Other Public Funded Agencies and Organizations: Responses to Final Report
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**Response Matrix to 03-04 Final Report**

The following matrix for the Grand Jury activities for 2003 - 2004 notes the agencies that were inspected/investigated. It denotes those agencies which are headed by an elected official and which have recommendations that the agency head needs respond to in a timely manner. Penal code Sections 933 (c) [No later than 90 days after the grand jury submits a final report on the operations of any public agency subject to its reviewing authority, the governing body of the public agency shall comment to the presiding judge of the superior court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the governing body, and every elected county officer or agency head for which the grand jury has responsibility pursuant to Section 914.1 shall comment within 60 days to the presiding judge of the superior court, with an information copy sent to the board of supervisors, on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of that county officer or agency head and any agency or agencies which that officer or agency head supervises or controls. In any city and county, the mayor shall also comment on the findings and recommendations. All of these comments and reports shall forthwith be submitted to the presiding judge of the superior court who impaneled the grand jury. A copy of all responses to grand jury reports shall be placed on file with the clerk of the public agency and the office of the county clerk, or the mayor when applicable, and shall remain on file in those offices. One copy shall be placed on file with the applicable grand jury final report by, and in the control of the currently impaneled grand jury, where it shall be maintained for a minimum of five years.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Headed by Elected Official?</th>
<th>Date Response Received</th>
<th>Location of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditor-Controller, Sutter County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7-2-04</td>
<td>Auditor-Controller Response, see attached; Board of Supervisors Response Page 9 &amp; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-County Juvenile Hall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9-29-04 &amp; 10-11-04</td>
<td>Sutter &amp; Yuba County Probation, see attached; Board of Supervisors Response Page 16 &amp; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9-29-04</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte View High School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8-25-04</td>
<td>Sutter Union High School District Response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Gaither Elementary School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Live Oak</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9-10-04</td>
<td>City of Live Oak Response and Department of Transportation, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8-9-04</td>
<td>City of Yuba City Response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-7-04</td>
<td>Attachment to the Board of Supervisors Response, Letter from Larry Combs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Clerk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8-2-04 &amp; 9-29-04</td>
<td>County Clerk Response, see attached; Board of Supervisors Response Page 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Nicholaus Volunteer Fire Department</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9-29-04</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Response Page 48 &amp; 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinal Elementary School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-7-04</td>
<td>Live Oak Unified School District Response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection in Sutter County</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9-29-04</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Response Page 44 &amp; 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Jury Permanent Meeting Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-29-04</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Response Page 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Chesney Community Correction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7-2-04</td>
<td>Cornell Companies Response, see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attached Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levee District 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Chief of Meridian Fire Protection District Response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Fire Protections District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3-1-05</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Response Page 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Guardian/Conservator</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9-29-04</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Response Page 59 &amp; 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins Elementary School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter Basin Fire District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9-29-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7-12-04</td>
<td>Sheriff Sutter County Response, see attached; Board of Supervisors Response Page 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter-Yuba Mosquito &amp; Vector Control</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3-11-05</td>
<td>Sutter-Yuba Mosquito &amp; Vector Control Response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City Police Department</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7-2-04</td>
<td>Yuba City Police Department Response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City Unified School District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3-18-05</td>
<td>Yuba City Unified School District, see attached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 2, 2004

Michael R. Sarringar, Foreperson
Sutter County Grand Jury
446 Second Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Re: Auditor-Controller Response to Grand Jury Report

Dear Mr. Sarringar:

The Audit & Finance Committee has captured very clearly some issues of importance to the County.

For clarification, however, it should be noted that both internal service and enterprise funds use proprietary accounting. The only real distinction is the internal service fund (ISF) is, as described, for internal county use, and the enterprise fund accounts for services provided to outsider users. Since the Records Query Project seems to serve a dual purpose it will fit within the existing structure of the ISF. In both cases capitalization is required. The report incorrectly states that the RQP is in a separate fund when it actually is within the ISF. This is not a substantive difference.

The “Findings” section appropriately identifies the lack of an internal audit function in the Auditor-Controller’s office. Credit is given to Smith & Newell for opining that “the responsibility of general oversight and review of county internal controls should be vested with the Auditor-Controller.” The auditor at that time was actually Bartig, Basler & Ray. We agree with the finding.

With respect to the RECOMMENDATIONS section, in the order presented:

- With a budget over $165,000,000 and the multiplicity of funds, boards, agencies and commissions, Sutter County has far exceeded the size for which an internal audit function is advisable per Government Code Section 1237:

   "All state and local agencies with an aggregate spending of Fifty million dollars ($50,000,000) or more annually shall consider establishing an ongoing internal audit function."

