Other Public Funded Agencies and Organizations: Responses to Final Report
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Response Matrix to 05-06 Final Report

The following matrix for the Grand Jury activities for 2005 – 2006 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, [90 days of receipt of Final Report for county and city administered officials and 60 days or receipt for elected officials – Penal Code Sections 933 (c)]

<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>8-28-06</td>
<td>Auditor Controller’s response, see attached, Board of Supervisors response, see attached, pages 1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-County Ambulance Service, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-2-06</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors response, see attached, pages 52-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-County Juvenile Hall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7-3-06</td>
<td>Yuba-Sutter Juvenile Hall Camp Singer Youth Guidance Center response, see attached, Board of Supervisors response, see attached, pages 28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-2-06</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-13-06</td>
<td>Dept. of California Highway Patrol response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Live Oak</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-5-06</td>
<td>City of Live Oak response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7-13-06</td>
<td>City of Yuba City response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-2-06</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors response, see attached, pages 1-9 &amp; 10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinal Elementary School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7-10-06</td>
<td>Live Oak Unified School District response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-2-06</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors response, see attached, pages 56-63 &amp; 64-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Chesney Community Correction Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8-11-06</td>
<td>Cornel Companies, Inc. response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak Unified School District</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-10-06</td>
<td>Live Oak Unified School District response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-5-06</td>
<td>Live Oak City Council, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Fire Protections District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County Children &amp; Families Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-22-06</td>
<td>Sutter County Children &amp; Families Commission response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Response Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County Clerk/Recorder, Registrar of Voters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7-10-06</td>
<td>Sutter County Clerk/Recorder response, see attached &amp; Board of Supervisors response, see attached, pages 21-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County Information Technology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10-2-06</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors response, see attached, pages 1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County Probation Department</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10-2-06</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors response, see attached, pages 28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County Sheriff’s Department &amp; Jail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-30-06</td>
<td>Sutter County Sheriff’s response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-14-06</td>
<td>Sutter County Superintendent of Schools response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter-Yuba Mental Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-2-06</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors response, see attached, pages 56-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-13-06</td>
<td>City of Yuba City response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City Police Department</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-30-06</td>
<td>City of Yuba City, Police Department response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City Unified School District</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-25-06</td>
<td>Yuba City Unified School District response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County Juvenile Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-7-06</td>
<td>Yuba-Sutter Juvenile Hall Camp Singer Youth Guidance Center response, see attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County Probation Department</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba-Sutter Economic Development Corporation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7-20-06</td>
<td>Yuba-Sutter Economic Development Corp. response, see attached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 26, 2006

The Honorable Robert H. Damron  
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California  
County of Sutter  
446 Second Street  
Yuba City, California 95993

Dear Judge Damron:

Submitted herewith is the Auditor-Controller’s Office response to the 2005-2006 Grand Jury Final Report. Penal Code § 933(c) and § 933.05 require my office to respond to the findings and recommendations of the Grand Jury. This response is submitted directly to you pursuant to Penal Code § 933.05(f).

I commend the individual members of the Grand Jury for their public service.

I share the Grand Jury’s concerns in making Sutter County government work better. I am looking forward to working constructively and positively with the Board of Supervisors and the County Administrator’s Office to implement improvements with the objective of increasing the County’s efficiency and effectiveness.

By law I am also required to send a copy of this report to the Sutter County Board of Supervisors, after which they will have another 30 days to write their response. I am complying with that requirement. I trust that my response will likewise be distributed to all recipients of the Grand Jury’s report and all recipients of the Board of Supervisor’s response.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Stark, CPA  
Auditor-Controller

Cc: Sutter County Board of Supervisors

RECEIVED

AUG 28 2006

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SUTTER  
CRIMINAL DIVISION  

463 SECOND STREET • YUBA CITY, CALIFORNIA 95991 • (530) 822-7127 FAX 822-7439
August 26, 2006

Auditor-Controller Response to Sutter County Grand Jury 2005-2006

SUMMARY:

The Auditor-Controller response which follows is limited to that which is necessary to comply with the requirements of the law and is not intended as a general discussion of issues important to Sutter County. The terminology required for the response is defined by the Penal Code.

We thank the members of the Grand Jury for their work in identifying topics of interest which will help to improve the operation of Sutter County government and specifically the Auditor-Controller’s Office.

RESPONSE TO “FINDINGS” SECTION:

- “The investigation discovered that Sutter County has a very fragmented accounting system. The current accounting system appears awkward and cumbersome; and out of date from a technology standpoint. While most department heads have stated that they do not have a problem with the system, the Committee believes that the fragmentation of the systems create divisive issues that impact all departments. A review of the technology should also review staff efficiency in processing data. Some of the problems may be caused by poor training or supervision, or lack of data entry control and review.”

Auditor-Controller Response § 1—Insufficient Information to Agree or Disagree with Finding. It would have been helpful if the Grand Jury had provided evidentiary support. If the Grand Jury is referring to a general lack of integration of related accounting systems we agree. Not enough factual information is provided to discuss this in definitive terms. We commend the Grand Jury for their diligence in looking into these very complex professional accounting and computer software/hardware issues. We are addressing some of these issues now in meetings with other departments to find the best payroll solution for the County.

- “The County maintains three (3) independent computer systems.”

Auditor-Controller Response § 2—Insufficient Information to Agree or Disagree with Finding. The Grand Jury’s description of the County’s computer systems is not clear. The applications are cataloged fairly well but are not complete, leaving out systems and/or software used by the three divisions of the Human Services department. It would have been helpful to distinguish more clearly between hardware and software. The “IBM” is actually the IBM AS400 computer; the “UNIX” is an IBM RS6000 computer (running the IBM version of the UNIX operating system); and the “Cost Accounting Management System (CAMS) is not a computer system at all but software which runs on personal computers in the Public Works department. A complete discussion of all these systems is outside the scope of this response. The Grand Jury discussion has been very helpful in furthering the public’s understanding of the scope of the information technology used in the County.
• "Cost Accounting Management System (CAMS)"

• "Purchased two years ago as a Microsoft based system that is PC driven"

1. Job Costing: a duplication of programs which forces the payroll to be entered twice each pay period for all employees working in more that one job category because this program is not integrated into the existing payroll program.

2. Accounting package for Public Works"

Auditor-Controller Response § 3—Agree.

• "The UNIX and IBM computers are not integrated or compatible. However, a program has been written to transport the Budget from the IBM into the UNIX for reporting purposes. This process involves a special handling operation at Information Technology (IT)."

Auditor-Controller Response § 4—Agree. IT is to be commended for their hard work in keeping these systems working together.

• "The IT Department is in the process of converting all County offices to the Microsoft PC driven operating system. This is a major step in bringing the County to real time accounting."

Auditor-Controller Response § 5—Disagree Partially. It would have been helpful here if the Grand Jury had provided more information so the reader could understand the benefits of IT’s conversion to the “Microsoft PC driven operating system” and how it will lead to “real time accounting”. We support systems which will result in increased accountability.

• "The departments using the accounts payable or the general ledger program cannot make real time comparisons with the Budget when posting ledger entries or paying bills, so the Auditor/Controller may issue payments without being able to verify fund balances. Also, no department can make real time comparisons with the General Ledger and the Budget. There have been several comments made about the amount of manual work that has to be done in payroll and accounting."

Auditor-Controller Response § 6—Disagree Partially. It would have been helpful if the Grand Jury had explained its concept of “real time comparisons”. Departments are responsible for their own budgets and must have the ability to look at their balances in the online general ledger system. Lacking examples, it is hard to comment on specific manual processes. We do agree upgrading systems has the potential to eliminate manual work. It is important to remember that payroll and accounting are separate systems. It is helpful to have the Grand Jury looking at these matters.

• "CAMS does not integrate into either of the other two systems (UNIX and IBM)."
Auditor-Controller Response § 7—Agree. CAMS was purchased by Public Works knowing that it did not integrate into the general ledger system on the IBM RS6000 (UNIX) and the payroll system running on the IBM AS400.

