



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

2014-2015 FINAL REPORT

June 26, 2015

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PLACER COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT
GRAND JURY

11532 B AVENUE
AUBURN, CA 95603



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Phone: (530) 886-5200
Mailing Address:

FAX: (530) 886-5201
11532 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603

June 26, 2015

The Honorable Alan V. Pineschi
Presiding Judge, Superior Court
County of Placer
P.O. Box 619072
Roseville, CA 95661

The Honorable Jeffrey S. Penney
Advising Grand Jury Judge, Superior Court
County of Placer
P.O. Box 619072
Roseville, CA 95661

and Citizens of Placer County

Re: Final Report of the 2014-2015 Placer County Grand Jury

Dear Judge Pineschi, Judge Penney, and Citizens of Placer County:

The 2014-2015 Placer County Grand Jury takes pleasure in presenting our Final Report. On behalf of all 19 members of the Grand Jury, I would like to acknowledge the advice and guidance provided by our Advising Judge, the Honorable Jeffrey S. Penney, Presiding Judge, the Honorable Alan V. Pineschi, County Counsel, Gerald O. Carden, and District Attorney, Scott Owens, Esq.. We are also grateful to the Grand Jury Coordinator, Ms. Rosalinda Cruz, for her assistance throughout the year.

In July of 2014, nineteen Placer County residents volunteered and were sworn in to serve as the 2014 - 2015 Placer County Grand Jury. It has been an honor to serve with an outstanding group of citizens who contributed their time, talents and valuable experience in carrying out our function as a watchdog on city and county governments, school districts and special districts.

This Final Report contains the results of our investigations as required by law, those requested by citizens, and those internally generated by the Grand Jury.

Sincerely,

Sharon Stanners, Foreperson
2014-2015 Placer County Grand Jury

Table of Contents

Placer County 2014 – 2015 Grand Jurors	1
2014 – 2015 Grand Jury Photograph	2
Introduction to the Grand Jury	
What is a Grand Jury?	3
History	3
Investigations	3
Placer County Grand Jury Committees	4
Jurisdiction	6
Grand Juror Qualifications	6
Juror Selection	7
Commitment	7
Remuneration	7
Orientation	7
Why Become a Grand Juror?	7
How to Apply to Serve as a Grand Juror	8
Grand Jury Reports	8
How to Submit a Confidential Citizen Complaint	8
How to Contact the Grand Jury	8
Instructions for Respondents	
Instructions for Respondents	9
Response to Grand Jury Report Form	10
California Penal Code Section 933.05	11
Final Report Summaries	12
Final Reports	
<u>Investigations</u>	
Eureka Union School District School Lunch Program Contract, Brown Act Open Meeting Concerns	21

Examination of Fire Hydrant Inspection and Maintenance	26
Human Trafficking	34
Investigation of County and City Operational Policies	41
Placer County Water Agency Enhanced Service to Placer County Residents Utilizing Reserves from Sale of Surplus Water and Electricity	52
Review of Placer County Government and Special District/Agency Websites	57
Temporary Emergency Homeless Shelter	77
<u>Follow-up to 2013-2014 Reports</u>	
A Five-Year Plan for Meeting the Needs of a Growing Senior Population in Placer County A Continuation of a 2013-2014 Grand Jury Investigation	83
Anti-Bullying Policies in Middle and High Schools: Are They Effective? Follow-up to the Responses to the 2013-2014 Report	89
Placer County Meals on Wheels: A Failure to Communicate Response to a Response	96
Transfer of Dewitt Center Enterprise Funds and Its Impact on Citizens	100
<u>Annual Inspections</u>	
Auburn Police Department and Holding Facility – Annual Inspection	106
Placer County Jails and Holding Facilities: A Consolidated Report Annual Inspection	110
Placer County Juvenile Detention Facility Annual Inspection	118
Rocklin City Jail - Annual Inspection	125
Roseville Police Department and Holding Facility - Annual Inspection	128