   RECEIVED
   JUL 2 2004
   SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
   COUNTY OF SUTTER
   CRIMINAL DIVISION

463 SECOND STREET • YUBA CITY, CALIFORNIA 95991 • (530) 822-7127 FAX 822-7439
The Auditor-Controller’s office agrees with the recommendation that “the AC and BOS should work together to ensure that an internal audit unit in the AC office is funded, developed and audits performed.”

- As the report correctly points out the “auditor-controller shall be the chief accounting officer of the county.” We agree with the recommendation “the BOS should defer to the AC on issues concerning proper accounting of county funds.”

- We agree with the recommendation “the BOS should direct the CAO to provide timely and accurate responses to the AC request for information.” The underlying issue here is accountability. Timely and accurate information is required from all departments.

- The recommendation “that the AC bring issues before the BOS in a manner that allows the BOS to ask clarifying questions” should be implemented. That method or manner needs to be defined. Rarely, though, should it be necessary for the AC to bring issues to the BOS. We agree with the recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert E. Stark, CPA
Auditor-Controller
July 21, 2004

The Honorable Robert H. Damron  
Superior Court Judge  
Courthouse West, 446 Second Street,  
Yuba City, California 95991


Dear Judge Damron,

The City of Live Oak has no decision making authority regarding State Highway 99; however, the following comment in the "Findings" appear to be unsupported by facts:

"The increase in home construction and population in the Live Oak Area raises the risk of injuries to school age children if corrective action is not taken."

The City has seen no statistical evidence to support this statement. To the contrary, the City knows of no one vehicle/pedestrian accidents that occurred on City streets involved children and attributed in some way to the increase in home construction. In fact, the City has only issued a modest 49 single home building permits over the past year. Of this, 34 are still under construction and consequently have not added to the traffic increases referenced in the Grand Jury Report. The traffic increase once these homes are built and occupied may add 98 vehicles (based on two vehicles per home) to the current 3,200 (based on 1600 current dwellings at two vehicles per home)—a statistically insignificant number.

The apparent traffic increases seen on State Highway 99 may be attributed to growth elsewhere; however as stated above, this would be a Caltrans issue.

I would recommend the Grand Jury review any applicable vehicle accident reports to determine cause. Should they find the vehicle drivers not at fault, then again, why this unsupported generalization?

The City is committed to ensuring city streets are safe and requires all development projects containing more than 50 homes to submit a traffic impact study along with their project. This allows the City to ensure potential traffic impact issues are identified and mitigated as appropriate. The City of Live Oak's streets are as safe now as they were prior to the current increase in home construction activity occurring within the City.

Very truly yours,

Charles Epp  
Mayor

Cc: Sutter County Board of Supervisors
August 16, 2004

Dear Ms. Lambert:

This is in response to your letter dated June 25, 2004, regarding concerns for pedestrian safety and traffic hazards at the intersection of Highway 99 and Elm Street, as documented in the Final Report of the Sutter County Grand Jury.

In 2002, in consultation with the City of Live Oak, the speed limit on Highway 99 through the intersection was reduced from 40 mph to 35 mph. This was done in an effort to reduce vehicle speeds where pedestrian activity and frequent vehicular turning movements occur. Also, in 2002 and previously in 1999, an engineering and traffic study was completed that evaluated the need for a traffic signal. Both studies evaluated collision data and traffic volumes but concluded that a signal is not warranted. In 2004, the City’s engineering consultant performed a new study in conjunction with planned development proposed for the west side of town. The study is under evaluation at this time.

We will continue to monitor this location as the Live Oak Area develops and grows; however, at this time, no additional corrective action or improvements are planned.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. WOOD
Deputy District Director
Traffic Operations

c: Michael Sarringar, Sutter County Grand Jury Foreperson

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
August 3, 2004

The Honorable Robert H. Damron  
Presiding Judge  
Superior Court of California  
County of Sutter  
Courthouse West, 446 Second Street  
Yuba City, CA 95991  

Re: Grand Jury Report

Dear Judge Damron:

The City of Yuba City is in receipt of the 2004 Grand Jury Final Report. The City appreciates their review of the City's departments. We have reviewed their findings and recommendations and will act accordingly.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeffrey Foltz  
City Manager

JF: cw

Enc. (disk)
August 4, 2004

To: Sutter County Grand Jury  
From: Christine D. Odom, Chief Probation Officer  
Re: Response to Grand Jury from Bi-County Juvenile Hall

Attached please find the response to the Grand Jury from the Bi-County Juvenile Hall Superintendent, Frank Sorgea. Please advise me if you desire further information.

