

GLENN COUNTY GRAND JURY



Butte City Cemetery, East Side Of County Road Y,
One Mile South Of Hwy 162

FINAL REPORT 2000 – 2001

2000-2001 Glenn County Grand Jury

526 West Sycamore Street
Willows, California 95988

July 10, 2001

Superior Court Judge
The Honorable Donald C. Byrd
526 West Sycamore Street
Willows, CA 95988

Judge Byrd:

Enclosed herewith is the Final Report of the 2000-2001 Glenn County Grand Jury. Following the swearing-in ceremony last July, the nineteen Grand Jury members met, established rules of procedure and formed committees. The full Grand Jury met twice monthly alternating between Orland and Willows. Committees met as often as necessary.

The Grand Jury conducted the tasks that grand juries are charged with, including inspecting county facilities, reviewing financial documents and responding to citizen concerns. Each committee prepared reports of their activities which were reviewed by the full Grand Jury, and upon the concurrence of the required twelve members, committee reports were included in this final report. In addition, the Grand Jury reviewed the responses made by the various agencies and departments to the previous Grand Jury recommendations, and commented upon the adequacy of those responses.

We would like to express our appreciation to the many department heads and their staffs for providing us with material and information as requested.

We believe that the recommendations and comments in this report will be valuable tools to the various agencies and departments as they continue their efforts to improve upon the public's understanding of their decisions and services.

Sincerely,

William A. Murphy
Grand Jury Foreperson

2000-2001 Glenn County Grand Jury Members

Timothy Asbury

Mary Brubaker

Sandra Chaney (Secretary)

Trina Darby

Nancy Farrell

Ginger Flowerdew

Theresa (Tina) Fodge

Robert Gaines, Jr.

Susan (Kathy) Gilmore

Dan Green

James Jacobs

Richard (Ned) Kelly (Foreperson, Pro-Tem)

Jackie Lane (Sergeant-at-Arms)

Sandra Martin

Sharon McMahan

William (Bill) Murphy (Foreperson)

Margaret Noraas

William Schroer

THE ROLE OF THE GRAND JURY

The Grand Jury is primarily an investigative body created by the U. S. Constitution's Fifth Amendment and the California Constitution.

Nineteen residents of Glenn County are selected after reviewing 30 to 40 people. Grand Juries are impaneled annually and are officers of the Court, but work independently. Most of the work is done by committees, which may include Public Safety, Public Works, Administration, Education, Social Services, Health Administration, City Government, and Special Districts. Other committees may be appointed as needed.

The Grand Jury and committees meet several times a month. They meet with County and City officials, visit local government facilities, and conduct research on matters of interest and concern. The proceedings of the Grand Jury are kept confidential. Jurors may not discuss the business of the Jury with other individuals.

The Grand Jury receives letters from citizens expressing concern over a particular matter of local government. Anyone can file a complaint with the Grand Jury. The Grand Jury chooses which complaints to investigate. The Grand Jury cannot investigate disputes between private parties. All complaints to the Grand Jury are confidential.

All Grand Jury findings and recommendations are issued in written reports. Each report must be approved by at least 12 members. At the end of the term (June 30th), the Jury issues a final report. Copies of the report are distributed to public officials, libraries, news media, and any entity that is the subject of a report. Within ninety days following the issuance of the report, officials responsible for matters addressed are required to respond in writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

2000-2001 Glenn County Grand Jury Members
Role of the Grand Jury

GRAND JURY REPORT

CITY AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Glenn County Board of Supervisors	
Purchasing Procedures	1
Final Budget	3
Butte City Cemetery District	5
Orland City Council	
Dismissal of City Manager	6

ASSESSOR'S OFFICE	8
--------------------------------	----------

BUILDING DEPARTMENT	10
----------------------------------	-----------

FINANCE

Finance Department	12
--------------------------	----

HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT	13
-----------------------------------------	-----------

PUBLIC SAFETY

Glenn County Jail	15
Jane Hahn Juvenile Hall	17
Orland Police Department	19
Willows Police Department	21
Orland Volunteer Fire Department	23
Willows Fire Department	24

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT	25
--------------------------------------	-----------

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION ...	27
-----------------------------------------------------------	-----------

WILLOWS AIRPORT

Repair Road and Parking Lot	28
-----------------------------------	----

APPENDIX

2000-2001 Response Report	1
Cover photo by David Brown, photographer, Colusi County Historical Society Wagon Wheels	

**GLENN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Purchasing Procedures**

I. PURPOSE:

The Grand Jury reviewed the Finance Department, including purchasing procedures.

II. BACKGROUND:

In the past year, the Department of Public Works purchased 56 customized wristwatches as employee awards at a cost of \$46.49 each, for a total cost of \$2,792.19.

III. FINDINGS:

- The Department of Finance rejected an invoice for payment for the watches, which were purchased without prior approval of the Board of Supervisors.
- The Department of Public Works sought retroactive approval of the purchase from the Board, which was approved.
- The Board of Supervisors on November 21, 2000, adopted a resolution to amend the Glenn County Administrative Manual, Title II, Awards and Recognitions, as follows:

Agency heads shall have the option to recognize employee and volunteer efforts through promotional items, such as food, refreshments, and plaques and other minor awards. Awards in excess of \$25 per employee must be pre-approved by the Board of Supervisors.

- The Administrative Manual has not yet been updated.

IV. CONCLUSION:

The Grand Jury commends the Glenn County Board of Supervisors and the Finance Department for its careful processing of this purchase and amending the procedures to avoid future errors.

V. RECOMMENDATION:

- **01-01** The Administrative Manual should be updated to reflect the new language.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: (01-01)

Finance Department: (01-01)

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Glenn County Final Budget**

I. PURPOSE:

The Grand Jury reviewed the Glenn County fiscal documents and the Final Budget for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2001.

II. BACKGROUND:

In addition to reviewing the budget with the Finance Director to answer questions about policies and programs, the Grand Jury reviewed the fiscal documents to determine whether or not the budget and its adoption process are clearly readable and accessible to general citizenry.

III. FINDINGS:

- The annual budget is adopted by the Glenn County Board of Supervisors in accordance with the California Law known as the County Budget Act.
- The adopted Final budget is a comprehensive document, well prepared and inclusive of the necessary information for the operation of the County Government and the Special Districts in the county.
- Glenn County Department heads and their staff members describe the operations of the budget units under their jurisdictions to the board of supervisors at budget hearings and throughout the year, but such descriptions of the budget units are not included in the Final Budget.
- The Finance Department this year is requiring a narrative description for each budget unit to be submitted by the departments together with the proposed departmental budgets for fiscal year 2001-2002.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

The Board of Supervisors and the Finance Department are to be commended for the attention to detail and accessibility of the county's financial documents and approval process.

While financial activities of Glenn County are handled in an open and professional fashion, citizen satisfaction with the process could be enhanced with

documents made available to the public that provide narrative and other illustrative descriptions of each of the budget units.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

01-02 Publish the narrative descriptions and other illustrative material, such as charts and graphs that describe the individual budget units in the Annual Proposed Budget for review by the board of supervisors and the public at annual budget hearings in June. The Final Budget, which would reflect any changes made by the board to the Proposed Budget, could still be prepared and adopted separately in August as it is currently done, in accordance with the Budget Act.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: **(01-02)**
Finance Department: **(01-02)**

GLENN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Butte City Cemetery District

I. PURPOSE:

The neglected condition of the Butte City Cemetery located on County Road “Y” in southeastern Glenn County has caught the attention of concerned citizens, including Grand Jurors.

II. BACKGROUND:

The Butte City Cemetery (sometimes called the “Pioneer Cemetery”) is an old public cemetery that has received attention from time to time by journalists and scholars and occasional maintenance by volunteers over the years, but there has not been a burial there in 70 years. Recently, concerned citizens have complained about the apparent neglect of the cemetery.

