meets the all of the conditions set forth in Penal Code Section 1203.099(a) by January 1, 2026. (F8)

REQUIRED RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933(a) and (c) and 933.05, the grand jury requests responses as follows. From the following "agency head" as specified in Penal Code section 933(c) within 60 days, for all Findings and Recommendations:

- Interim Chief Probation Officer Julie Wherry
Sacramento County Probation Department
8745 Folsom Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95826
(All findings and recommendations)

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the grand jury requests a response from the following "governing body" as specified in Penal Code section 933(c) within 90 days, for all Findings and Recommendations:

- Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
700 H Street, Suite 2450
Sacramento, CA 95814
(All findings and recommendations)

Mail or deliver a hard copy response to:

The Honorable Bunmi Awoniyi
Presiding Judge Sacramento County Superior Court
720 9th Street Sacramento, CA 95814

Email the response to:

Ms. Erendira Tapia-Bouthillier
Sacramento County Grand Jury Coordinator
Email: TapiaE@saccourt.ca.gov

Reports issued by the Grand Jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code section 929 requires that reports of the Grand Jury not contain the name of any person or facts leading to the identity of any person who provides information to the Grand Jury.