Attachment
TO: Chris Odom, Chief Probation Officer, Sutter County
FROM: Frank D. Sorgea, Superintendent
DATE: July 29, 2004
SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO SUTTER COUNTY GRAND JURY

The following is submitted in response to the 2003/2004 Sutter County Grand Jury report. The report contained a finding that characterized the Juvenile Hall as a "clean well-functioning facility". We appreciate the Jury's findings as we strive to maintain the operation at a high level.

Relative to the findings I will respond to each individually.

1. SALLY PORT FENCING
   We agree with the recommendation. While there is no immediate plan to place a gate at the sally port area, this was a design consideration which was reviewed at the time of construction. As funding becomes available we intend to address this issue along with other infrastructural improvements.

2. EMERGENCY GENERATOR
   We agree with the recommendation. The emergency power generator has been in place since 1976 and has not caused any difficulties as noted in the Jury's concerns. I do agree that this is an area which would be safer if fenced. We intend to have the Camp Construction program construct a fence in this area in the early fall of 2004.

3. LAWN MAINTAINENCE
   All lawn maintenance is performed by crews from the Camp Singer program. The lawn at the Camp was recently planted. Landscaping projects are undertaken as time and materials allow.

4. PROCEDURAL MANUAL UPDATE
   The policy and procedural manual is updated on a continual basis.

RECEIVED
OCT 21 2004
June 28, 2004

The Honorable Robert H. Damron, Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California
County of Sutter
Courthouse West, 446 Second Street
Yuba City, California 95991

Dear Judge Damron:

This is provided in response to the final 2003/2004 report of the Sutter County Grand Jury. We concur with the findings of the Grand Jury.

The Leo Chesney Community Correctional Facility is committed to making a positive difference in the lives of the inmates in our care, our employees and the Live Oak community.

I appreciate the time and effort made by all the Jurors that toured our facility. If I can be of further assistance, please don’t hesitate to contact me at (530) 695-1846 Ext. 302.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Ron Murray
Facility Director

Cc: Michael R. Sarringar
Foreperson

ENDORSED FILED

OCT 2 7 2004

JOAN BECHTEL, Clerk
BYC. MC MILLAN, Deputy Clerk

RECEIVED

JUL 0 8 2004

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SUTTER
July 7, 2004

To: Robert H. Damron, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California County of Sutter

From: Jim Denney, Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator

Subject: Response to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury Final Report

The following are the responses of the Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator to the findings and recommendations of the 2003-2004 Sutter County Grand Jury Final Report.

3.0 Criminal Justice Committee Report

3.3 Sutter County Sheriff's Department

Finding #1:

The last budget cut cost the Sheriff's Department six Sheriff Positions and three court bailiffs totaling $500,000.

Response:

The Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator partially concurs with the finding. The final 2003-2004 state budget cut the allocation of $500,000 to 37 rural counties (including Sutter County) for enhanced law enforcement services. As a result, one lieutenant position and two deputy sheriff positions funded by this allocation were cut from the Sheriff-Coroner budget, per the agreement previously established between the Sheriff, the County Administrative Officer and the Board of Supervisors that in the event this funding was eliminated by the state, that the funded positions would also be eliminated, thus preventing a direct impact to the County General Fund.

In addition to the above listed positions, three bailiff positions were also eliminated from the security contract with the Superior Court at their request, due to the Court being unable to continue funding these positions from their allocation of the state Trial Court Funding. As a result the Sheriff's Department no longer is responsible for perimeter and entrance security at the court buildings, which is now handled by court employees; and the remaining seven members of the Sheriff's staff assigned to the courts under the security contract provide bailiff services only to the various courtrooms.
Finding #2:

After the initial visit with the Sheriff, members of the Grand Jury returned to view the "Megan (sic) Law" computer system and it was found to have the most current information available to the general public.

Response:

The Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator concurs with the finding.

Recommendation:

The locker where the staff secures their firearms appears to be rusty. We are asking to have this repaired or replaced.

Response:

The Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator concur with the recommendation and the issue of the repair or replacement of the locker has been submitted to the building maintenance staff to address.

Final Comments:

The Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator wishes to personally thank and commend the members of the 2003-2004 Grand Jury for their thorough review and comments regarding the operation of the Sutter County Sheriff's Department.