III. FINDINGS:

- The cemetery consists of twenty-seven gravesites, some with significant monuments, most burials taking place before the turn of the 20th century.
- The land is listed as public land with the Glenn County Assessor, but it is not registered with the Glenn County Finance Department or with the California Board of Equalization.

- No records could be found of the formation or dissolution of the district and its governing board neither in either Glenn County nor in Colusa County for the years prior to the formation of Glenn County.

IV. CONCLUSION:

It is the Grand Jury's conclusion that the Butte City Cemetery District on County Road "Y" near Afton is an abandoned public cemetery.

V. RECOMMENDATION:

01-03 The Board of Supervisors should take the necessary steps to recognize the Butte City Cemetery District as a legitimate Glenn County entity and arrange for the Cemetery's restoration and regular maintenance.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: **(01-03)**

**ORLAND CITY COUNCIL
Dismissal of City Manager**

I. PURPOSE:

Citizens and Grand Jury members expressed concern about the manner in which the Orland City Council dismissed the city manager and then changed its decision at a subsequent meeting.

II. BACKGROUND:

The Orland City Council dismissed the city manager on March 20, 2001 following a closed session. One city council member complained that the council violated the Brown Act in its closed session deliberation. At a subsequent City Council meeting, the council re-considered its action and decided to re-employ the manager. While the council has the authority to dismiss the city manager, it is required to follow certain procedures in the conduct of its meetings where such action is taken.

III. FINDINGS:

- Since the action was taken in a closed session, the public is unaware of the actual discussion.

- It is understood that personnel matters must be confidential, but the city manager was not included in the closed session, and the agenda item was not adequately noticed.
- City Council action in personnel matters found to be improper, could be costly to the local agency.
- The City Council subsequently participated in a public training session that emphasized council responsibility in similar issues.

IV. CONCLUSION:

The City Council is commended for participating in the public training session. However, the apparent mishandling of an important decision – the dismissal of the city manager - causes many citizens to be suspicious of other council action.

V. RECOMMENDATION:

01-25 City Council and staff should adhere closely to Brown Act provisions when preparing agendas, conducting meetings and making decisions.

VI. REQUIRED RESPONSES:

Orland City Council: **(01-25)**
 City Attorney: **(01-25)**

ASSESSORS'S OFFICE

I. PURPOSE:

The Assessor's Office has not been reviewed recently. No specific complaint was raised.

II. BACKGROUND:

In June 1997, the Assessor's Office was consolidated with the Recorder, Clerk to the Board of Supervisors, Elections and Micrographics. So, not only is the Assessor the County Assessor, but he serves as head of other departments as well.

III. FINDINGS:

- The County Assessor's Office does not have at the present time an in-house Auditing Appraiser. The work done by an Auditing Appraiser is currently being accomplished by an outside agency, which this Grand Jury has found to be doing a satisfactory job.

- Each year the Micrographics Department budgets \$5,000.00 for the restoration of the County's historical maps. At this time, they are still in the process of restoring the maps. At present, the only documents being digitized are those that are recorded in the Recorder's Office on a daily basis. There are however old books from the Assessor's Office and the Clerk's Office that have been restored on microfilm which are stored in the County vault. Old documents and historical artifacts have been found in a storage room that have not been restored. Each County Department Head oversees the restoration and preservation of their documents as well as deciding what is historical and what is not.
- There is not a central storing location for all departments to store and preserve departmental documents.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

The Assessor's Office seems to be running smoothly along with the Recorder and the Clerk to the Board of Supervisors. There is no one person in charge of overseeing the restoration and preservation of all the County's documents and artifacts nor is there a central location for storing them. There is a great concern for this historical need.

V. RECOMMENDATION:

- 01-05** Establish a unit within the Recorder's Office that will restore and preserve the County documents and artifacts.
- 01-06** Designate a centralized location for storage of all restored documents and historical artifacts.
- 01-07** Purchase necessary scanning equipment for the proper restoration of all County documents and historical artifacts.
- 01-08** Consider utilizing citizen volunteers to assist in historic record and artifact preservation.

VI. RESPONSES REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: **(01-05, 01-06, 01-07, 01-08)**
 Assessor: **(01-05, 01-07, 01-08)**
 Building & Grounds: **(01-06)**

BUILDING DEPARTMENT

I. PURPOSE:

Response to citizen complaints.

II. BACKGROUND:

The Grand Jury received three complaints about how building inspections are conducted. These complaints dealt with consistency of inspections by different inspectors. Also, whether it was proper for an inspector to not approve an electrical job that was completed and had passed inspection (the permit being for electrical work only) because the inspector observed building code violations unrelated to the work covered under the electrical permit, and therefore refused to allow the properly completed electrical service to be connected to the utility company line.

III. FINDINGS:

- The Grand Jury met with one of the complainants who is a building tradesman. The complainant cited several examples of construction projects where disputes arose over interpretation of building codes. The complainant felt the inspector made arbitrary decisions and in some cases could not cite the appropriate code for the changes demanded. The complainant said that due to construction delays and schedules the changes would be made, as it would be too costly to delay the project. The complainant felt there should be consistency in enforcement by all inspectors, saying that one inspector approves a part of a construction project, then another inspector comes out to inspect something else and finds fault with the completed work already approved by the previous inspector requiring more changes to be made.
- Another complaint received was from a parent who complained that when the parents were absent a building inspector told their 13-year old child that due to code violations their house may be “red tagged.” The parent felt this was inappropriate as it caused the child unnecessary anguish.
- The Grand Jury met with the Building Maintenance & Inspection Director and a member of his staff. These issues were discussed at length. The Director outlined the many functions of his department. Grand Jurors referenced the 1998-1999 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 99-64 that suggested the creation of a Board of Appeals to resolve building code enforcement disputes. The Director and staff stated that there previously had been a Board of Appeals similar to the model outlined in the Uniform Building Code, which was never utilized by disputants. The Director told Jurors that if a citizen disputes a decision made by one of his inspectors,

the citizen may appeal directly to him. If that does not resolve the dispute the citizen may appeal to the Glenn County Board of Supervisors.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

The Grand Jury realizes that building code enforcement can be controversial because of the changing code requirements. Jurors can understand the frustration of citizens when there is inconsistency between inspectors in interpretation of the various building codes.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

01-16 When an inspector notes a discrepancy and the permit holder disputes the inspector's finding, the inspector should issue a written notice to the permit holder defining the code section in violation.

01-17 Inspectors that inspect the same job site at different times should insure that subsequent decisions are consistent with prior inspections.

01-18 Consider the development of a process that allows a contractor to receive a certificate of code compliance at job completion when the work performed meets all the requirements a permit was issued for. This would allow the contractor to seek payment from the customer, even if the customer had other issues that prevented the inspector from issuing a final clearance because of other code violations discovered on the job site unrelated to the work the permit was issued for.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: **(01-18)**

Building and Maintenance Inspection Director: **(01-16, 01-17, 01-18)**

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

I. PURPOSE:

The Grand Jury reviewed the activities of the Finance Department.

II. BACKGROUND:

The issue of the County's requirement for excessive liability insurance on an employee's personal vehicle was brought up by Grand Jury members as a concern.

III. FINDINGS:

- The County currently requires employees to carry liability insurance coverage on their personal vehicles if they intend to seek mileage reimbursement from the County for work related business. The County requires employees to have a minimum liability coverage of \$100,000/\$300,000 for their personal vehicles. There is concern as to why this amount is set so high. Employees who do use their own vehicle for County use do not get mileage reimbursement if they do not have the required coverage. The existing policy is cost prohibitive to lower income employees who may because of job necessity, have to utilize their private vehicle. In the last 21 years, there has not been any reported employee personal vehicle accidents while on County business.