RESPONSE TO "RECOMMENDATIONS" SECTION:

- "Accounting systems:

  The Committee recommends that the Board of Supervisors take immediate action, through the IT Department, to analyze the capability and future value of the present computer systems and find a way to bring the County accounting and budgeting to an integrated, real time system. The Committee further recommends that the Board look at systems now on the market that will provide all the necessary accounting programs on an integrated basis that will allow for more flexible budget planning and more error free data entry. The Committee recognizes that this will be a very expensive investment; however, it is an investment for the operational future of the County. A completely new system may become a cheaper necessity if the County considers the current costs of time and inefficiency with the present operating systems."

Auditor-Controller Response § 8—The Auditor-Controller’s Office will not implement this because it is a recommendation to the Board.

- "A second choice would be to have the IT Department overhaul the existing systems and build a completely integrated operating system that can allow for real time entry and analysis work. The Committee found that the current UNIX system needs only a payroll module added to complete an integrated financial system for the County. The cost of this addition would be within the allowance for a new payroll package. A commitment is needed from all departments to change their procedures to make integration work. Quality, in-depth training with well-written procedures is necessary to maximize the value of a new system."

Auditor-Controller Response § 9—The Auditor-Controller’s Office will not implement this because it is a recommendation to the Board.

- "The County’s UNIX system allows for several budget scenarios to be run at the same time, which would increase the flexibility of the County government to create and manage a workable budget under the fluid conditions of a growing county. The committee would urge the IT department to work with all departments to eliminate as much manual data processing as possible."

Auditor-Controller Response § 10—The Auditor-Controller’s Office will not implement this because it is a recommendation to the IT department or the Board. However, we thank the Grand Jury for pointing out the importance of eliminating as much manual work as possible. This is one objective of our efforts to acquire a new payroll solution which is now underway.
• "The Committee further recommends that all departments cooperate with IT to keep program modifications to a minimum. The Committee believes that many of the current problems with a smoothly operating accounting system are due to modifications made to suit individual needs. This creates problems with software upgrades and training when the responsible individual departs, leaving future users in a difficult untrained and undocumented situation. Custom modifications generally do not have adequate operating instructions or universal training. Once the initial user has left employment, the procedures become obscure. Relying on 'this is how we have always done it' attitude is not a satisfactory solution."

Auditor-Controller Response § 11—The Auditor-Controller has already implemented this recommendation. It is the policy of the Auditor-Controller’s Office to base all requests to IT on a genuine need with an analysis of costs versus benefits including anticipated changes to workload for other departments. The Grand Jury’s recommendation helps by informing all County departments of the policy.

• "Policy and Procedures:

The Committee recommends that the Board of Supervisors hire, as soon as possible, a consultant to review the present accounting operational procedures and create a formal written policy and procedures program for all accounting and financial jobs in the County. A training program will need to be implemented once the policy and procedures have been approved. This should also be the responsibility of the consultant. There are policy and procedures available from other counties. The Auditor/Controller has on several occasions stated that his department has a workload that prevents the Auditor’s office from doing this project; therefore, the Committee recommends that the consultant be independent, but work through the Auditor’s office, and answerable to the Board of Supervisors, but not hired as a permanent employee. Once the consultant’s work is complete the Auditor’s office will need to continually update and train staff in all departments."

Auditor-Controller Response § 12—The Auditor-Controller’s Office will not implement this because it is a recommendation to the Board.

• "Final County Authority and Chain of Command:

The Committee strongly recommends that the Board of Supervisors assume responsibility as final authority in the governing of Sutter County. Discussion with the State Controller’s office verified that the final authority for financial/accounting decisions in all counties is with the Board of Supervisors. The Committee is very concerned with the defiant attitude taken by the Auditor/Controller who refuses to accept the Board’s authority. This is not acceptable behavior for those officials elected as well as those appointed. This situation has developed over a period of years, but has now reached the point where the authority in the county is gridlocked with Board decisions subject to legal settlement. The legal costs alone are a substantial burden for Sutter County citizens. The Board of Supervisors public meeting is not the place to replay county arguments. The Committee recommends that
improved communication be established between departments and inter-departmental issues be resolved internally."

Auditor-Controller Response § 13—The Auditor-Controller's Office will not implement this because it is a recommendation to the Board. The Auditor-Controller's Office has always respected the authority of the Board of Supervisors and we have always conducted ourselves in a professional manner whenever a matter of professional disagreement has arisen. We have followed Board authority, even recently when we believed the Board to be in error where it has been necessary to protect the important interests of the citizens of Sutter County. We are seeking to clarify the authority, duties and responsibilities of the Auditor-Controller's Office through a civil action and in the litigation initiated against the Auditor-Controller by this and the prior Grand Jury. Once clarification is received we will follow the directions of the court or the State Controller's Office.

- "Professionalism and Job Integrity:

All positions of authority in the county, elected or appointed, demand a high degree of professionalism and dedication. The Grand Jury is embarrassed by officials' acts of disrespect for each other. Poor attitudes displayed by County officials reflect the character of quality of the residents of Sutter County who elect them, and how the county is viewed by others. The committee believes that the citizens of Sutter County are not getting the quality of service that we should expect for what we pay. The Committee recommends that the Board of Supervisors take measures to create a better working environment in the County that will focus on making the County a more functioning unit. The Board needs to instill the spirit in the staff of getting the job done correctly and in the most efficient way possible. 'Team Sutter' is not working because the whole team is not functioning as a single unit."

Auditor-Controller Response § 14—The Auditor-Controller's Office will not implement this because it is a recommendation to the Board. Notwithstanding the difficult issues with which we are faced, the Auditor-Controller's Office has and will continue to act in a professional manner to get the job done for Sutter County.

- "Staffing:

The Auditor/Controller complains about the lack of staff to get the job done. At the same time the committee saw evidence where the Auditor's staff was involved with projects that were irrelevant and time consuming. While the Committee supports the Auditor for attempting to 'control' expenses to 'save the County money', the Committee questions the expense of second guessing the approval of other departments' charges while the Auditor is making huge mistakes in other accounting that affects the way the County does business. The issue here is spending hundreds of dollars to save 50 cents. At the same time the Auditor explains that his department cannot create policies and procedures because of the lack of time, yet, the department spends extraordinary time in researching issues to settle an argument with another department. The Committee believes that inadequate job
management is an issue and quite probably the present accounting system is a contributing factor."

Auditor-Controller Response § 15—The recommendation will not be implemented because no specific recommendation has been made. The Auditor-Controller's Office disagrees with the conclusory statements in the above text. The Grand Jury provides no evidentiary support here which would allow for a more detailed response.

- "The Committee recommends that the Board of Supervisors review the staff and job requirements of the Auditor/Controller. The Committee knows that as the pressure increases with growth in Sutter County that job functions change and extra workloads are created without changes in staff. The Committee recommends that staffing analysis be viewed with changes in implementing a more efficient accounting system. This will include a review of the accounting positions in all the County departments."

Auditor-Controller Response § 16—The Auditor-Controller's Office will not implement this because it is a recommendation to the Board. However, we are currently working with the Harvey M. Rose Accountancy Corporation on a review of staff and job requirements of the Auditor-Controller's Office.
June 29, 2006

Honorable, Robert Damron, Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California
County of Sutter
446 Second Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of the 2005/06 Sutter County Grand Jury, Criminal Justice Committee report, pertaining to the operation of the Yuba - Sutter Juvenile Hall and Maxine Singer Youth Guidance Center. I very much appreciate the Committee’s recognition of the contribution our staff makes to the community. We are grateful for the support of the Courts and the Probation Departments, and for their willingness to recognize our efforts. We are committed to continued excellence in our programs and facility operations. The staff at our facilities plays an integral role in development and delivery of the high standards of care recognized by the Grand Jury. We do very much appreciate the acknowledgement.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Frank D. Sorgera,
Superintendent

cc: Chris Odom, Chief Probation Officer

RECEIVED
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SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SUTTER
CRIMINAL DIVISION
June 29, 2006

Honorable, Robert Dunron, Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California
County of Sutter
446 Second Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of the 2005/06 Sutter County Grand Jury, Criminal Justice Committee report, pertaining to the operation of the Yuba – Sutter Juvenile Hall and Maxine Singer Youth Guidance Center. I very much appreciate the Committee’s recognition of the contribution our staff makes to the community. We are grateful for the support of the Courts and the Probation Departments, and for their willingness to recognize our efforts. We are committed to continued excellence in our programs and facility operations. The staff at our facilities plays an integral role in development and delivery of the high standards of care recognized by the Grand Jury. We do very much appreciate the acknowledgement.