Placer County 2014 – 2015 Grand Jurors

Foreperson:	Sharon Stanners	Auburn
Foreperson Pro Tempore:	Robert Mehler	Auburn
Secretary:	Walter Boswell	Auburn
Office Manager:	Shane Campbell-Kaslin	Newcastle
Sergeant-at-Arms:	Catherine Williams	Meadow Vista
Technology Coordinator:	Sharry Colnar	Roseville
	Frank Calton	Granite Bay
	Diane Eilers	Roseville
	Karen Enghusen	Rocklin
	Tim Eyster	Roseville
	Roger Faranato	Roseville
	Robert Ferber	Auburn
	Marjorie Habein	Lincoln
	Kevin Knauss	Granite Bay
	Ralph Neal	Rocklin
	Laura Sciarrino	Auburn
	Linda Jane Slaughter	Roseville
	Mary Anne Turner	Lincoln
	Leon Tuttle	Rocklin

THE 2014-2015 PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY



Grand Jury members (L to R): Walter Boswell, Karen Enghusen, Kevin Knauss, Laura Sciarrino, Marjorie Habein, Ralph Neal, Sharon Stanners, Diane Eilers, Tim Eyster, Shane Campbell-Kaslin, Mary Anne Turner, Linda Jane Slaughter, Leon Tuttle, Sharry Colnar, Robert Mehler, Robert Ferber, Frank Calton. Seated: Roger Faranato, Catherine Williams.

Photography Credits

Grand Jury Photograph: Cole Cotton, Cole Cotton Photography

Cover Photographs: Cole Cotton, Cole Cotton Photography

The restored Department 3 Courtroom in the Placer County Superior Court's Historic Courthouse. The Historic Courthouse was dedicated on July 4, 1898 and underwent a major restoration from 1986 to 1990. Department 3 Courtroom was, as much as possible, restored to its historic grandeur.

The Grand Jury wishes to thank Cole Cotton for contributing her time and talents to this report.

Introduction to the Grand Jury

What is the Grand Jury?

The Grand Jury is an investigatory body with the authority to act as a watchdog on local government, investigate citizen complaints, and assist in criminal matters at the request of the district attorney.

The Grand Jury is part of the county judicial system as authorized by the California State Constitution. It is advised by the Superior Court, but is not accountable to elected officials or government employees. Its findings and recommendations are unbiased and impartial. Grand jurors are sworn to secrecy and, other than final reports; their work is kept strictly confidential.

History

Juries stem from the eleventh century. In 1215, the concept of a jury had become a pledge expressed in the Magna Charta that no free man would be *"imprisoned or dispossessed or exiled or in any way destroyed ...except by the lawful judgment of his peers ..."*

In 1635, the Massachusetts Bay Colony impaneled the first grand jury to consider cases of murder, robbery and wife beating. The U.S. Constitution's Fifth Amendment and the California Constitution call for grand juries. Grand Juries were established throughout California during the early years of statehood. As constituted today, criminal and civil grand juries are a part of the judicial branch of government, arms of the court system.

Investigations

The grand jury is an investigatory body created for the protection of society and the enforcement of the law. The grand jury in California is unusual because its duty includes investigation of local and county governments as provided by statutes passed in 1880.

The primary duty of the grand jury is to evaluate local government entities through a systematic fact-finding process. The objective of the investigations is to produce beneficial reports that persuade local officials to run their agencies more effectively and efficiently. The final report is the end result of year-long investigative efforts and is the only public record of that endeavor.

Grand jury investigations are formal, systematic examinations in search of the truth. It is the process of determining Who, What, When, Where, Why ... and maybe Why Not? It is a specific, planned approach to determine the truth of allegations, assumptions, complaints, and speculation.

Anyone may ask the Grand Jury to conduct an investigation of a civil issue that falls within the Grand Jury's jurisdiction. Whether it chooses to investigate such a complaint is entirely in the jury's discretion and may be affected by workload, resource limitations or jurisdictional issues.

By law, all proceedings of the grand jury are confidential. Findings and recommendations of the complaints and issues it chooses to address are published in its final report.

After a final report is published, the official or governing body of an agency or government covered in the report must respond to the grand jury within a given period of time, as prescribed by California law. Officials must respond within 60 days; governments or agencies must respond within 90 days. The following year's grand jury publishes the responses to the final report.

Upon occasion, the district attorney asks the grand jury to hold hearings in criminal investigations to determine whether evidence presented by the district attorney is sufficient to indict an individual, who would then stand trial in court. A minimum of 12 grand jurors must vote for an indictment in any criminal proceeding.