IV CONCLUSIONS:

The Grand Jury has determined that in some instances county owned vehicles just are not available, therefore, employees must use their own vehicles, but cannot claim mileage reimbursement because they cannot afford the higher insurance required.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 01-04** The current requirement for employee liability insurance on their personal vehicles should be lowered to the State minimum requirement, which is \$15,000 per person for bodily injury; \$30,000 per incident for bodily injury; and \$10,000 for property damage.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: **(01-04)**
Finance Department: **(01-04)**
Golden State Risk Management Authority: **(01-04)**

HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT

I. PURPOSE:

This was a routine inspection of the Glenn County Health Services Department. There were no complaints filed.

II. BACKGROUND:

There are approximately seventy employees in the Health Services Department, which has an allocation of seventy-five employees. Approximately 85 – 90% of this Agency's budget is funded from State or Federal sources. The committee met with the Director and interviewed several employees.

III. FINDINGS:

- Professional level vacancies seem to take a long time to fill. There is a severe human resource shortage statewide and the competition for these positions is a problem that has always faced this county. Although the hiring procedures are being followed as mandated by law, the county needs to look into more productive methods of hiring on a more timely basis.
- Morale had been low in the past. The department had given a survey to the rank and file, and asked the employees to express their concerns. Morale has since improved and has proven that communication is an essential factor to employee/supervisor relations. Annual surveys would continue to allow all employees to communicate their concerns.
- The Policies and Procedures Manual has been updated since the last Grand Jury Report, but the Grand Jury does not want to see it set aside again as a low priority. Continued updating will ensure a current information resource for all employees.
- Long Term Care for our county is at a critical stage. There is a shortage of facilities and the elderly population is increasing at alarming rates. There is no plan in effect to meet this huge burden of housing and medical care. The Director and his staff are aware of the problem and it has been identified as a statewide concern.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

The Health Services Department is moving in the right direction to improve communication with all employees, continues to fill vacancies as mandated by law, and is aware of the need for implementing new programs for our elderly population.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **01-21** Inquire into more timely and productive methods of hiring procedures to reduce open vacancies.

01-22 It is recommended that the department conduct annual surveys of all employees for continued improvement in communication.

01-23 Update Policy and Procedure Manual annually.

01-24 Develop plan to accommodate increased demands for Long Term Care for our elderly.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: (01-21, 01-24)

Health Services: (01-21, 01-22, 01-23, 01-24)

GLENN COUNTY JAIL

I. PURPOSE:

In accordance with California Statutes, the Glenn County Grand Jury performed a physical inspection of the Glenn County Jail.

II. BACKGROUND:

Glenn County Jail was built in 1990; it is a Type II facility housing both male and female inmates. It also houses illegal immigrants for the Immigration Department. The Glenn County Sheriff's Department is responsible for the operation and maintenance of this facility. The inspection of this facility by the Grand Jury is an annual requirement by the State of California.

III. FINDINGS:

- The jail is staffed with 1 Lieutenant, 1 Sergeant and 18 line Officers. With training, vacation and sickness this leaves the staffing a little short and it is recommended that the Board of Supervisors and Personnel investigate the possibility of increasing the number of Officers.
- The pay scale would appear to be approximately 20% lower than in surrounding Counties. Although pay increases have been agreed to, they are over a period of three years after which these Officers will still be behind those of other Counties. This discrepancy leads to the problem of hiring and retaining well-qualified Officers.
- Most of the improvements addressed by the two previous Grand Juries had not yet been completed and are scheduled for November 2001. The

following are considered safety items and should be addressed as soon as possible. They are:

1. Replace generator
 2. Widen sally port entrance
 3. Provide secure walkway between the jail and courthouse
 4. Security of the fenced area outside the kitchen
- Because of a computer problem, the Policy Manual has still not been completed. We urge that this be finished as soon as possible.
 - It was noted in the kitchen that the only covering on the meat slicer were dishtowels. This can hardly be classified as secure. This is a safety item reported by the previous Grand Jury and should receive immediate attention.

IV. CONCLUSION:

The jail is being run in an efficient manner. Improvements are being addressed and in time should be in effect.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

01-09 Complete a study of the staffing requirements of the jail. Consider a further study of the salaries to make these positions more attractive thereby improving the recruitment and retention of the staff of the Sheriff's Department and the jail staff.

01-10 In the interests of safety and security it is again recommended that the planned improvements be expedited.

01-11 Once again, and for the same reasons, a cover for the slicer must be found.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: **(01-09, 01-10)**

Personnel Department: **(01-09)**

Sheriff: **(01-10, 01-11)**

JANE HAHN JUVENILE HALL

I. PURPOSE:

It is a requirement of the State of California that the Grand Jury perform an annual inspection of the Juvenile Hall.

II. BACKGROUND:

Glenn County Probation Department is responsible for the operation of the Juvenile Hall. This facility was built in 1994 to house juveniles on a temporary basis. In 1994 it was changed to a long-term facility to provide housing for up to one year. It has six rooms, four with one bed and two with two beds. It has a staff of 10.

III. FINDINGS:

- Although the Juvenile Hall was built as an eight-bed facility at the time of visiting there were twelve juveniles being held, at times there are as many as sixteen. The extra children were sleeping on the floor between beds. Emphasizing again the need to expedite the remodeling that is planned.
- The plans for the remodeling were very well explained. It was also pointed out that it should be completed a year ahead of schedule.
- The vehicles in use were described as badly in need of maintenance and it was indicated that there was a need for a bus or van to accommodate their needs.
- It was pointed out that there was a problem with leakage around the windows in the holding rooms. These should be sealed as soon as possible.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

The staff of Juvenile Hall is performing a very valuable service to this Community. They should be commended for their performance under very trying and overcrowded conditions.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

01-12 We again urge the completion of the remodeling as soon as possible, as the overcrowding is unacceptable.

01-13 The windows in the cells should be sealed, as the present facility will probably still be in use during the next wet season.

01-14 Transportation needs, such as maintenance and need for a larger capacity vehicle, should be investigated.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: **(01-12, 01-14)**

Chief Probation Officer: **(01-12, 01-14)**

Building and Grounds Department: (01-12, 01-13)

ORLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT

I. PURPOSE:

Conducted a routine visit to Orland City Police Department. No complaints received.

II. BACKGROUND:

Orland Police Department serves the City of Orland with a population of just less than 6000. Manpower consists of the Chief, two Sergeants, nine Officers and five reserves. The Department operates five vehicles leased and maintained by the County. The Department also operates a volunteer force known as VIPS consisting of twenty-two volunteers and two donated cars. The Department is fully computerized and laptops are being installed in all cars, digital cameras are used for crime scenes and suspects.

III. FINDINGS:

- Benefits for the Officers appears to be very good, however it was noted that the pay scale for the Chief and Officers were lower than surrounding areas.
- The City or County does not have firing range facilities; Orland PD must perform the firearms training at a neighboring County facility.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

Orland PD appears to be in good shape. The Chief has done much to bring this department into the computer age. Officers have access to computers to check cases and this is being expanded to include laptop communication in all vehicles. There appears to be a good working environment and good relationship with the community, especially with regards to the schools and any associated problems. All manuals have been brought up to date. A good Volunteer Program (VIPS) is in place and is a working unit.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

01-26 The Orland City Council conduct research into the wage scale for all Officers and endeavor to bring them to par with other Communities.

01-27 City or County should investigate the possibility of securing a piece of land to be used by all County Law Enforcement Agencies. It is understood that a parcel of land near Black Butte was under consideration.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Orland City Council: **(01-26, 01-27)**
Board of Supervisors: **(01-27)**
Sheriff: **(01-27)**

WILLOWS POLICE DEPARTMENT

I. PURPOSE:

Conducted a routine visit to Willows City Police Department. Some citizens questioned arrest procedures and allegations of use of excessive force by arresting Officers.

II. BACKGROUND:

The Willows Police Department is responsible for security in the City of Willows, with a population of approximately 6300. The Department manpower is made up of the Chief, two Sergeants, an investigating Officer and six Officers. There is no Reserve Officer program, mainly due to a lack of volunteers willing to undergo the lengthy training period. Four vehicles are leased and maintained through the County.