Sincerely,

Frank D. Sorgea
Superintendent

cc: Chris Odom, Chief Probation Officer
Rich Hall, Asst. Co. Administrator, Sutter Co.
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL  
1619 Poole Boulevard  
Yuba City, CA 95993  
(530) 674-5141  
(800) 735-2929 (TT/TDD)  
(800) 735-2922 (Voice) 

September 6, 2006

File No.: 285.12374.14241.GJRPT

The Honorable Robert H. Danron  
Presiding Judge, Sutter County Superior Court  
463 Second Street  
Yuba City, CA 95993

Dear Judge Danron:

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) has reviewed the 2005-2006 Sutter County Grand Jury Final Report. Per Section 933 (c) of the California Penal Code, the CHP is providing the following findings and recommendations relative to traffic conditions at Encinal Elementary School located at 6484 Larkin Road. The 2005-06 Grand Jury Report revisits the issue of speeding on Larkin Road near Encinal School which was raised in the 2003-04 Grand Jury Report. Because this issue presented issues relating to public safety, and most importantly the safety of a school zone, the CHP took immediate steps to provide additional enforcement and educational efforts.

Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations

The Grand Jury Education Committee reported that speeding traffic on Larkin Road was still a concern and recommended better enforcement of speed limits while school was in session. The Final Report suggested the CHP reduce the speed limit on Larkin Road near Encinal Elementary School. They also requested that immediate steps be taken “before a very avoidable tragedy occurs.”

Response:

The CHP concurs with the Grand Jury’s findings relative to speeding traffic near Encinal Elementary School. Indeed, the Department is concerned with many traffic issues surrounding multiple school facilities within the unincorporated areas of Sutter County. In recent years, the CHP has made it a practice to convene at local schools, particularly at the beginning of the school year to create a visible presence and alleviate traffic issues which seem to present themselves at that time. It has been noted through experience that a significant percentage of the violations contacted near school zones were the parents of children who attend the school. In the past year we have sought out new and innovative methods and funding sources to provide the necessary services to this community, both enforcement and education.

RECEIVED  
SEP 13 2006  

Safety, Service, and Security
In response to the Grand Jury’s report, the California Highway Patrol has significantly increased its presence in the area, particularly during Encinal Elementary School ingress and egress. This has been accomplished through increased patrol and the placement of the Department’s radar trailer on Larkin Road which advises drivers of their traveling speed. The CHP has provided increased patrols (Special Enforcement Units) which have specifically provided additional enforcement on Larkin Road in the vicinity of Encinal Elementary School during ingress and egress. Further, CHP management has directed uniformed members to provide a visible presence in the area whenever possible. The Yuba-Sutter CHP has applied for, and been awarded, additional funding from the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) for traffic enforcement purposes. Much of these resources have been directed to traffic enforcement in and around school zones throughout both Yuba and Sutter Counties.

The CHP has met with Encinal Elementary School Administration to discuss the traffic related issues surrounding the school and possible solutions. On January 11, 2006, Officer Jeff Larson, the Public Affairs Officer, met with Encinal Elementary School Principal Staci Kaelin at Encinal Elementary School. The meeting was productive and provided additional insight into the problems plaguing the school. Mrs. Kaelin stated that much of the problem is with the parents of students enrolled at the school. Among her chief concerns were: parents who drop their children off across the road causing their children to have to cross two lanes of traffic, the lack of a safe drop-off point for children, the need for teachers to educate parents through parent/teacher conferences and open houses about the traffic issues at the school, and her desire to have portable or permanent flashing lights installed advising motorists of the school zone. The CHP has provided numerous public awareness and educational events throughout Sutter County and Live Oak advising parents and kids alike, about the dangers and concerns of vehicular traffic near schools.

The CHP has reviewed and discussed the Grand Jury Report with the Sutter County Sheriff’s Department and Sutter County Public Works Department and our three agencies will continue to work together to provide a safe environment for those traveling in the area of Encinal Elementary School. Additionally, the Sutter County Public Works Department has been awarded a “Safe Schools” grant which will provide the necessary funding to provide signage and lights in school zones throughout Sutter County including Encinal Elementary School.

In conclusion, the CHP shares the concerns of the Grand Jury Report and has actively worked to address those concerns. To summarize; the CHP met with the school principal at Encinal School to address her concerns and suggestions, promoted numerous public awareness and educational presentations throughout Sutter County regarding school zone safety, deployed the radar trailer near Encinal School as well as other school zones in unincorporated Sutter County, provided additional enforcement in the form of SEU’s, and worked closely with the Sutter County Sheriff’s Department and Sutter County Public Works Department for enforcement and signage.

The CHP is very concerned with the issues presented by the Sutter County Grand Jury. We have taken a proactive stance regarding the issue of traffic safety in the area of Encinal Elementary School. The Yuba-Sutter CHP Office remains completely committed to traffic safety and safety
Judge R. Damron  
September 8, 2006  
Page 3

around school zones. If you have any questions regarding this matter please do not hesitate to call me at (530) 674-5141.

S. SILSBEE, Captain  
Commander  
Yuba-Sutter Area

Cc: Staci, Kaelin, Principal, Encinal Elementary School  
Jim Denney, Sheriff-Coronel, Sutter County Sheriff's Department  
George Musallam, Director, Sutter County Public Works Department
September 28, 2006,

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


Dear Judge Dameron,

The City of Live Oak accepts the grand jury report and appreciates the time and efforts spent by the members of the Grand Jury in reviewing and commenting on the growth and traffic issues within the City. The City is working diligently to plan for future growth. We appreciate the Grand Jury’s recognition of our hard work and of the dedicated, professional City staff who work tirelessly to make Live Oak a better place for all to enjoy.

Very truly yours,

Mel Wilkins
Mayor

cc: Sutter County Board of Supervisors
July 10, 2006

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 2006 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,

Steven R. Jepsen  
City Manager

SJ: cw

RECEIVED

JUL 13 2006

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SUTTER  
CRIMINAL DIVISION

1201 CIVIC CENTER BOULEVARD • YUBA CITY, CALIFORNIA 95993 • (530) 822-4501 • FAX 822-4594
Dear Judge Damron,

This letter is in response to the portion of the 2003-2004 Sutter County Grand Jury Report (REPORT). Education Committee Report, which pertains to the visitation of the Sutter County Grand Jury Education Committee to Encinal Elementary School on September 29, 2006.

I received a copy of the report on June 28, 2006. The copy I received was signed by Sandra Lee Jopson and dated 6/5/06.

**Response to the Encinal Elementary School Report**

The Grand Jury made two recommendations regarding Encinal Elementary School.

1. The first recommendation was for the installation of solar powered speed notification radar signs, or flashing yellow lights on the school zone signs.

   Our most recent efforts have been in working with James Walton at Sutter County Public Works to obtain grant funding, through the Safe Routes To Schools Program, to install, operate and maintain a solar powered speed notification radar sign. The status of our efforts is that in late June 2006, Mr. Walton notified us that the County had been selected for the grant, totaling approximately $112,000, to install two solar powered radar notification signs (North and South of Encinal) on Larkin Road. We will keep in close communication with Mr. Walton as to the installation of these signs.

2. The second recommendation was to repair cracks in the asphalt on the Encinal playground.

   Our original response to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report regarding the Encinal playground was to seek bids to re-seal the cracks on the Encinal playground surface. But upon further examination and through the bidding process, it became apparent that additional work needed to be completed.

In my response to the 2004-2005 Grand Jury that re-visited Encinal, I gave a brief history of the playground maintenance and a tentative timeline for repair. The 2004-2005 response was as follows:
Live Oak Unified School District
2201 Pennington Road
Live Oak, CA 95953
(530) 695-5400
Tom Pritchard, Superintendent

Focusing On Student Achievement

"The first recommendation was that, "asphalt on the playground should be repaired as soon as funding becomes available."