Sincerely,

JIM DENNEY
SHERIFF-CORONER-
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR

cc: Larry T. Combs, County Administrative Officer

ENDORSED FILED

OCT 27 2004

JOAN BECHTEL, Clerk
BY C. McMILLAN, Deputy Clerk
RE: Response from the Yuba City Police Department

Thank you very much for the opportunity to respond to the comments made about the Yuba City Police Department in the 2003/04 Sutter County Grand Jury Report. We appreciate the positive comments about the Agency as reflected in the Jury's Report and welcome the yearly interaction we have with their members.

Just as clarification points, we would point out the following (bold italic represents comments in the report, followed by corrections):

1. "Nine to ten police cars are on patrol at all times." There is a minimum of 5 police patrol vehicles on the street at any one time; however, with Traffic Enforcement Units and Crime Scene Investigators, that number could rise to the nine to ten indicated during certain time periods.

2. "Approximately 100,000 911 calls are logged each year." The 911 Center logs approximately 100,000 total calls each year, not just 911 calls.

3. "There are approximately 32,000 incidents per year that require an officer to respond." On average, there are approximately 40,000 direct citizen requests for police service and an additional 40,000 officer initiated contacts.

4. "Salary and benefits are within the median range of cities of comparable size." Currently, the salary range is somewhat below the median; however, we are in the midst of contract negotiations, the goal of which is to address this particular issue. City management and the Police Officers' Association are please with the progress thus far.

5. "YCPD has a S.W.A.T. team that is made up of YCPD officers and Sutter County Sheriff's Department personnel and responds to all S.W.A.T. necessary incidents in Sutter County, Yuba County and Beale Air Force Base." Yuba City has a Metro S.W.A.T. Team, which responds to high risk incidents in the City of Yuba City, Marysville, Yuba County and Beale A.F.B. Members of the Sutter County Sheriff's
Department are not members of the Metro SWAT Unit, but rather have their own Team and respond to incidents in the predominantly unincorporated area of Sutter County.

6. "A vehicle was purchased from Beale Air Force Base and refurbished for use by the S.W.A.T. Team." An armored personnel carrier was obtained from the Air Force, free of charge (inclusive of shipping from North Dakota). The City refurbished the vehicle with grant funding and has placed it in use for the most serious of critical incidents and rescues.

7. "There are computers in all YCPD vehicles on patrol for officers to access both the YCPD manual and other routine police work." Each marked patrol unit is equipped with a Mobile Data Terminal, which is a significant advance over a standard computer. Each vehicle has the capability to "see" the 911 Dispatcher's call screen as it is being updated in the Communication's Center. Each terminal also has the ability to search various State and Federal data bases for needed information.

8. "YCPD is in direct communication with the State Office of Emergency Planning as well as the F.B.I. and the Office of Homeland Security." The Department has multiple secure and routine links to the State Office of Emergency Services, The California Warning Center, FEMA, the F.B.I. and the Department of Homeland Security.

Thank you again for providing us the opportunity to fully explain the discussion points in the Report.

Respectfully,

RICHARD J. DOSCHER
Chief of Police

Cc: City Manager – Yuba City
Asst. City Manager – Yuba City
City Council Members
Dear Judge Damron,

This letter is in response to the portion of the 2003-2004 Sutter County Grand Jury Report (REPORT), Section 4.0 Education Committee Report: subsections 4.2 and 4.3, which pertains to the visitation of the Sutter County Grand Jury Education Committee to Live Oak Alternative Schools on March 29, 2004 and Encinal Elementary School on March 31, 2004.

Jennifer Lambert prepared the section of the REPORT that I received on June 25, 2004 and I received the REPORT on June 28, 2004.

Response to the Live Oak Alternative Schools Report

The Grand Jury made two recommendations regarding Live Oak Alternative Schools (LOAS).

The first recommendation was that the Live Oak Unified School District replace or repair the entry ramp to the office at LOAS. This ramp does not need replacement. It is structurally sound and meets all of the requirements required to accommodate students, staff and visitors including those requiring a wheelchair. Yes, there is a “spot” on the main deck of the ramp that does make a sound when stepped on, but having used the ramp myself on many occasions, I do not believe that the ramp “gives way several inches”. There is a slight bend or bubble in the main deck and the District has identified the main deck for repair to be welded to the under-structure to eliminate the noise associated with the bend. The Live Oak Unified School District gladly accepts the recommendation from the Grand Jury and will complete this repair project by the beginning of the 2004-2005 school year.