III. FINDINGS:

- There appears to be some concern on the part of the citizens of Willows that the arresting practices of the Willows PD might be excessive. The Chief believes that his Officers behave correctly and the concerns may have been exaggerated by the local Media, also a lack of understanding of arrest procedures by the populace.
- There is a serious problem of space, especially storage for records, evidence, etc. There is a possibility of added space, but it depends greatly

on financing for the Library to move and is three to five years down the road.

- Presently Willows PD must share firing range facilities in neighboring Counties. At present, none exists in Glenn County. Some consideration had been given to a parcel near Black Butte.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

The Department appears to be in good shape. Officer training receives a high priority. Manuals have been updated. Communications have improved with the upgrade of the Red Mountain repeater. The Department needs to upgrade its computer/internet facilities to avail itself of better communication with other Law Enforcement Departments. The Department needs to address its Community Relations problems to improve its image with the citizens of Willows.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 01-28** Willows PD should embark on an extensive program to improve its image and Community Relations. Every effort should be made to demonstrate the valuable services performed by this Department and that the Department is always aware of the concerns of the citizen.
- 01-29** In Officer training, reinforce the need for proper restraint on the part of an arresting Officer, safety of both parties still being the main concern.
- 01-30** Willows PD, as a manpower consideration, should explore the need for Reserve Officers or a VIPS program as used in neighboring Communities, giving a greater visibility to the PD at Schools and Community functions.
- 01-31** The need of more space is still of great concern. If a move to a larger facility is impossible then temporary, secure storage space should be sought.
- 01-32** Upgrading of the computer/internet communications should be given a high priority thus making all sources of information available to the Officers and Department.
- 01-33** Willows PD, together with other Law Enforcement Agencies in Glenn County, have to share firing range facilities in other

Counties. Glenn County should give consideration to this much-needed training facility for use by all law enforcement in this County. We understand that consideration had been given to a parcel of land near Black Butte.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: (01-33)

Willows Police Department: (01-28, 01-29, 01-30, 01-31, 01-32, 01-33)

Willows City Council: (01-28, 01-29, 01-30, 01-31, 01-32, 01-33)

Sheriff: (01-33)

ORLAND VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

I. PURPOSE:

This was a routine inspection of the Orland Volunteer Fire Department. There were no complaints filed.

II. BACKGROUND:

Orland VFD serves the City of Orland, the Orland Rural District and assists the California Forestry Department when requested. In addition to the Chief, there are between thirty and fifty volunteers. Six are qualified EMT's. The Officers meet monthly and there are also two business meetings. Training is performed at the 3-4 per monthly meetings, at times some specialized training must be done out of town. Vehicles range from the mid-70's to the latest equipped, modern engine. There are also a large number of older vehicles of the early 1900's, which are restored and maintained by the firemen for display purposes. Regular maintenance is funded out while cleaning and oil changes are performed by the firefighters. Funding comes from City and County and through fundraisers by the Department. Calls are through Pratt's answering service and all firefighters have pagers, average response time is 4-5 minutes. Approximately 300 calls per year are answered. They have expanded to larger building, which serves as storage for equipment and the older vehicles. Plans are on the way for a heli-pad.

III. FINDINGS:

- There is no policy manual as such. All the latest information is maintained up to date in a folder.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

It is the opinion of this Grand Jury that the Orland Volunteers Fire Department is well maintained, well equipped, well trained and continues to plan for the future. The Chief, his Officers and Volunteers should be highly commended for the superb duty they perform for the city of Orland and surrounding Rural District.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

01-34 The Department heads should formulate a Policy Manual of standard practices employed in the Department for the instruction of new Officers following in line.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Orland VFD: **(01-34)**

WILLOWS FIRE DEPARTMENT

I. PURPOSE:

This was a routine inspection of the Willows Fire Department. There were no complaints filed.

II. BACKGROUND:

The Willows Fire Department serves the City of Willows, the Willows Rural Area, County and when required the California Department of Forestry. One Fire Chief, thirty to forty volunteers and five permanent firefighters provide the manpower. There is one Training Officer for fire fighting techniques. The Department operates three vehicles, 1972 grassfire truck, 1978 ladder truck and 2001 International with all the latest equipment. There is also the use of a CDF truck if needed for City, County or forest fires when called upon. Maintenance is provided by the City/County yard, the firefighters perform routine cleaning and oil changes. Bids are put out for spare parts, etc. Manuals are updated regularly. The Willows City, Rural Fire Department and fundraisers by the fire fighters provide funding for this facility.

III. FINDINGS:

- Communication facilities, intercom, phones, wireless, etc. were in the process of being updated.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

It was the opinion of the Grand Jury that this Department was operated in a highly efficient and professional manner. There were no apparent problems and the

Chief and his Department deserve the highest recognition and recommendation for a job well done.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

01-35 In the interests of safety it is recommended that the upgrade of all communications equipment be completed as soon as possible.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Willows Fire Department: **(01-35)**

PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AGENCY

I. PURPOSE:

Response to a citizen inquiry.

II. BACKGROUND:

The Grand Jury received a letter from a citizen wishing verification that the heavy equipment purchased for the Glenn County landfill had in fact been handled through the vendor's Willows facility. A portion of the sales tax is returned to the governing body for sales transactions occurring within its jurisdiction. The vendor in question has sales outlets in other jurisdictions within California. The Public Works and Development Services Agency Director had written a letter stating that the vendor had informed him that the sale had been handled through the Willows store.

III. FINDINGS:

- The Grand Jury contacted the City of Willows Finance Director for assistance in determining if in fact the above sales tax was being received by the City of Willows. The Finance Director with the assistance of the Glenn County Department of finance determined the following:

The County entered into a lease agreement with Caterpillar Financial Services Corporation to lease/purchase both pieces of equipment.

Sales tax is charged and collected ratably over the life of each lease. As such, as the County pays each annual installment, sales tax is collected by Caterpillar and paid to the California Board of Equalization. Since the sales tax is paid ratably, no significant "spike" in sales tax was noted in the Caterpillar account, nor will it be expected over the life of the lease.

Caterpillar Financial Services Corporation has verified that the tax paid with the first installment of the lease was credited to Glenn County as part of its sales tax reporting. Please note that of the 7-1/4% sales tax (7% after 1/1/01) 6% goes to the State, and the remaining 1-1/4% is allocated 1% to the City and 1/4% to the County (if the location of sale is outside the city limits, then the County is allocated all 1-1/4%).

III. CONCLUSIONS:

The lease/purchase of the heavy equipment for the Glenn County Landfill was handled through the Caterpillar sales facility in the City of Willows resulting in the allocation of sales tax to the City of Willows and the County of Glenn.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS:

01-15 Government entities with Glenn County should make every effort to ensure that purchases that can be credited to a point of sale within Glenn County are in fact so credited as such. This will return a portion of sales tax revenue to local jurisdictions.

V. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: **(01-15)**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION**

I. PURPOSE:

The Grand Jury performed a routine review of U. C. Cooperative Extension Office of Glenn County.

II. BACKGROUND:

The U. C. Extension Office had not been evaluated by a Grand Jury in several years.

III. FINDINGS:

- The Cooperative Extension Services is a cooperative services supported by the University of California and the County of Glenn.
- The Cooperative Extension provides important agricultural information to local farmers and other residents.

- The local 4-H program is organized and administered by U. C. Cooperative Extension.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

Cooperative Extension provides a direct connection with the University of California. Staff are to be commended for their willingness to assist local farmers and other residents with their agriculturally related problems and for their enthusiastic involvement in the local community with educational services, such as 4-H.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

None.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

None.

**WILLOWS AIRPORT
Repair Road and Parking Lot**

I. PURPOSE:

Follow-up on recommendations of previous Grand Juries.

II. BACKGROUND:

The 1998-99 Grand Jury recommended that the roads and parking lot at the Willows Airport needed repair. The Public Works Department responded that the repairs would be scheduled contingent upon the availability of road crews and the airport budget. The 2000-2001 Grand Jury visited the airport to evaluate the facility.