This playground was slurry sealed during the 1999-2000 school year. The slurry sealing was designed to last for 5-7 years, so it is reaching the point at which additional maintenance is required. The District has already addressed uneven areas of the asphalt associated with the loading area for busing and also areas around the tetherball poles. The remaining identified work is designed to address the "cracks" issue.

The District has had considerable internal discussions as to how to secure funding to re-surface the playground area. The conclusion of those meetings was to allocate money from our routine restricted maintenance accounts and include the playground maintenance project with the Encinal office/support building upgrade project. The funding for this project has been budgeted and plans to begin the project are slated for the summer of 2006 with completion anticipated by the end of the 2007 summer. There are three main factors that affect this timeline: 1) the office/support building needs to be located, built, and secured, 2) septic tank maintenance must be performed prior to re-sealing of the playground because the septic system must be accessed (entailing the "tearing-up" of the playground asphalt), and 3) bids must be sought and obtained to do the actual slurry sealing at a time that does not impact student learning. We feel very confident that our timelines are realistic and that by the end of the 2007 summer we will have completed this project. And, we feel that upon completion of the project we will have addressed the recommendation from the Grand Jury."

Although, we now realize that the entire playground will need to be re-surfaced (not simply re-"slurry-sealed"), I am still confident that our timeline to have the playground upgrade completed by the end of the 2007 summer is a realistic one.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tom Pritchard
LOUSD Superintendent
August 7, 2006

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 2005/2006 report of the Sutter County Grand Jury. We concur with the Grand Jury’s findings.

In response to the Grand Jury’s recommendations: the psycho-social perspective is truly interdisciplinary and may enable us to start thinking in a different way about social problems and their possible solutions. We understand the necessity for the women entrusted to our care to be supplied with structured group programs to improve coping and socialization skills. To that end, the Leo Chesney Community Correctional Facility provides a Pre-release program that is available to all residents before they parole. This program entails, stress management, anger management, discharge preparation, as well as other important components to help prepare the residents for successful parole.

Additionally, residents have the opportunity to participate in leisure activities and to interact socially in a casual but monitored setting. This element of socialization includes team sports such as basketball; table games, videos, etc. These activities and group interactions enhance social skills, and encourage teamwork and fair play. As a result the residents who participate are healthier, calmer, and possess a positive frame of mind.

We have recently been in discussions with representatives from Yuba Community College. We currently offer distance learning classes to our resident population and are hopeful Yuba College will provide a multitude of classes in the spring of 2007 that will be open, not only to the residents on the facility, but community members within the surrounding jurisdictions. These classes could include: Life Management Skills, Health and Lifestyle Choices, Addiction and Domestic Violence, Career Planning and Development, and General Psychology, just to name a few.

However, the question must always be asked, “Can we do better?” The answer most certainly is yes. We know we can do better and that we can help each other do better. With that in mind, we will be implementing a new program at the Leo Chesney Facility.
in the fall facilitated by trained, on-site staff. This program is called Beyond Trauma and deals with domestic violence issues in a group setting.

The final point to consider is that the Leo Chesney Facility is a private company that must by contract provide services as specified in the scope of work in the approved contract. Amendments to the contract are possible but must be approved by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). Should the grand jury desire more programs or services be provided than the contract allows, then CDCR would need to be involved in any changes to the contract that would then authorize the additional programs or services recommended by the grand jury.

In response to the Grand Jury’s second recommendation: all residents housed at the Leo Chesney Facility are pre-screened by CDCR’s medical staff and cleared of any psychological or health problems before being transferred to the Leo Chesney Facility.

We agree it would be beneficial to the residents to have available a clinical social worker, psychiatrist, marriage and family counselor, and a psychologist to assist them before they parole. Unfortunately, it is not only outside of the existing contract, it would be cost prohibitive to accommodate that recommendation for such a small community correctional facility. However, if a resident requires or requests counseling or psychiatric assistance, they can be transferred back to the mainline institution at Chowchilla, where there are numerous resources available.

Currently, the CDCR is researching the possibility of utilizing the Leo Chesney Facility for a Substance Abuse Program (SAP). This program would include intensive weekly individual therapy sessions conducted by professionally trained staff. In addition, residents and their loved ones may attend family therapy sessions during regular visiting hours. The primary treatment or focus in a SAP is for the resident to acquire tools on changing her way of thinking, behavior, and restructuring her feelings. The emphasis is on her values, belief systems, behaviors and attitudes as it relates to the self, family, and community. We are excited about the opportunity to provide this valuable service to our residents.

The Leo Chesney Facility is committed to making a positive difference in the lives of the inmates in our care, our employees and the Live Oak community. We appreciate the comments and recommendations made by the grand jury and remain committed to provide the maximum services to our residents that the current contract allows. We will forward a copy of the grand jury’s report along with this response to CDCR so they are aware of the grand jury’s recommendations.

I appreciate the time and effort made by all jurors that toured our facility. If I can be of further assistance, please don’t hesitate to contact me at (530) 695-1800.
Sincerely,

Ron Murray
Facility Director

Cc: Calla Krupp, Programs Administrator(A) CDCR
September 20, 2006

Honorable Robert Damron
Consolidated Superior Court of Sutter County
463 Second Street
Yuba City, CA 95993

Dear Honorable Damron,

It has come to our attention that the Sutter County Board of Supervisors does not present the Sutter County Children and Families response to the Sutter County Grand Jury on behalf of the Commission. Therefore, I am enclosing the Commission approved response for your review.

If my office may be of further assistance to you regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at 822-7505.

Most Sincerely,

Deborah Coulter
Executive Director
Sutter County Children and Families Commission
August 3, 2006

Richards Hall
Assistant County Administrator
1160 Civic Center Drive
Yuba City, Ca 95993

Dear Mr. Hall,

I have enclosed the Sutter County Children & Families Commission response to the Grand Jury Report 2005-2006. The response was approved by the Commission at the public meeting held on August 1, 2006.

The Sutter County Children & Families Commission appreciates the support of the Board of Supervisors and is proud of the excellent programs the Commission funds for Sutter County’s youngest children.

If my office can be of further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Deb Coulter
Executive Director
Response:
The Sutter County Children and Families Commission appreciate the efforts of the 2005-2006 Sutter County Grand Jury in reviewing the actions, policies and programs funded by the Commission. We are of the opinion that the Grand Jury is not clear that the Commission operates much like a private foundation, in that for the most part, the Commission funds programs proposed by responsible individuals and organizations in the community in conformance with the Commission Strategic Plan. The Commission is not a department of County Government and depends on other organizations, within and without government to provide proposals for funding consideration. Thus some findings and recommendations appear to be based on the premise that we operate the programs we fund.

Finding #1 (Grand Jury Report pg 53) The Commission is in agreement with this finding.

Recommendation #1 This recommendation is directed to the Sutter County Board of Supervisors but the Commission recommends it not be implemented because it is not warranted.

Explanation: The Grand Jury accurately identifies the current composition of the Commission, however the recommendation does not identify that California Law contained in Health and Safety Code Section 130140, which is the statute that allows creation of County Commissions and was voted upon by the state electorate in 1998, specifies that Commission members can include “representatives of a local organization for prevention or early intervention for families at risk”. In Sutter County the Board of Supervisors chose to appoint representatives of organizations that comprise the Sutter County Family Intervention Team as the core of the Children and Families Commission. This action by the Board of Supervisors was taken in Public Session after review and testimony was received from the public on this topic. (A copy of the original staff report on this topic is attached). This action was taken after review of Subsection (a) of Health and Safety Code 130100 which states that it is the intent of the act (Proposition 10), among other things, to emphasize LOCAL decision making, and to ELIMINATE duplicative administrative systems.

The appointment of individuals who are also involved in the very successful Family Intervention Team meets both the requirements and intent of Proposition 10 and was fully reviewed. The Board of Supervisors received public comment on this issue when the Commission was appointed. There is no need or requirement to make changes in appointments at this time.