The second recommendation was that the United States Flag and the California State Flag be properly displayed, stored and handled. At LOAS, students are currently responsible for handling, displaying and storing the flags. Two months into the 2003-2004 school year, the main office secretary resigned and a new secretary came on board. The new secretary was not aware of her oversight responsibilities in regards to the flags. In order to properly handle, display, and store the flags, it will be the responsibility of the main office secretary to use office assistants to handle, display and store the flags. Additionally, it will be the responsibility of the main office secretary to train the office assistants as to the proper procedures. The Live Oak Unified School District gladly accepts the recommendation from the Grand Jury and will begin to train office assistants in the proper procedures for flag usage beginning with the 2004-2005 school year.
Response to the Encinal Elementary School Report

The Grand Jury made seven recommendations regarding Encinal Elementary School.

The first recommendation was that the staff at Encinal follow and enforce state health codes as it relates to the use of gloves and hairnets when handling unpackaged foods and having open containers of food positioned next to other storage containers containing non-food items. Additionally, the area in and around the kitchen was cluttered. These concerns by the visiting committee have been forwarded to our Food Services Supervisor, Mrs. Bonnie Whipple and she will continue instructing the Encinal staff as to the proper procedures to follow in regards to food preparation. The Live Oak Unified School District gladly accepts the recommendation from the Grand Jury and will provide ongoing training to the Encinal staff regarding food preparation.

The second recommendation was to repair cracks in the asphalt on the Encinal playground. This playground was slurry sealed four years ago. The slurry sealing was designed to last for 5-7 years. The District has already addressed areas of the asphalt associated with the loading area for busing and also areas around the tetherball poles. Additional work is slated to be done to address the “cracks” issue. The District has had considerable internal discussions as to how to secure funding to re-surface the playground area. However, little progress has been made and the District is proceeding with getting bids for slurry scaling the cracks once again. The Live Oak Unified School District gladly accepts the recommendation from the Grand Jury and will continue its facility modernization planning for Encinal.

The third recommendation was to keep the storage building locked and the doors closed whenever the staff is not immediately present. Encinal will change their procedures to address this concern. The Live Oak Unified School District gladly accepts the recommendation from the Grand Jury and will comply with this procedure.

The fourth and fifth recommendations were to trim foliage and clean-up debris behind the storage building. These concerns have been forwarded to our maintenance and grounds staff and will be addressed as soon as possible. The Live Oak Unified School District gladly accepts the recommendation from the Grand Jury and will remove untrimmed foliage and debris prior to the beginning of the 2004-2005 school year and will monitor its grounds schedules throughout the year.

The sixth recommendation was in regards to the cleanliness and organization of the room housing the library. These concerns have been forwarded to the custodial staff at Encinal and every effort will be made to maintain this room in a clean and organized condition. The Live Oak Unified School District gladly accepts the recommendation from the Grand Jury and will have the library ready for usage beginning with the 2004-2005 school year.

The last recommendation was to work closely with any applicable entities to help with traffic on Larkin Road. Traffic on Larkin Road is not a new issue. In the past we have worked with the Sutter County Sheriff Department to station patrol cars north and south of the school for
enforcement of applicable speed limits. We have also had Highway Patrol vehicles attempt the same type of enforcement. In the past, the District has purchased reflective signs to be placed north and south of the school during school hours. These signs displayed the posted speed limit and were placed on the centerline of the road. Passing vehicles destroyed six signs. School personnel closely monitor and supervise students after school during the heaviest pick-up periods and staff members escort students when crossing the road. Sutter County maintains the road identification of the crosswalk by painting each year and they have posted new fluorescent signs indicating a school zone. We have had parents watch for cars traveling at speeds thought to be excessive and the principal on several occasions has followed cars into town to identify the driver. Several students have lost their parking privileges at the high school as a result. We have initiated informational campaigns through the school site and district newsletters, but these efforts have met with little success. All of these efforts have had limited success, but we will continue to look for ways to improve the safety of our students in relationship to the traffic issues at Encinal. The Live Oak Unified School District gladly accepts the recommendation from the Grand Jury and will continue to look for ways to reduce the risks associated with the traffic on Larkin Road.

Summary

The Live Oak Unified School District is committed to providing the best educational environment possible so that our students can be successful. To that end, we are very pleased with the Grand Jury Report and will work diligently to correct any concerns that the visiting Educational Committee has reported.