III. FINDINGS:

- Road and parking lot conditions remain poor at the airport.
- It has been two years since the Department of Public Works agreed to schedule repairs.
- Travel along the roadway and in the parking lot is uncomfortable and dusty.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

Driving on the airport roadways and parking lots could cause damage to an automobile. Walking along the road and in the parking lot could present a trip and fall danger to pedestrians. The condition of the access and parking areas present a poor public image.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

01-19 Repair the damaged roads and parking areas at the airport.

01-20 Heavy trucks be required to park in designated area with signs to direct them.

VI. RESPONSE REQUIRED:

Board of Supervisors: **(01-19, 01-20)**

Public Works: **(01-19, 01-20)**

Airport Advisory Commission: **(01-19, 01-20)**

2000-2001
GLENN COUNTY GRAND JURY

APPENDIX

2000-2001 RESPONSE REPORT

RESPONSE COMMITTEE REPORT

The duties of the 2000-2001 Grand Jury Response Committee are to review the responses made to the findings of the previous Grand Jury and to determine their level of adequacy.

GLENN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

00-01 The Board of Supervisors should review creating and filling a County Administrative Officer position.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board will review and consider the position of a County Administrative Officer position.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation has not been implemented.

00-02 The Board of Supervisors should review its sole source purchasing policy and eliminate, as much as practical, non-competitive purchasing.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board believes the purchasing policy is clear and has been reviewed over the past two years; however, will continue to review for any changes that may need to be made. In addition, this has been thoroughly reviewed by the Revenue, Expenditure and Fiscal Committee and changes that have been made have been made, have come as their recommendation.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation has been implemented.

00-03 Review staff reports and research should be of higher quality.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

There are several incorrect statements of fact in the report concerning this item. Competitive bidding was in fact pursued through the California Multiple Award System (CMAS) which is based on statewide bids available to any public agency. The price received for the items of equipment was that price available to all agencies through CMAS. The bidder whose equipment was selected was the only manufacturer willing

to offer a guaranteed ceiling on maintenance costs. At the time the report was published, no money had changed hands so the statement regarding the sales tax is in error. The dealer has been instructed to record the sale in Glenn County and thus the sales tax, when received will be credited here. All of this information was contained in a lengthy and detailed analysis of the item which was reviewed by the Board of Supervisors on May 2, 2000, appended hereto as Attachment A.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Department of Public Works failed to address recommendation 00-03.

00-04

When County Counsel is required to review and make comments prior to Board of Supervisor action, Counsel should have more input than “Approved As To Form”, as required in Title 4, Section 4.02.01 of the Administrative Manual.

RESPONSE: County Counsel

The recommendation should be directed to the Board of Supervisors. The recommendation indicates a desire for the County Counsel to participate in policy decisions instead of reviewing documents for legal sufficiency. This would be a significant change from existing practices and the job description of the County Counsel. Unless the Board of Supervisors formally directs the County counsel to provide policy guidance in document review, the role of the County Counsel is limited to reviewing the legal sufficiency of documents.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response avoids the issue. This recommendation should be reviewed by future Grand Juries.

ORLAND FREE LIBRARY

00-05

Explore funding opportunities to expand the Library building.

RESPONSE: Orland City Council

The City has long been desirous of expanding the facility presently housing the Orland Free Library. For many years, it has been documented that usage of the building and services is 50% Orland residents and 50% Glenn County residents. Funding for operation and maintenance of the Library has not been equally shared by Glenn County, which has contributed about 40% in the recent past. There is no indication that Glenn County will share in cost of expansion. Nevertheless, 4 years ago the City applied for and received grant to study the possibility of

expansion of Library. The report recommended reorganizing existing facilities to create greater space. Those recommendations, where felt appropriate, have been implemented. The Capital Improvement Plan for the city includes a line item for expansion of Library, but has yet to develop a funding source. Presently each new residence constructed in the City of Orland pays an amount into a Library impact fund. These moneys are available for capital expansion or capital maintenance. As of June 30, 2000, this fund was slightly over \$20,000. It is estimated that it will cost significantly more than this to construct addition to present Library facility. Staff has been directed to explore funding options including grants, bequests, foundations, donations, and whatever else may become available. As you may be aware, moneys have been allocated for Libraries from bond issue to be provided by State of California. The City Librarian will prioritize needs for these funds and present report to City Council for action. We will continue to explore all options.

RESPONSE: Orland City Librarian

See City Council response.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is acceptable.

00-06

Actively pursue funding and hiring for a Children's Library.

RESPONSE: Orland City Council

Based on budgetary realities, prior City Councils have eliminated a part-time position and full-time Children's Librarian position from the Library staff. The city's budget position has not changed significantly in the interim and demands for additional police support have received priority over other department requests for expenditure. During consideration of the 2000-2001 preliminary budget, it was agreed by City Council members present to try to find funding for this position. At this time, the City Librarian is preparing report on additional services that would be provided and cost benefit analysis. The City Council has agreed to consider refunding this position if financially feasible and a higher priority than requests yet to be funded for other departments.

RESPONSE: Orland City Librarian:

See City Council response.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is acceptable.

WILLOWS PUBLIC LIBRARY

00-07 Increase part time employee hours and ensure that salaries are comparable.

RESPONSE: Willows City Council

Pursuant to guidelines established by the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS), part-time employees are limited to nineteen (19) hours per week. If the City exceeds the hours established by PERS, the City is subject to the imposition of retirement and other benefits that would exceed the City's ability to fiscally support the position. Since his arrival, the City's Librarian has attempted to set the average part-time employee's hours at nineteen (19) hours per week.

With respect to salaries, the City of Willows is aware that comparable salaries play a role in attracting and retaining qualified personnel in all City departments. The City will continually explore new opportunities for increased revenue in order to ensure comparable salaries for all city personnel.

RESPONSE: Willows City Librarian

See City Council response.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is acceptable.

00-08 Enact a policy for time limits for computer use.

RESPONSE: Willows City Council

A policy establishing time limits, as well as other criteria for the use of library computers, was enacted by the Library Board of Directors at their meeting of February 10, 2000. This policy appears in the Library Procedure Manual as Procedure 5, along with the Internet User Agreement Form.

RESPONSE: Willows City Librarian

See City Council response.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation has been implemented.

00-09 Explore avenues such as grants or corporate donations to increase the number of computers and/or ports available for use.

RESPONSE: Willows City Council

The computers currently utilized within the Library are primarily the result of successful grant proposals. The use of grant funding for future expansion and upgrade of the Library's computer system is under on-going review. Three (3) computers were recently (June 2000) added to the Library, as a result of using equipment left over from an upgrade grant from "The Library Corporation." A difficulty that currently exists is finding space for the computers and their stations that are close enough to the circulation desk to allow appropriate monitoring. Currently the Willows Library has within its computer inventory a total of fifteen (15) computers, two (2) circulation computers, seven (7) computers for internet use, and six (6) computers for cataloging, etc.

RESPONSE: Willows City Librarian

See City Council response.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation has been implemented.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

00-10 Continue with employee training as well as Purchasing Officer training on the proper use of the Cal-Card.

RESPONSE: Finance Department

The Department of Finance is currently developing a new document that will outline the responsibilities, liabilities, and limits of each Cal-Card user. The document will require signature attestation by each user that they understand the authorized use of the Cal-Card. Additionally, each department's authorized Cal-Card liaison, who will be responsible for obtaining the signature attestation, will be trained in the proper use of the cards.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is accepted and the procedures for the Cal-Card use has been implemented.

00-11

Designate a centralized County Purchasing Agent to handle more complicated purchases or those that affect many Departments.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

This position has been reviewed by the Board of Supervisors in the past. The Department of Finance response to this recommendation outlines the current research done on implementing this position. Refer to attached to response from Department of Finance dated August 4, 2000.