Finding #2 (Grand Jury Report pg 54) The Commission is in agreement with this finding.
Recommendation #2  This recommendation has already been implemented. The Commission is in agreement with the intent of the recommendation and has met the need for program input by utilizing smaller advisory bodies focusing on specific functions. The large School Readiness project is a good example of using specific subject matter experts to design elements of a project and share expertise with the organization implementing the project. Similar groups have met regarding Sutter County Smiles, Smart Start, Bright Futures, etc. In using this model to secure input an advisory body is not limited to specific members, individuals with specialized knowledge can be involved in projects of interest to them. This process also allows for individuals who are not seeking grants from the commission to participate more fully. Finally, public input at commission meetings on all projects and topics is regularly received from interested parties.

Finding #3  (Grand Jury Report pg 54) The Commission disagrees in part with Finding #3.

While the finding is correct regarding the Commission having a large reserve fund, it is incorrect in that:

a. The Grand Jury has expressed an opinion about the future availability of tobacco taxes but that opinion does not appear to include the current efforts underway to add $2.50 tax per pack of cigarettes to fund; Emergency room services, nurse education, disease prevention, treatment and research, etc. This effort is supposed to appear on the November 2006 ballot for voters to consider. The Grand Jury opinion may not have been aware of this or other legislative activities over the past few years that have considered using Tobacco Taxes for other purposes any one of which may impact Commission funding in a negative way.

b. Many County Commissions have established “Endowment Funds” (in part due to encouragement from the State Commission) containing large amounts to provide for significant one time expenditures, program sustainability or other unanticipated program costs. Sutter County has always viewed its reserve as an “Endowment Fund”.

Recommendation #3 (Grand Jury Report pg 55) This recommendation will not be implemented as it is not warranted nor is it good stewardship of public funds.

Current Commission activities underway well in advance of the Grand Jury’s findings call for use of approximately $800,000 of the reserve funds in the coming year. Continued use of those funds will be the subject of future Commission activities.

The Commission notes with interest that having a large reserve fund is of concern to the Grand Jury when most governmental organizations would be praised for having reserves of this nature and magnitude. It is also difficult to understand a recommendation to expend one time funds when there are active statewide efforts to significantly impact the only source of revenue available to the Commission.
The Commission has for the past few years been funding programs from Proposition 10 moneys beyond the first 24 month period. "Family Soup", Sutter County Smiles, Smart Start, School Readiness, FREE Immunizations, and the Child Development Behavioral Specialist Program are all examples of this effort.

The Commission makes decisions based on specific information regarding individual projects, thus analysis of each is essential.

**Finding #4** (Grand Jury Report pg 55) The Commission disagrees with this finding in part.

a. Bright Futures was started as a project in Live Oak only and operated there for one year when it became apparent that there was insufficient demand for services to continue to operate exclusively in that community. Only after that finding was the project moved to Yuba City where 75% of Sutter County Children reside and attend school. Bright Futures has been held yearly at Brittan School in Sutter and has been well received. The program has continued to hold yearly events in Live Oak and participation continues to be low despite increased outreach activities.

b. Smart Start services have been offered to residents of South and Western Sutter County through the Yuba City Unified School District and Sutter County Schools efforts since the project was proposed, by the Yuba City Education Foundation. Each offering identified that there were not sufficient parents interested in this effort to create a viable class of children. Such classes have been held at Brittan School in Sutter and Luther School in Live Oak for a number of years. Children from other parts of Sutter County have always been welcome in these classes.

c. Programs funded by the Commission are voluntary on the part of parents and while all programs are available to all children in Sutter County many families do not wish or need to participate. 2,936 children aged 0-5 (unduplicated count) received services in a Commission funded project in the two years from 2004 through 2006. Of those children, 401 received services in both the 04/05 FY and 05/06 FY. In general this would indicate that about 20% of the children aged 0-5 were taken by their parents to participate in the voluntary programs funded by the Commission.

d. The number of children provided with FREE Immunizations has grown in 2005-2006. In a six month comparison of January to June in 2005 to 2006 the Sutter County Health Department reports that the number of children receiving vaccinations averaged 67 in 2006 up from an average of 45 each month in 2005. The average number of vaccinations given averaged 231 in 2006 as opposed to 146 in 2005. The program has increased outreach activities and it is impossible to determine the number of children who received needed immunizations from private providers due to the immunization advertisements.

e. The Commission asks the Grand Jury to identify those programs that provide a similar free, pre-kindergarten experience comparable to Smart Start. The Smart Start program includes parental support and education as well as facilitated
The Commission is not aware of any such program in Sutter County providing similar services for Kindergarten readiness.

The Commission is in the middle of its scheduled review of its Strategic Plan. An extensive effort to illicit input from the public is being conducted and will include direct mailing of a survey to parents of children aged 0-5 in Sutter County, newspaper survey, online survey, direct mailing of survey to childcare providers and other local professionals, attendance by commission staff at school site parent group meetings. In addition Commission staff will survey Sutter County residents at the Yuba Sutter Fair. A workgroup will be convened to receive community input prior to January 1, 2007. When draft elements of the plan are ready they will be presented for public review and comment.

**Recommendation #4** (Grand Jury Report pg 56)

This recommendation needs further analysis by the Commission as the Commission felt all of these items were being done. This analysis will be completed by February 1, 2007.

The Executive Director has conducted a variety of activities to establish program services in the western and southern parts of the county including personal contacts and attendance at Sutter County Schools Administrators meetings. While site specific programs are not currently available in western and southern county locations, collaborative efforts and outreach continues in these areas and all Commission services are available to children aged 0-5 and their families.

Migrant Head Start and the Yuba City Unified School District’s Migrant Child Care Program have program managers that establish curriculum for the children prior to summer. However if the programs desire to do enrichment activities outside their available summer budgets the commission would encourage them to apply for mini grants. The Commission would welcome the opportunity to collaborate with either entity. Specific outreach activities to inform both Migrant Head Start and the Yuba City Unified School Districts Migrant Child Care Program of available Commission programs continue year round.

Examples of the Commission efforts to reach out to the community include;

1. For the Smart Start Program 1000 flyers in English and 500 flyers in Spanish were provided to all Kindergarten registration packets throughout Sutter County. Posters in both English and Spanish were distributed throughout Sutter County and placed in small grocery stores, laundromats, school sites and other highly frequented locations.

2. Public Service announcements were run on local radio including KUBA, Sunny 101, KKCY 103.1, Spanish radio, and Channel 19 cable television ran for one month.

3. Signs at local transit stops ran for 90 days being rotated throughout the county transit system.

4. The Program Manager for the grantee, Yuba City Unified School District, met with county school superintendents to describe the program and attempt to develop interest in participation.
The Executive Director participates/serves on a variety of councils/committees including the Homeless Consortium, Yuba Sutter Substance Abuse Advisory Board, Head Start Policy Council (2003-2005), Migrant Head Start Health Committee and the Capitol Region Healthy Futures Project Leadership Council. In addition Commission funded programs encompass a wide variety of public and private organizations. For example to distribute the New Parent Kits commission staff works with contacts at Family SOUP, WIC, Mental Health, First Steps, Children’s Home Society, Employment Services, Welfare & Social Services, Sutter North, Casa De Esperanza, Migrant Education, Feather River Tribal Health, Park Avenue School, Bridge Street School, King Avenue School, YCUSD Child Development Program, Sutter Yuba Children’s System of Care, Head Start, Planned Parenthood, Sutter County Health Department and Jack and Jill Playschool. Commission staff hosts Program Integration meetings to facilitate collaboration and the exchange of available program services.

**Finding #5** (Grand Jury Report pg 57)

The Commission disagrees with this finding.

**Recommendation #5** (Grand Jury Report pg 57) This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

From the Commission’s point of view anticipating mid-year evaluations to contain “serious investigative analysis and strong recommendations for improvement” is similar to consuming half cooked meals, and then complaining about the taste. The Commission, along with program provider’s use mid year evaluations to provide preliminary information on how projects are progressing. Utilizing full year evaluations, as the Commission does, produces more accurate and complete evaluations and treats program providers in a fully ethical manner. In addition the importance of consistent annual data management allows for the development of longitudinal studies that will demonstrate children accessing one or more Commission programs enter school ready to learn and demonstrate higher test scores in second grade.