Placer County Grand Jury Committees

Most grand jury work is done by committee. A typical juror serves on three committees and is an officer on two committees. The following eight committees meet at least twice each month.

The 2014-2015 Placer County Grand Jury served a one-year term from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. In performing its duties, it examined county government, special districts, school districts, and city governments.

Audit and Finance

This committee initiates audits of county government offices, departments, agencies, and districts, as needed and as mandated by law. It also reviews monthly Grand Jury (GJ) expenses, keeping in line with the adopted GJ budget.

Cities

This committee may investigate incorporated cities/towns within the county. The six incorporated cities/towns in Placer County are Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville.

Continuity and Editorial

This committee is responsible for seeing that the written reports of the Grand Jury are factual, clear, concise and readable. Editing includes proper punctuation, spelling, grammar and format. This committee also leads the task of the continual update of the Placer County Grand Jury Handbook, so that the next grand jury may make a smooth, user-friendly transition into its new term.

County Administration

The scope of the committee encompasses all county government not specifically assigned to another committee. This includes investigations of appointed boards and commissions, the Board of Supervisors, Assessor, County Executive Office, and many more.

Criminal Justice

This committee is mandated to inspect all eight Placer County jails each year. It also may investigate matters concerning criminal justice.

Health and Welfare

This committee investigates issues related to the social services of the county. In addition, it may investigate Juvenile Hall and any child issues within the county funded by taxpayer monies.

Schools and Libraries

This committee investigates public educational institutions and libraries. It may not investigate school policies or personnel.

Special Districts

This committee investigates special districts, agencies, boards, commissions, and joint-powers agencies serving Placer County. Examples of these special districts include water agencies, cemetery districts, fire districts, and hospitals.

Jurisdiction

The following summarizes the areas that are **within** the investigatory jurisdiction of the Placer County Grand Jury:

- Persons imprisoned in the jail of the county on a criminal charge and not indicted;
- The condition and management of the public jails within the county;
- Willful or corrupt misconduct in office of public officers of every description within the county;
- County government, city government, special districts, school districts, agencies and authorities;
- Criminal hearings upon request of the district attorney.

Areas **not within** county grand jury jurisdiction include:

- Federal agencies;
- State agencies;
- Superior court system;
- School district personnel records, curriculum, and policy.

Grand Juror Qualifications

Prospective grand jurors must possess the following qualifications (California Penal Code Section 893):

- Applicant is a citizen of the United States, 18 years or older, who has been a resident of Placer County for one year immediately before being selected and sworn in;
- Applicant is in possession of his natural faculties, of ordinary intelligence, of sound judgment, and of fair character;
- Applicant is possessed of sufficient knowledge of the English language.

A person is not allowed to serve as a grand juror if the individual:

- Is serving as a trial juror in any California court;
- Has been convicted of a felony;
- Has been discharged as a grand juror in any court of this state within one year;
- Has been convicted of malfeasance in office or any felony or other high crime;
- Is serving as an elected public officer.

Desirable qualifications for a grand juror include the following:

- Have computer and Internet communication skills;
- Be in good health;
- Be open-minded with concern for the views of others;
- Have the ability to work with others;
- Have genuine interest in community affairs;
- Have investigative skills and an ability to write reports.

Juror Selection

In the spring of each year, the Presiding Judge selects residents by lottery from the list of applicants. Applicants should expect that a criminal records check will be conducted. Applications are reviewed and an interview is scheduled with the Presiding Judge, the foreperson of the outgoing grand jury, and perhaps the Presiding Judge's assistant.

After the interview process, prospective applicants are requested to appear for the final selection, held in a Placer County Superior Court courtroom. At this time, with outgoing grand jurors in attendance, the court clerk draws nineteen names randomly. A minimum of ten names are drawn and ranked to form a list of alternate jurors. The Presiding Superior Court Judge then swears in the new nineteen grand jury members and gives them a description of their duties and responsibilities. The jurors begin a one-year term on July 1.

Commitment

Persons selected for grand jury service can expect to serve 25 or more hours per month for a period of one year, July 1 through June 30. Jurors may opt to serve a second consecutive year, if desired.