RESPONSE: Finance Department

If the Grand Jury is proposing an Independent Purchasing Agent with their own Centralized Department, I disagree with this recommendation. The costs of a Centralized Purchasing Department in a county this small would offset the benefits. Glenn County is already implementing a number of procedures that would be used by a Centralized Purchasing department, such as countywide contracts with certain vendors, to obtain more favorable pricing, cooperative purchasing of items used by numerous departments, and mandated competitive bid processes. Any additional savings obtained using an Independent Purchasing Agent would be minimal.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation has not been implemented.

00-12

With Cal-Cards numbering more than 100, we recommend that a department designate a person to hold on to cards and check them out to traveling employees as needed. This would allow for safekeeping.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board concurs with the response of Department of Finance (below).

RESPONSE: Finance Department

I agree with this recommendation and note that a number of departments are already using this procedure to control access to the Cal-Card. I will notify each department of this recommendation procedure by August 31, 2000.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is accepted and each department was notified of this recommendation. Departments using Cal-Cards have implemented this procedure.

HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT

00-13 Review the hiring process so that positions can be filled more expediently and the workloads could be more equitably distributed.

RESPONSE: Director of Health Services

The hiring process at the Health Services Agency has been reviewed and is expediently followed. When the filling of a new position is required, the paperwork is completed within the first 24 to 48 hours and forwarded to the Personnel Department to begin the recruitment process. There are four individuals in the Agency with signature authority to ensure that the request for recruitment does not get delayed at the Agency level.

This recommendation is intended to allow workloads to be equitably distributed. I find this somewhat confusing since in the report by the Grand Jury it states, "There are approximately 70 employees in the Health Services Department which has an allocation of 75 employees." This is a very low vacancy rate at any given time for an agency the size of the Health Services Agency. However, without specifics by the Grand Jury, I suspect that the focus of the recommendation is on the professional level classifications since this is the area of greatest turnover. Given this assumption, I want to report that applications for staff vacancies at the professional level are few in number and success in recruitment is less than ideal for reasons that are similar to every county in the State of California. There is a severe human resource shortage in the professional health services arena statewide and for every professional graduate there are 6 to 10 jobs. Competition amongst the counties for this scarce resource has resulted in the problems I believe the Grand Jury is referring to with this recommendation. We hope that the new classification and salary study, soon to be completed, will help address some of these recruitment problems.

RESPONSE: Personnel Director

This Department provides recruitment and testing services to all County Departments. Unlike the private sector which can hire anyone they choose with little or no process involved; County's and other public entities are bound by "Merit System Principles", statutes, regulations, and case law which make the recruitment process a time consuming and lengthy process. In the past year, this office has added an additional extra-help

clerical position to improve turn around time. However, it should be noted that the individual department's internal process, background investigations and mental fitness evaluations might also delay the process.

The Personnel Department strives to provide the most streamlined recruitment process we can within the constraints with which we must operate. Had the Grand Jury discussed this matter with this Department before the release of the report, I believe we could have addressed many of their concerns regarding the recruitment process.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Health Services Department hiring procedures are being followed as mandated by law, including specific time limitations.

00-14

Department supervisors continue to meet with staff at all levels to encourage communications.

RESPONSE: Director of Health Services

The supervisors do meet with their staff at all levels on a regular basis. See attachment of the master meeting schedule of all units and their regularly scheduled meeting times and dates. This schedule is distributed to all units in the Agency so that supervisors are able to attend other unit meetings when necessary and appropriate. In addition to these scheduled meetings, there are other meetings that line staff have with department management.

Every four to six weeks, line staff meet with top management without the supervisors in attendance. The meetings are held at a local restaurant with management providing coffee or other beverages for the meeting. Each unit in the Agency has at least one representative from line staff to meet with the Director and the Deputy Directors in order to ensure ongoing clear communications, answer questions that do not easily flow through the formal chain of command, hopefully quell rumors and develop intra-agency social events and training events.

The combination of the regularly scheduled meetings with the supervisors and the regular line staff meetings with top administration will continue as a proven effective way of encouraging communication.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

Regularly scheduled meetings with supervisors and regular line staff meetings with top administration are being implemented. Continued meetings will ensure ongoing communication in the Agency.

00-15 Provide equitable salaries.

RESPONSE: Director of Health Services

Equitable salaries are intended to be addressed through the current salary study initiated by the Board of Supervisors.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board concurs with the attached response of Health Services Director dated July 17, 2000. The implementation process is on going.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This item appears to be a continuous and on-going problem for all small counties. All salaries are reviewed and compared to larger counties and raised accordingly, only to have the larger counties raise their salaries again. The resulting seesaw appears to keep Glenn County salaries lower than most. Also, many employees have bargaining units to address salary issues. The Grand Jury concurs that providing equitable salaries is on going.

00-16 Update Policies and Procedures Manual. It would be a resource for employees who have questions, but may not be able to obtain an immediate answer from a supervisor.

RESPONSE: Director of Health Services

The Policies and procedures Manual is in the process of being updated from its last update of 1995/1996. By September of this year, all sections will have been updated and we will continue to maintain the effort to update the manual on an annual basis. The Manual continues to be available at all units for reference by all employees.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Manual has been updated and a program put into place to keep it current, as well as available to all employees. Recommend yearly updates.

ANIMAL CONTROL

00-17 Orders to Comply and Notices to Appear should adhere to California Penal Codes.

RESPONSE: Animal Control Office

There was some confusion with the Judicial Council of California – Administrative Office approved format. This has since been corrected and approved with the new Citations.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

Recommendation has been complied with. This was also referred to County Counsel with the same response.

- 00-18** The Cities of Orland and Willows should have a Public Hearing so that the residents can express their concerns about the problem of stray cats in their respective City Councils.

RESPONSE: Animal Control Office

The Animal Control Officer agrees.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation was intended for action by Orland and Willows City Councils and was referred to them. There was no response from Orland. Willows recognized the problem as a reoccurring one, but suggested that it could be placed on the agenda at the request of a member of the community. This recommendation was made as a result of complaints to the Grand Jury and has not been complied with. Suggest we repeat this recommendation to both City Councils.

- 00-19** Develop a Policies and Procedures Manual.

RESPONSE: Animal Control Office

I will be reviewing policies and procedures manuals from other agencies to see if there would be any benefits or advantages. State and local statues dictate most of the Animal Control functions, which may be just duplication in a manual.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This requires follow-up to ensure compliance.

GLENN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

- 00-20** As the transition occurs for separating the Family Support Division from the District Attorney's Office, re-evaluate the needed number of investigators in each of the Divisions.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

Transition of the Family Support Division is scheduled for 2003. The Board of Supervisors will reevaluate prior to the transition, staffing in each of the Divisions.

RESPONSE: District Attorney's Office

We concur and will make the necessary evaluation when appropriate. A similar response was received from the County Supervisors, to whom this was also referred.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

Transition is not planned until 2003. This might require a follow-up as that time approaches.

- 00-21** Develop a Policy and Procedures Manual for the operation of the District Attorney's Office.

RESPONSE: District Attorney's Office

A Policy and Procedures Manual in the Criminal Division is not warranted because of the small size of our office. The Child Support Division does have a Policy and Procedures Manual.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The requirement for a Policy and Procedures Manual is not determined by the size of the department, but more by the importance of its function. It will be used as a guide, not only by those now in the department, but by those joining at a later date. Suggest this recommendation be reissued.

- 00-22** Complete the repairs in the facility housing the District Attorney's Office.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

In preparation for the transition of the Family Support Division, the first phase is to move Family Support out of the present facility and then evaluate the needs of the District Attorney Staff at that time.

RESPONSE: District Attorney's Office

The Board of Supervisors should insure the necessary repairs are made to the District Attorney's Office.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

This item should be referred to the Buildings and Grounds Department for response. Public Works has no authority to take the action indicated in the report.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Grand Jury agrees with the District Attorney. This was referred to the Board of Supervisors who stated “in preparation for the transition of the Family Support Division, the first phase is to move the Family Support out of the present facility and then evaluate the needs of the District Attorney’s staff at that time.” They previously mentioned that this transition would be in 2003. We suggest that this recommendation not be held over that long and the previous Grand Jury Recommendation be reissued. This was also referred to Public Works who state that this was the responsibility of Building and Grounds and therefore this recommendation be referred to them.