The Commission is fully satisfied with the evaluation firm selected by competitive analysis a few years ago. In addition the Commission believes that the evaluation provides a review of what has happened in each project and it is the responsibility of Commission staff to make recommendations to the Commission on actions to take after review of all relevant data.

**Finding #6** (Grand Jury Report pg 57)

The Commission disagrees wholly with this finding. The Commission does not believe the room is too small and it is conducive for public meetings.

**Recommendation #6** (Grand Jury Report pg 57) This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

The Commission does not feel that a larger room is needed as we have always been able to easily accommodate an audience that has business with the Commission. In addition the
meeting time is well established and like all times will not be suitable for every person’s desires. It has been the Commission experience that persons who have interest in or business with the Commission have been able to attend the scheduled meetings.

Finding #7  (Grand Jury Report pg 57)
The Commission disagrees wholly with this finding. Each time proposals have been received it has been announced which of the Commission members have been identified to read the proposals in a public meeting. In addition outside readers are also identified in public meetings of the Commission. The Commission, like other organizations who grant funds, does not conduct a public debate with each applicant on the merits of the material the applicant submitted. Applicants always have the opportunity to consult with Commission Staff prior to submission of their proposal and after the awarding of grants to gain assistance.

During the current funding opportunity Commissioners and Commission Staff met with applicants of Community Impact Proposals to discuss the projects. The comments from all readers, both Commission Members and outside readers were provided to the proponents in advance of the meeting for their consideration.

Recommendation #7  (Grand Jury Report pg 57)
This Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

Since its inception the Commission has used Commission members and knowledgeable staff from within and outside our community to review and comment on proposals received. This process provides for independent analysis of proposals from outside our community while giving local Commission members an opportunity to see what types of programs are being requested. The addition of a separate review body is not necessary or desirable.

One Commission member had the unfortunate experience of having a proponent go to the child care site where the Commission member’s family was enrolled and lobbying the child care provider to try to impact the Commission members vote. This type of questionably ethical effort is reduced when reviews are conducted by individuals who do not reside or do business within our community.

Finding #8  (Grand Jury Report pg 58)
The Commission disagrees in part with this finding. When children nap is a function of family choice. Grand Jury members may prefer naps after lunch but others may find mornings and late afternoons acceptable. Children arriving at Bright Futures are dependent on when their parents will bring them. This is similar to other appointments or activities parents have. Our experience in trying various times is that afternoons have greater participation by families.

Recommendation #8  (Grand Jury Report pg 58) This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.
The Grand Jury is expressing a value decision that might work for them but the Commission Experience with this project over the past 4 years is that parents bring children in the afternoon in greater numbers than in the mornings thus allowing more children to participate in the screening process.

Finding #9 (Grand Jury Report pg 58) The Commission disagrees in part with this finding. Various groups attending Commission funded programs have had transportation provided for them.

Recommendation #9 (Grand Jury Report pg 58) This recommendation will require further analysis. As indicated earlier in this response the Commission funds projects proposed by responsible individuals or organizations. Funding for transportation has always been allowed by the Commission. Why some projects use transportation and others do not will require inquiring of applicants why they made the choice they did regarding transportation. It could be that proponents did not see transportation as a problem for their clients. Some projects such as Sutter County Smiles and School Readiness serve children at schools where transportation is already provided. In addition a number of Commission funded programs provide in home services making client transportation unnecessary. By March 1, 2007 the Commission will have inquired of its grant recipients as to their need for transportation.
July 7, 2006

The Honorable Robert H. Danron
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California
County of Sutter
466 Second Street
Yuba City, California 95991

Dear Judge Danron:

Re: Response to the 2005-2006 Grand Jury Final Report

Observation of the Special Election Held on November 8, 2005

The Grand Jury was invited to observe the precinct and voting activities of the Special Election held on November 8, 2005 and the auditing process of the Canvas Board following the election.

The Clerk-Recorder-Registrar of Voters and her staff appreciate the recognition by the Grand Jury of the cooperative spirit, dedication and thoroughness of the election staff.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Bechtel
Clerk-Recorder-Registrar of Voters
July 6, 2006

The Honorable Robert H. Darby
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California
County of Sutter
466 Second Street
Yuba City, California 95991

Dear Judge Darby:

Re: Response to the 2005-2006 Grand Jury Final Report

Demonstration of Electronic Voting Machines

The Clerk Recorder Registrar of Voters and her staff appreciate the time and effort spent by the Grand Jury in accepting our invitation to observe a demonstration of the new electronic voting equipment and a tour of the recently remodeled extension of the election office. We are pleased that “the voting machines performed flawlessly” and that the Grand Jury was impressed with the remodeled extension of the office.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Bechtel
Clerk-Recorder-Registrar of Voters

ENDORSED FILED
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COUNTY OF SUTTER

Clerk of the Court

Jennifer Lambert, Deputy

SUTTER COUNTY WEB SITE: www.suttercounty.org
June 29, 2006

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

From: Jim Denney, Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator

Subject: Response to the 2005-2006 Grand Jury Final Report

The following are the responses of the Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator to the findings and recommendations of the 2005-2006 Sutter County Grand Jury Final Report.

Criminal Justice Committee Report (pages 26-28)

Findings:

The Committee observed graffiti painted and etched into the walls in several areas of the jail. For example, in the exercise yard, gang symbols were noticeable along the walls of the basketball court, and the word "skinhead" was scratched on the door of one of the holding cells.

Recommendations:

In an effort to reduce racial tensions and gang rivalry, the Committee recommends that all graffiti be painted over as soon as it is discovered.

Response:

The Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator concurs with the finding; however, the Grand Jury Criminal Justice Committee was informed by Jail staff on the day of their tour that the Jail was undergoing a painting project as part of the ongoing maintenance of the facility. The graffiti described in the Committee's report has since been painted over and Jail staff will continue to take action to delete graffiti whenever it is discovered in the Jail.

Education Committee Report (pages 31-32)
Findings:

The playground asphalt has not been replaced and the solar-powered radar speed limit signs have not been installed.

Recommendations:

The 2006-07 Grand Jury follow up on the status of:

- The asphalt on the playground
- The installation of solar powered notification radar signs, or flashing yellow lights on the school zone signs

Response:

The Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator has no comment regarding the asphalt on the playground and concurs with the Grand Jury finding regarding the installation of solar-powered radar speed limit signs. While the school and the Sutter County Road Department continue to search for funding to install the needed signs, the Sheriff’s Department has continued to provide a close patrol of the area, including the placement of the Department’s radar trailer in the area of the school, the posting of Sheriff’s Citizen Volunteers to monitor traffic and the deployment of Patrol Deputies to conduct enforcement operations. This is in addition to enforcement actions that are being conducted by the California Highway Patrol to curtail speeding vehicles in the area.

In addition, the Sheriff’s Department School Resource Officers (deputies) have visited the school on at least six (6) occasions during the past year and matters related to traffic safety were discussed with the students.

This concludes the responses of the Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator and the Sutter County Sheriff’s Department. As always, should any questions arise from this or any other issue, please do not hesitate to contact me at (530) 822-7312.

Sincerely,

JIM DENNEY
SHERIFF-CORONER

cc: Sutter County Board of Supervisors  
Larry T. Combs, County Administrative Officer  
Captain Scott Silsbee, Commander, CHP-Yuba/Sutter Office  
Tom Pritchard, Superintendent, Live Oak Unified School District  
George Musallam, Director, Sutter County Public Works Department
July 12, 2006

Honorable Judge Damron
Superior Court of California
Foreperson Jopson
Sutter County Grand Jury
446 Second Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Dear Judge Damron and Foreperson Jopson:

On June 28, 2006, I received the Grand Jury’s reports for the 2005-06 year. I have reviewed your summary, findings, and recommendations. I want to thank you for the comprehensive nature of the reports. I note that the summary was divided into two parts. Part one focused on the overall operation of the Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Office, our emergency plan practices, and nursing issues at Feather River Academy. The second report focused on Feather River Academy (FRA). Notation was made of the quality of the FRA facilities provided to our students, the lack of student transportation, and the lack of nursing services on the campus.

I would like to clarify several items in both reports about the overall operation of Sutter County Superintendent of Schools’ programs, services, and Feather River Academy.