Remuneration

Grand jurors receive a nominal payment for meetings they attend, and they are reimbursed for mileage to attend meetings, training, and possibly other minor expenses.

Orientation

New jurors are encouraged to attend an orientation program about grand jury functions, including on county, city, and special district governments.

Why Become a Grand Juror?

Those who volunteer and are accepted for grand jury service should feel privileged to be selected. They enter this service with interest and curiosity to learn more about the administration and operation of Placer County government. Serving as a grand juror requires many hours and serious effort, and reflects a generous commitment to public service.

How to Apply to Serve as a Grand Juror

Download a Prospective County Grand Jury Application, available at <http://www.PlacerGrandJury.org>. Fill it out and follow the directions at the end of the application.

Grand Jury Reports

The Placer County Courts maintains web pages for the Grand Jury on the Placer Courts website. Past and present final reports, and responses to those final reports, may be found on the Placer County Superior Court website:

<http://www.PlacerGrandJury.org>.

How to Submit a Confidential Citizen Complaint

All complaints must be submitted in writing. Confidential Citizen Complaint forms are available online at:

<http://www.PlacerGrandJury.org>.

Fill out the form and mail, fax or hand-deliver it to the Grand Jury. The citizen will receive a letter acknowledging receipt of the complaint. The complainant's name will be held in strictest confidence.

All grand jury documents, including citizen's complaints, are secret and cannot be subpoenaed in court or revealed to the public.

How to Contact the Grand Jury

By Mail: Placer County Grand Jury
11532 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

In Person: Materials can be placed in a drop box located by the entrance door to the above address of Grand Jury Facility.

Online: <http://www.PlacerGrandJury.org>

By Phone: 530.886.5200

By Fax: 530.886.5201



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Phone: (530) 886-5200

FAX (530) 886-5201

Mailing Address:

11532 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RESPONDENTS

The legal requirements affecting respondents and responses to Grand Jury findings and recommendations are contained in California Penal Code, Section 933.05. The full text of the law is provided below.

Two different time periods for responses, and to whom you must respond is defined in Penal Code Section 933(c). They are as follows:

Type of Agency	Time Frame	To Whom
Public	Ninety (90) Days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Elective Office or Agency Head	Sixty (60) Days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presiding Judge of the Superior Court • Information copy to Board of Supervisors

Two originals of the responses must be provided to:

1. Presiding Judge of the Placer County Superior Court at the address listed below:

The Honorable Colleen Nichols
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
County of Placer
P.O. Box 619072
Roseville, CA 95661

2. Placer County Grand Jury at the address listed below:

Placer County Grand Jury
11532 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

When responding to more than one report, respondents must respond to each report separately.

You are encouraged to use the Response to Grand Jury Report Form below to help format and organize your response. An electronic version of the form is available upon request from the Grand Jury.

Response to Grand Jury Report Form

Report Title: _____

Report Date: _____

Response By: _____ Title: _____

FINDINGS

- I (we) agree with the findings, numbered: _____.
- I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the findings, numbered: _____.
(Describe here or attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed or not applicable; include an explanation of the reasons therefore.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendations numbered _____ have been implemented.
(Describe here or attach a summary statement regarding the implemented actions.)
- Recommendations numbered _____ have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
(Per Penal Code 933.05(b)(2), a time frame for implementation must be included. Describe here or in an attachment.)
- Recommendations numbered _____ require further analysis.
(Describe here or attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six (6) months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.)
- Recommendations numbered _____ will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.
(Describe here or attach an explanation.)

Date: _____ Signed: _____

Number of pages attached _____.

California Penal Code

Section 933.05

- (a) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:
 - (1) The respondent agrees with the finding.
 - (2) The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefore.
- (b) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:
 - (1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
 - (2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.
 - (3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.
 - (4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefore.
- (c) However, if a finding or recommendation of the grand jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or department headed by an elected officer, both the agency or department head and the board of supervisors shall respond if requested by the grand jury, but the response of the board of supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision-making authority. The response of the elected agency or department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency or department.
- (d) A grand jury may request a subject person or entity to come before the grand jury for the purpose of reading and discussing the findings of the grand jury report that relates to that person or entity in order to verify the accuracy of the findings prior to their release.
- (e) During an investigation, the grand jury shall meet with the subject of that investigation regarding the investigation, unless the court, either on its own determination or upon request of the foreperson of the grand jury, determines that such a meeting would be detrimental.
- (f) A grand jury shall provide to the affected agency a copy of the portion of the grand jury report relating to that person or entity two working days prior to its public release and after the approval of the presiding judge. No officer, agency, department, or governing body of a public agency shall disclose any contents of the report prior to the public release of the final report.