00-23 Establish a secure storage location for the evidence displays.

RESPONSE: District Attorney’s Office

The Board of Supervisors should insure there is a secure storage area for evidence displays.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

We agree with the District Attorney. This recommendation should have been referred to the Board of Supervisors. It is our suggestion that this be done as soon as possible.

00-24 The District Attorney facility should meet applicable ADA (Americans With Disabilities Act) standards and/or California Accessibility standards and codes.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

ADA and/or California Accessibility standards and codes will be addressed at the same time as Grand Jury Recommendation 00-22 above.

RESPONSE: District Attorney’s Office

The Board of Supervisors should insure the District Attorney building is accessible by all persons.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

This item should be referred to the Buildings and Grounds Department for response. Public Works has no authority to take the action indicated in the report.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

We agree with the District Attorney. This recommendation was also referred to the Board of Supervisors. The response was the same as for 00-22. For the same reasons stated in our review of 00-22 we strongly recommend that this be done as soon as possible.

GLENN COUNTY JAIL

00-25 Security of the fenced area outside the kitchen needs to be addressed to discourage contraband and escape.

RESPONSE: Glenn County Jail

We have met with County Architect to address this issue. Our suggested plan is to move the fence further south toward the sidewalk thus providing an additional secured area for the walk-in freezer and a larger generator. Once the plan is finalized, we will include the additional security measures in the budget.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Grand Jury agree with the plan as explained and urge an early implementation.

00-26 Complete all remodeling and improvements already funded as soon as possible to ensure the safety of the inmates, staff and community.

RESPONSE: Glenn County Jail

All remodeling in the interior of the facility has been completed. The improvements should be completed near November 2001. In order of priority, they will probably be addressed as follows:

1. Install additional closed circuit security cameras in and around the facility.
2. Install additional walk-in freezer
3. Replace current generator with a larger capacity unit
4. Widen the sally port entrance

5. Provide secure walkway between the jail and the courthouse

All the improvements will be based on the availability of I.N.S. revenue after Operational expenses. Regarding item 5 (secured walkway), this item is part of a courthouse security plan and remodel and will trail until a decision is finalized on the entire project.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Grand Jury agrees with the plans as explained and urge an early implementation, especially the generator and items of security such as the closed circuit cameras.

00-27 Keep meat slicer closed when not in use.

RESPONSE: Glenn County Jail

This issue has been addressed and proper security measures are in place.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

During a committee's visit to the jail facility kitchen the slicer was observed covered only with dishtowels. The Grand Jury urges the immediate implementation of the 1999-2000 Grand Jury recommendation. If the manufacturer cannot provide a secure cover then every effort should be made to manufacture one locally. This provides a threat to the security of inmates and staff.

00-28 Streamline the hiring process.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board concurs with the attached response of the Personnel Director, dated August 29, 2000.

RESPONSE: Personnel Department

This Department provides recruitment and testing services to all County Departments. Unlike the private sector which can hire anyone they choose with little or no process involved; County's and other public entities are bound by "Merit System Principles", statutes, regulations, and case law which make the recruitment process a time consuming and lengthy process. In the past year, this office has added an additional extra-help clerical position to improve turn around time. However, it should be noted that the individual department's internal process, background investigations and mental fitness evaluations might also delay the process.

The Personnel Department strives to provide the most streamlined recruitment process we can with the constraints with which we must operate. Had the Grand Jury discussed this matter with this Department before the release of the report, I believe we could have addressed many of their concerns regarding the recruitment process.

RESPONSE: Glenn County Jail

The hiring process is a countywide policy. The Personnel Department has been consistently testing for Correctional Officers at our request.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation was referred to the Board of Supervisors and Personnel Department. The Grand Jury concurs with the responses by the County Jail and the Personnel Department. As a result of this Committee's visit, it would appear that the problem is not one of obtaining Officers, but rather retaining them. It is a recommendation of the Grand Jury that a thorough study be made, and comparison with surrounding Counties, regarding the pay structure of these valuable Officers.

00-29 Complete Policy and Procedures Manual by December 2000.

RESPONSE: Glenn County Jail

Our revisions of the Manual have been delayed by the computer project. However, that project will be nearly complete in early August. The procedures portion has been completed and submitted to the Board of Corrections for approval.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Grand Jury understands the reason for the delay, but urges the early completion and implementation of this Manual.

GLENN COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

00-30 Complete Policy Manual by December 2000.

RESPONSE: Sheriff's Department

As stated in the Jail responses, our revisions were delayed by the computer project. We have always had a Policy Manual in place and the revisions will be accomplished by December 2000.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

As with the Jail response, the Grand Jury understands the reason for the delay, but urges the early completion and implementation of this Manual.

00-31

Board of Supervisors supports the Sheriff's efforts to provide an enhanced developmental training program to assist qualified staff with educational expenses.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board concurs with the attached response of the Sheriff, dated August 21, 2000.

RESPONSE: Sheriff's Department

The Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff's Department enjoy a tremendous relationship based on mutual respect and cooperativeness. The Board has implemented, via negotiations with the respective employee associations, an educational incentive program. Employees now can begin or continue higher education with the County providing up to \$150 per semester for tuition and/or books. The Board has also provided an additional \$25,000 to fund our continuing professional training budget. We anticipate a total budget of \$125,000 to train our staff. Most of these expenses will be reimbursed by the California Peace Officers Standards and Training Commission.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Sheriff appears to have more than adequately answered this Recommendation. The cooperation between the Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff's Department should be commended.

00-32

Glenn County complete a salary comparison with surrounding Counties. Bring County salaries in line with other Counties in order to retain employees.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

Salary survey has been completed and the County is in negotiations regarding implementation.

RESPONSE: Sheriff's Department

The Board of Supervisors has completed a countrywide classification study and the next step is the salary comparison. The Board is aware of

the retention and recruitment issue, but has to relate those to revenue sources. The Board of Supervisors states that it completed a salary comparison and is in negotiation regarding implementation.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Grand Jury is not aware of the state of negotiations or implementation. It is our understanding that the proposal was a 20% increase over a period of three years. This would still leave our Officers, Sheriff and Jail personnel still behind the surrounding Counties in salary levels. This hardly solves our recruitment and retention problem. A problem that seriously affects the citizens of Glenn County. This Grand Jury recommends further evaluation.

JANE HAHN JUVENILE HALL

00-33 Complete the above-mentioned remodeling as soon as possible.

RESPONSE: Chief Probation Officer

Currently, the contracted architect is developing and designing the schematics for the remodel project. It is anticipated that this project will be completed by August 2001, one year ahead of the Board of Corrections approved timetable.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

The Grand Jury is more than satisfied with this response and trusts the timetable holds up to expectation. During our visit to this facility it was pointed out that the windows in the cells leak very badly, we refer this to Public Works or Building and Grounds Department for immediate attention during this season of inclement weather.

ORLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT

00-34 Expedite updating the Policies and Procedures Manual.

RESPONSE: Orland Chief of Police

See City Council response.

RESPONSE: Orland City Council

For several years, updating the Policies and Procedures Manual has been an ongoing process in Orland Police Department and in most other small city departments. Recently Willows Police Department retained legal firm to assist its staff in updating their Policies and Procedures Manual. Both the Glenn County Sheriff and Orland Chief of Police have followed that effort closely. A recommendation will be made to Glenn County Joint Powers Authority for risk management to fund having same legal firm update Sheriff's Department and Orland Police Department's manuals in a consistent format. It has become apparent to those presently on staff of the Orland Police Department that this project cannot be done with limited staff available to assign to this project.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This is an acceptable response. Future Grand Juries should re-visit this issue.

00-35 Hold regular meetings to review procedures and policies with the staff.