On behalf of our agency, I would like to thank the Grand Jury for the overall compliment of agency management in the summary section. However, under the discussion section (page 40), it is stated that the “Mission statements and organizational flow charts are incomplete.” I provided a copy of the county office’s mission statement, which was quoted in the opening of the Grand Jury’s report. I was not requested by the Grand Jury to provide additional flow charts. We do have these documents and I am enclosing a copy for your review.

Your final bullet states: “The Feather River Academy does not have transportation services for students.” Though we do not provide regular bus service for FRA students, we do provide Yuba-Sutter Transit passes for students who do not have their own transportation. Bus passes are provided at no cost to the student. We also provide van transport services by staff, when necessary. Because of the highly transient student rate at FRA, it would be nearly impossible to coordinate busing with Yuba City Unified School District (YCUSD) or other school districts for students enrolled at FRA.
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The second finding states: "The Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Emergency Response Plan for the County Office and Feather River Academy does not address the evacuation of the students in the event of a levee or dam break." In our initial meeting last fall, I indicated that the plan would be updated by winter 2006 to reflect the addition of the new FRA campus which opened in August 2005. We do not have a written component for off-site evacuation at this time. However, we have a verbal agreement and a plan with (YCUSD) to provide bus service for evacuation of Feather River Academy in the event of flood or levee break.

The recommendation of the need to improve communication systems for contacting schools and districts is well-taken. This has been an ongoing concern of this agency. Our current radio system through OES is outdated and needs upgrading. We have applied for several grants to fund a better communication system and continue to work with OES on securing funding for this improvement.

You also mentioned an annual review of the Emergency Plan. We currently review and update the plan every three years as recommended by other emergency agencies. If this is a change in general procedure countywide, we would be glad to implement this recommendation. It has been my experience that schools’ emergency procedures and practices do not change enough annually to warrant an annual revision.

The next recommendation states: "The student-staff ratios should be analyzed annually to ensure there are sufficient levels of services provided to all students. The support staff should include school psychologists, nurses, special education teachers, speech therapists, administrators, and program managers.” We review class and program ratios on a monthly basis for all our programs and make adjustments accordingly. We currently maintain support staff ratios that are equivalent to other class-five county offices of our size. I do not recall a request for ratio information beyond nurse staffing. We only maintain ratio information for special education. Standards for nurses in general education are recommendations only.

The final recommendation states that: "The mission statement for the Superintendent should be corrected and the Regional Special Education and the Medi-Cal Administrative Activities Departments should develop mission statements.” These mission statements were never requested by the grand jury committee. I am enclosing a copy of the mission statements for your review. The mission statements are reviewed and updated annually and submitted to the County Board of Education for approval each June with the submission of the annual budget.

The second report for Feather River Academy focuses on two main areas: the lack of nursing services and the lack of transportation services. I have addressed both areas in the above section.
The final section of the report states: “The nursing services should be comparable to those provided at other sites, and be based on the present ratio of 125 students to one school nurse, which was developed several years ago by the Sutter County Superintendent’s Coordinating Council.” This ratio should read: a ratio of 120 students to one nurse. This ratio only applies to students in county-operated special education programs. It does not apply to regular education students in school districts or Feather River Academy.

I am in agreement that nursing services to all children in Sutter County are limited. The current services provided by school nurses is of the highest quality, but can always be expanded. Due to lack of state support for public school nurses and shortfalls in special education funding, the priority for increased nurses in schools is not likely in the foreseeable future.

Again, I would like to thank the Grand Jury for reviewing our programs and I would be glad to review final summaries for accuracy and detail in future years.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,

Jeff Holland

Enclosures
cc: County Board of Education
    District Superintendents
    County Cabinet Members
MISSION STATEMENT

The Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Office is dedicated to delivering successful solutions to the challenges of our local and regional partners by providing innovative support and services to promote education and self-sufficiency.
PERSONNEL

WENDY HYER
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR

SALLY WHITAKER
PERSONNEL ASSISTANT

SUZIE SILVEIRA
PERSONNEL ASSISTANT

LARK SANCHEZ
PERSONNEL TECHNICIAN

LEANN BRICKSTON
RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY

MISSION STATEMENT

The Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Personnel Department is committed to maintaining a high standard of excellence while serving the public, providing support to all employees and departments, protecting the organization by assuring compliance in areas of educational law related to personnel, and providing assistance to the school districts within Sutter County.
MISSION STATEMENT

Promote optimum self-sufficiency while addressing their unique educational needs and services to special needs students. The Special Education in our County is dedicated to providing...

EDUCATION

Special Needs

Robert (CEO)
The ES department is committed to providing leadership for curriculum and instructional support to all county operated programs and to districts within the county. ES will provide relevant support, guidance and accountability aimed at maximizing student academic performance and ensuring effective instructional practices in all classrooms.
MISSION STATEMENT

The Tri-County ROP will provide high quality career training programs and services to its customers and shall remain committed to continuous improvement. Program completers will be qualified to assume entry level employment in the occupation for which trained and/or advance to higher level careers through postsecondary education.
Mission Statement

Our mission in the Super Community Alternative School Program is to provide people with educational opportunities that are tailored to their needs, fostering a supportive and inclusive environment where each learner thrives.

Alternative Education
SPECIAL EDUCATION LOCAL PLAN AREA (SELPA)

DEBBI BROWN
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

ALISHA OJEDA
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY

LAURA JONES
PROGRAM SPECIALIST

LYNNE KOLL
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
SPECIAL EDUCATION LOCAL PLAN AREA (SELPA)

Lynne Kell
Admin Assistant

Debra Brown
Assistant Superintendent

Laura Jones – Program Specialist

Alisha Ojeda – Administrative Secretary

Sutter County Superintendent of Schools office is the administrative unit (AU) for the Sutter County SELPA. The SELPA is responsible for ensuring that special education funding including, but not limited to, IDEA funds, AB 602, and special education grants, is received and deposited per the Allocation Plan. The SELPA collaborates and works closely with staff of the AU on these tasks.

The SELPA receives and distributes revenue for pre-referral services prior to a referral made to Sutter-Yuba Mental Health Services (SYMHS) for Chapter 26.5 services. On behalf of all Non-Provider LEAs and Sutter High School District, the SELPA has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Family SOUP for these pre-referral services.
MEDI-CAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES

MARGIE ROLLINS
DIRECTOR OF MEDI-CAL ADMIN. ACTIVITIES

JUNE GILMORE
ACCOUNT SPECIALIST

JAN PERRY
OFFICE SECRETARY
MEDI-CAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES (MAA)

Pictured left to right: Jan Perry, Margie Rollins, and June Gilmore

Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Office is the host entity for the Capital Service Region (Region 3) Local Educational Consortium (LEC) statewide Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) program. Capital Service Region is based on the California County Superintendent Educational Services Association (CCSESA) regions. Region 3 serves Alpine, Colusa, El Dorado, Nevada, Plumas, Sacramento, Sierra, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties.

The MAA program allows school districts and county offices to be reimbursed federal dollars for costs incurred while performing certain administrative activities.

Such activities might include:

- Medi-Cal outreach
- Facilitating the Medi-Cal application
- Non-emergency, non-medical transportation of Medi-Cal eligible individuals to Medi-Cal services
- Contracting for Medi-Cal services
- Program planning and policy development
- MAA coordination and claims administration
June 29, 2006

The Honorable Robert Damron – Presiding Judge
Superior Court – State of California – County of Sutter
446 Second Street
Yuba City, California 95991

RE: Grand Jury Inspection Response As Required by Penal Code Section 933 (c)

Dear Judge Damron;

On behalf of the dedicated members of the Yuba City Police Department and the legislative body of the municipality, I would like to thank the members of the current Grand Jury for their time and consideration expended on the review of our Police Department operation and service level capabilities to our community.

We appreciate their recognition of the value we place on quality service and the efforts we continually make to insure an adequate blending of technology and effective management with a sense of community involvement.

While the Grand Jury noted the challenging opportunities we have in our future, they also noted the City has planning steps in place to help address issues such as competitive hiring and facility expansion. Two of the areas noted as lacking adequate space, (the SWAT room and locker room area), are included in our current expansion needs assessment; however, both are monitored to insure fire code compliance and ingress and egress paths are consistent with requirements. Our employees are adapting well to sharing of space for multiple uses and I applaud them for same.