Sincerely,

Tom Pritchard, Superintendent
August 18, 2004

Sutter County Grand Jury
Michael R. Sarringer, Foreperson
446 Second Street
Yuba City, CA  95991


Dear Mr. Sarringer:

On behalf of the Board of Trustees of Sutter Union High School, I am happy to respond to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury Final Report, 4.0 Education Committee Report, 4.6 Butte View High School.

The Trustees and I found the report to be factual in all areas except one. The FINDINGS of the report states: The District has plans to expand both the agriculture department and the continuation high school and is in the process of building classrooms for continuation students at the Sutter High School site. In actuality, the building of classrooms for continuation students at the Sutter Union High School site is not in process, it is in the long-term planning stage.

Thank you for your interest in Sutter Union High School District. We welcome and appreciate your comments.

Sincerely,

Ryan Robison
Superintendent Principal

cc: Robert H. Damron, Presiding Judge
    Len L. LeTellier, Court Executive Officer

RECEIVED
AUG 25 2004
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SUTTER
CRIMINAL DIVISION

2665 ACACIA STREET • P.O. BOX 498 • SUTTER, CA  95982 • PHONE (530) 822-5161 • FAX (530) 822-5168
January 12, 2005

Sutter County Grand Jury

The following issues were raised by the Grand Jury letter to the Meridian Fire Protection District, and this is the District Board’s response.

Bylaws for the Meridian Fire Protection District

The current Board Members and the Chief have searched for a copy of the Meridian District Bylaws... if they ever existed; they are lost to us now.

Past Board President, Lyle Callaway, spent considerable time researching bylaws from other districts, Robbins and Sutter were among these, but nothing shown to the board fit Meridian exactly. President Callaway also located a consultant, whose specialty is the formation of bylaws, and proposed to the Board that the consultant be engaged to develop bylaws for Meridian.

After considering this Bylaw issue in several monthly meetings, the Meridian Board voted to simply abide by the existing California codes which govern organizations like the Meridian Fire Protection District.

A replacement Type I fire truck

In 2003, the Board acted to replace the District’s primary Rescue/Pumper #661 by using a combination of funds accumulated in a New Equipment Reserve Fund and a loan. The unit was ordered in the fall of 2003 from Westates Manufacturing in Woodland, CA.

In February, 2004, the District learned it had been awarded a FEMA grant to cover 90% of the estimated cost of the vehicle, $220,007.

The replacement unit 661 arrived and went into immediate service in July, 2004. Thanks to the FEMA grant, this was accomplished without incurring any further financial obligation for the District.

Appropriate means of selling municipal (sic) property

This issue was raised regarding the disposal of a surplus vehicle in 2003. The fact of the transaction is that it was sold to our neighboring Meridian agency, Reclaim District 70, the sole bidder for the vehicle.

We have since implemented a policy of inviting closed bidding for publicized sale of surplus vehicles and equipment.
**Status of Chief Jason Cooper**

Jason Cooper was made Meridian's Fire Chief in early in 2004 by the Board's approval of the recommendation of the membership of the Meridian Firemen's Association. He is the District's only fulltime paid employee, and also its most highly trained and qualified fire-fighter.

Thanks for the Grand Jury members' patience in waiting for this response.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Miles Shafer
Vice-President
Meridian Fire Protection District Board
Suter-Yuba
Mosquito & Vector Control District

MANAGER
Ronald L. McBride

GENERAL FOREMAN
Michael R. Kimbell

ADMIN. ASST.
Cathy C. Burns

August 2, 2004

Sutter County Grand Jury
446 Second Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

The Honorable Robert H. Damron:

The Sutter-Yuba Mosquito & Vector Control District was a subject of review by the 2003-2004 Sutter County Grand Jury. I have reviewed the final report by the 2003-2004 Grand Jury and agree with the content and their findings.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. McBride
District Manager
Sutter-Yuba Mosquito & Vector Control District
P.O. Box 726
Yuba City, CA 95992

RECEIVED
MAR 11 2005
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SUTTER
CRIMINAL DIVISION
July 30, 2004

TO: Michael R. Sarringar, Foreperson and Robert H. Damron, Presiding Judge


Finding #1

Regarding ballot-counting procedures

Response:

We appreciate the recognition by the Grand Jury of staff's knowledge, experience and dedication to thoroughness and accuracy in ballot counting. We agree with the Grand Jury recommendation that "an effort me made to find a larger area in which to count ballots". The County Administration is aware of our space needs and does have a plan for meeting those needs and is in the process of implementing the plan.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Bechtel
Clerk-Recorder-Registrar of Voters