RESPONSE: Orland Chief of Police

Since the present Chief of Police has assumed his duties, monthly staff meetings have been held, which include review of procedures and policies. In addition, the Chief and Sergeants meet weekly to address issues related to procedures and policies. Recently a second monthly meeting has been held with Field Training Officers to review procedures and policies that affect officers in field training. When the Policies and Procedures Manual has been updated, concentrated training will be provided to insure that all staff are able to access needed information in timely manner.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation has been implemented.

00-36 Authorize additional funding for reserve officers.

RESPONSE: Orland Chief of Police

See City Council response.

RESPONSE: Orland City Council

Reserve Officers are non-compensated personnel. Each new Reserve is provided a one-time allotment to facilitate the purchase of uniforms and other mandatory equipment. The City Council has authorized an allotment of five Reserves since 1995. It has proven very difficult to

recruit and retain Reserve Officers as they are hired as regulars by this or other departments once they have finished orientation and served some time with the department. Presently the Orland Police Department has two Reserve Officers and an open recruitment to obtain up to five.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation has been implemented.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

00-37 Acquire title to the property at the landfill site.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board concurs with the attached response of County Counsel, dated August 23, 2000.

RESPONSE: County Counsel

Partially agree. In order for the County to acquire title to the landfill site, either the property owner must sell the site to the County or the County must pursue eminent domain proceedings. Negotiations regarding purchase are being pursued by the affected department. Should purchase not be possible and upon direction by the Board of Supervisors, the County Counsel or counsel retained by the County will pursue acquisition as required by California law.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This is an acceptable response.

00-38 Install permanent electrical power and telephone service at the landfill site.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

We have contracted to install the facilities to bring permanent power and telecommunications facilities to the disposal site and are currently in discussions with the affected utility companies to supply service. If all proceeds as planned, such service should be available by late summer 2001.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation is being implemented.

00-39 Explore ways and means for construction of an indoor tipping area.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

In July 2000, the County applied for an interest free loan from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) for funds for the construction of an indoor tipping area. This application was endorsed by the Board of Supervisors and Environmental Health, our Local Enforcement Agency. We have estimated that annual savings in constructing all weather access roads, removing and transporting dirt for daily cover and patrolling litter at the disposal site would generate more than sufficient funding to repay the loan funds. We anticipate a response to our application before the end of the year.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is acceptable.

00-40 Continue the education program in the schools and public awareness programs on recycling and services that are available at the landfill site.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

All education, public awareness and recycling programs are dependent on the availability of funding and they will be continued so long as funds are available to do so, whether through the County's budget or through grants made available by State and Federal agencies. Glenn County has been a major recipient of such grants in past years due to an aggressive grants management program instated by the Department of Public Works; it is anticipated that this policy will continue.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation is being implemented.

00-41 The fuel storage tanks project should be elevated as a priority item for the Public Works Department so that a savings on gasoline purchases can begin to be realized.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board concurs with the attached response of the Public Works Director, dated August 28, 2000.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

We have completed an exhaustive and detailed analysis of all the costs involved in the dispensing of fuel through county-owned tanks. That analysis is attached hereto as Attachment B. In summary, when the cost of the new facilities is added to the cost of fuel and operating costs, it is much less costly (\$0.17 per gallon) for the County to purchase fuel through card lock operators than to construct and operate its own dispensing system.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is acceptable.

00-42

Look into alternative fuel credit card options (like the Cal-Card for purchasing) where one card can be used for a number of participating stations. This would eliminate the need for controlling a large amount of individual credit cards.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board concurs with the attached response of the Public Works Director, dated August 28, 2000.

RESPONSE: Finance Department

The Department of Finance recently met with the Public Works Department regarding the use of commercial card-lock vendors, such as Pacific Pride and CFN. The Department of Finance will review these options for January 1, 2001.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

In September 2000, we will present to the Board of Supervisors a proposal for the consolidation of all gasoline credit cards into one or two card lock systems that are available throughout the state, at a price considerably lower than that available through commercial dealers.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is acceptable. The Public Works Department has implemented the use of the CFN and Pacific Pride cards. They are in the process of gathering all fuel cards that are currently in use and discontinuing all cards (i.e., Chevron, Shell) except universal cards.

00-43

Grand Jury item 99-63 be assigned to the Public Works Department and Service Center with assistance from the Finance Department. Examine the use of private vehicles for county business to determine if there would be a cost savings if more employees used county vehicles. The issue of insurance coverage in relation to the use of POV should be a consideration in this analysis.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board concurs with the attached response of the Public Works Director, dated August 28, 2000.

RESPONSE: Finance Department

A new Glenn County fleet management policy was established July 1, 2000. Part of the enabling resolution requires that the results of the operations be reported to the Board of Supervisors after three months of operations. A number of changes are planned for the services center, including:

- 1) transferring a number of additional vehicles to the service center in the form of the small truck fleet now in public works,
- 2) the sale of a number of surplus vehicles now at the service center, and
- 3) county departments returning underused vehicles to the service center.

All these changes will have a fiscal effect on the service center's operations and until the changes come about, the results of operations cannot be estimated.

Once the operation of the service center stabilize, a comparison of possible savings by requiring more employees to use county vehicles will be possible.

The Department of Finance will complete this comparison by March 31, 2001.

RESPONSE: Service Center Manager

See response from Department of Public Works.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

In June 2000 the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy regarding the use of and charges for, County owned vehicles. This policy is appended hereto as Attachment C. Since the adoption of this policy a study of the utilization of all County owed vehicles has been conducted and many of the older, underused and unsafe vehicles have been turned over to an auction service to be sold or disposed of as scrap. We will continue to

pursue options to the use of private vehicles by County employees, but it should be noted that one of the major problems in doing this is with those individuals or departments who put only a minimal number of miles on their vehicles. To assure that the County receives sufficient funds to replace these vehicles when they have “aged out” a minimum monthly charge has been adopted. Since the vehicle replacement fund is an enterprise fund it must be fully supported by fees to its users (all departments utilizing County Owned vehicles).

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

As of this writing, the Service Center is stabilized in its operations. The rate for the use of fleet vehicles has been increased although no amount was given to the Grand Jury. The Finance Department has not completed the comparison by 3/31/01 as stated above. The Grand Jury recommends the 2001-02 Grand Jury pursue this issue.

00-44

A vehicle utilization analysis is necessary to determine if vehicles are underutilized, what their current condition is, and what their individual disposition should be.

RESPONSE: Service Center Manager

See response 00-43.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

See response 00-43.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is acceptable.

00-45

If the above analysis shows underutilization and employees will continue to use their private vehicles, the older vehicles and marginal vehicles should be considered surplus, auctioned off and not replaced.

RESPONSE: Service Center Manager

See response 00-43.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

See response 00-43.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation has not been implemented.

00-46

The rate of reimbursement should be equal throughout all county departments.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board concurs with the attached response of the Department of Finance, dated August 4, 2000.

RESPONSE: Finance Department

All county employees are paid at the same rate, which is the current rate allowed by the Internal Revenue Service. I cannot further comment since the report does not indicate which departments are reimbursing for a lesser rate and none of the financial records indicate that a lesser rate is paid of county employees.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This response is acceptable.

00-47

Glenn County Departments should enforce its Harassment Policy at all County locations. Under Chapter 12.06 of the Administrative Manual, "Visual conduct such as derogatory posters, photographs, cartoons, drawings or gestures" could be considered a form of prohibited unlawful harassment or discrimination.

RESPONSE: Board of Supervisors

The Board agrees with the recommendation of the Grand Jury.

RESPONSE: Service Center Manager

See response from Department of Public Works.

RESPONSE: Department of Public Works

At the time of the Grand Jury member tour of the Service Center the Public Works Department was unaware of the poster situation that was immediately remedied by removing all questionable posters, photos, calendars and drawings from the Service Center.

2000-01 Grand Jury Evaluation:

This recommendation has been implemented.