The lab area referred to in the report has embedded chemical stains in the Formica counter-top, which cannot be removed without complete replacement of the entire segment. While it looks somewhat unsightly, the area is sanitized prior to any examination of material and neither employee health or evidence integrity is compromised. Our expansion plans call for stainless steel replacements for these types of use areas.

Again, we thank the Grand Jury for their voice of support. Their findings and recommendations have been passed along to our staff.

Respectfully,
On Behalf of the City Manager and Legislative Body

RICHARD J. DOSCHER
Chief of Police

OCT 3 2006
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SUTTER
RECEIVED
JUN 30 2006
CRIMINAL DIVISION
August 18, 2006

The Honorable Robert H. Damron
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California
County of Sutter
4446 Second Street
Yuba City, California 95991

Dear Presiding Judge Damron:

Re: Response to the Report of the 2005-2006 Sutter County Grand Jury

The Yuba City Unified School District (District) submits the following responses to the reports, findings, and recommendations of the 2005-2006 Sutter County Grand Jury.

Reports (pages 36 through 38 and 42 through 43)

The District accepts the two Grand Jury reports. The first summarized the plant and program for Lincrest Elementary School. The second report summarized plans for present/future growth and development for YCUSD; school emergency plans/procedures; student injury/health care plans/procedures; State standardized testing programs, and recruitment processes for administrators and teachers.

Findings (pages 37 and 43)

The District is pleased with the finding (page 37) about the exemplary program offered to students of Lincrest School. That program is representative of all District schools except that Lincrest has proportionately more students with special needs, many of whom are served by Sutter County programs on the Lincrest campus. The co-existence of County and District programs affords students with special needs the social and academic experiences consistent with their general education peers at Lincrest and other YCUSD schools.

The District offers clarification to the finding (page 43) regarding school site health care. That care is offered through a health care team consisting of nurses, health clerks, and health aides. Both comprehensive high schools receive full time care to students through their health care team. All other District sites are provided 3.5 hours of health aide care per day and a school nurse who is assigned based upon established guidelines.

Recommendations (page 28)

RECEIVED
AUG 26 2006
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SUTTER
CRIMINAL DIVISION

Educating Today's Students To Succeed In Tomorrow's World
The District carefully monitors the health care program for coverage and quality. The District uses information from that monitoring process to make annual and necessary changes in staffing. The District has increased health care services for the 2006-2007 school year. The District finds our current program able to adequately address the various health and emergency needs of its students.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy H. Aaberg
Superintendent

Cc: Jeff Holland, Superintendent Sutter County Schools
Len L. LeTellier  
Court Executive Officer  
Superior court of California  
County of Sutter  
446 Second Street  
Yuba City, Ca 95991  

Mr. LeTellier:  

This letter is in response to the 2005-06 report by the Sutter County Grand Jury on the Yuba-Sutter Economic Development Corporation, YSEDC.  

Little was written about YSEDC's successful work, including managing over $14 million dollars in revolving loan funds in support of the growth of small, minority, disadvantaged and women owned businesses. In addition, YSEDC's achievement to retain and attract thousands of jobs, help create billions of dollars in investments and the reduction of the region's unemployment rate by over 10% in 5 years is a significant achievement. This achievement has recently been recognized by the US Department of Commerce, Office of Economic Adjustment as the best rural economic development organization in the nation for 2006. YSEDC has also been recognized by the National Association of Development Organization, NADO for their Innovation Award for our Autonomous Technology Initiative Project.  

In 1999, YSEDC embraced a vision statement of becoming the best economic development organization in the nation in 5 to 7 years. It takes time to build a strong economy given all of the dynamics. But, YSEDC has worked to build a focused, directed and outcome oriented community based organization that embraces an open, shared and participatory environment.  

YSEDC provides the following comments that elaborate upon the Grand Jury's key findings:  

First, in response to the lack of industrial zoned properties that are infrastructure served, YSEDC is and remains a staunch advocate of the jurisdictions reviewing their General Plans and land use policies as the vehicle for change. It is the responsibility of Sutter County and the cities of Live Oak and Yuba City to
understand the dynamics of supply and demand of land uses through their General Plans. Yuba City recently completed a General Plan and added no acreage for industrial development contrary to YSEDC's recommendation. Live Oak is in the midst of a General Plan update, but at this point, there appears to be no indication of additional expansion of industrial zoned property. Sutter County has not done a General Plan update in 10 years. It is the responsibility of the local governments to ensure that there is an adequate supply to meet current and future needs for the expansion and retention of existing businesses. Given the regulatory nature of land use in California, industrial developers need deep pockets and long-term patience for a zone change. Few are willing to risk the money associated with the process, including YSEDC, especially when confronted with the lack of existing infrastructure to support the investment.

YSEDC strongly suggests that the Grand Jury recommend that the cities and county examine future locations for industrial development with private developers and pursue an over-arching plan for rezoning and an infrastructure-financing plan in support of development yielding employment generation. Should the cities or counties require assistance, YSEDC as always is available at their convenience.

Second, the Grand Jury recognized that YSEDC was involved in the “Save Beale” campaign. YSEDC pointed out that it devoted a substantial amount of its resources and in fact was instrumental in the success of the “Save Beale” campaign. However, the Grand Jury recommended that YSEDC look at a long-term economic strategy associated with an economy without Beale Air Force Base. However, such a recommendation is contradictory to YSEDC's goal of preservation and enhancement of the Base. We remind the Grand Jury that Beale is in Yuba County and that this recommendation is best pursued in a dialogue between the Boards of Supervisors before said action is pursued.

The successful outcome of the retention of Beale through the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission was due in large part to YSEDC's exhaustive community efforts to retain the base, YSEDC understanding the economic dependence from defense spending quickly took the initiative to identify ways to reverse this trend. YSEDC applied and was awarded a $90,000 grant for Yuba County from the Department of Defense, Office of Economic Adjustment to examine ways to reduce and reverse reliance from Beale Air Force
Base. YSEDC in concert with the Yuba County Office of Economic Development completed the report, ‘Reducing and Reversing Economic Reliance on Defense Spending,’ October 2005. A copy of the Executive Summary of the report was provided to the Grand Jury.

The findings and recommendations from the report were presented to and reviewed by the Yuba County Board of Supervisors. The key resolve of the report is to reduce the 28% employment dependency on Yuba County by 2% per year over the next five years, thus achieving a more diversified employment base and economy. The implementation plan to achieve this benchmark and the corresponding entities to achieve it can be found in the report.

Additionally, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research is in the process of formulating a Joint Land Use Study with Yuba County to address land use and other compatible issues between operations at Beale and growth in the adjacent jurisdictions. The purpose of this effort is to encourage cooperative land use planning between the Base and the adjacent jurisdictions thereby ensuring that training and operational activities of the installation and future development are compatible, ensuring longevity of the Base at least from this perspective. This effort was recently accentuated by release of a recommendation by the Air Force to reduce the size of the noise contours, creating opportunities for development previously impacted by these restrictions in Yuba County, which helps to stimulate a more diverse and sustainable economy.

Third, as it pertains to creating a financially sustainable organization, YSEDC whole-heartedly appreciates the comments by the Grand Jury. Non-profits, including, YSEDC specifically since January 2005, have been impacted by the redirection of philanthropic monies and government assistance to areas impacted by tsunamis, earthquakes and hurricanes. In addition, President Bush through the Strengthen America’s Community Initiative has called for the elimination of $4.3 billion and over 17 federal agencies that support economic development activities in the nation. YSEDC’s business model is one of the most successful in the nation but it has been impacted by these unfortunate acts of nature and after 12 years of service has yet to be completely sustainable through its management for service programs in support of economic development. Today, local government supports about 15 percent of YSEDC’s budget. However, it has and still remains a goal that is in the sights of the Board of Directors and management of YSEDC.
We welcome further discussion and input to achieve our goal of creating a diverse, sustainable and global economy. We applaud the members of the Grand Jury for their service.

Should you have any questions, we are available at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Dan Flores
President/Chairman

Tim Johnson
Executive Director/Secretary