Final Report Summaries

Eureka Union School District School Lunch Program Contract Brown Act Open Meeting Concerns

The Grand Jury investigated the formation of a food services contract between the Eureka Unified School District (EUSD) and the Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) to determine whether the EUSD Board had violated the Brown Act in approving the contract.

The Grand Jury recommends that an individual Board member not be allowed to attend more than one information meeting in a given series of meetings set up by the Superintendent. Further, the Grand Jury is recommending that EUSD Board members and executive district staff obtain additional training regarding the Ralph M. Brown Act (hereinafter, Brown Act or Act; Government Code section 54950, et seq.), so that the district can avoid any violation of the Act and any appearance of violation of the Act.

Examination of Fire Hydrant Inspection and Maintenance

The Grand Jury conducted an investigation into whether fire hydrants in Placer County are being properly inspected and maintained and determined that the current system, though not standard throughout the county, is working.

Human Trafficking

The 2014-2015 Placer County Grand Jury (GJ) conducted an investigation into the extent and pervasiveness of human trafficking in Placer County. The GJ was most interested in the resources available to law enforcement to identify and assist victims and to ascertain whether law enforcement was able to successfully utilize existing county social service programs to best facilitate assistance to the victims of human trafficking.

The GJ interviewed representatives of all entities and county officials tasked with the responsibility of identifying and assisting victims. Law enforcement agencies were interviewed as to the measures they take to identify a human trafficking situation and assist victims in obtaining the help they need. The GJ found that Placer County recognizes the problem of human trafficking and continues to utilize programs which have been in place for years. Additionally, in 2014, Placer County Children's System of Care (CSOC) developed the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children Task Force (CSEC). This task force is comprised of members of law enforcement at every level, as well as county social services entities, and has the potential to adequately assist victims. One short-coming that must be addressed is the lack of a state-wide tracking system for victims already identified by law enforcement.

Investigation of County and City Operational Policies

The Grand Jury (GJ) reviewed the operational policies of the incorporated city governments and Placer County. These included Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville. The Grand Jury met with county and local government financial managers to understand their various individual local policies, their implementation, and their review procedures and control elements. Our intent was to determine if the policies for travel, use of government and private vehicles for official business, use of government credit cards, computers, and phones, contracting, bidding and purchasing were appropriate, up-to-date and complete.

The GJ sought to determine how such policies are updated to address changes over time and as technology evolves. The GJ also wanted to verify that the policies for travel and the use of technology applied to elected officials as well as government employees. The GJ noted minor improvements were needed in documenting policies, their timeliness and maintaining an inventory of policies. Keeping policies in line with technology changes represents a continuing challenge.

Included in this report are several recommendations that the GJ considers to be representative of *best practices* including:

- Schedule regular specific reviews of policies to assure they are current.
- Have employees verify they understand rules and policies on a recurring basis.
- Include a policy and form for whistleblower use.
- Consider cyber-security insurance.
- Clarify policies to include all aspects of technology.

Placer County Water Agency - Enhanced Service to Placer County Residents Utilizing Reserves from Sale of Surplus Water and Electricity

The Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) was authorized by the Placer County Water Agency Act (the Act) in 1957, to manage certain water resources for the public good of Placer County residents. PCWA has emerged as a financially secure agency with Unrestricted Reserves in excess of \$110 million plus a Water Systems Expansion Restricted Account balance of \$40 million. PCWA has done an admirable job of managing their water and infrastructure assets for their rate payers. What has not been legislatively specified is how PCWA should manage excess cash generated from either the sale of surplus water or from net revenues derived from the sale of electricity from their hydroelectric operations on the Middle Fork of the American River.

The realities of the ongoing nature of the drought, and its effect on some Placer County communities not part of the PCWA service area, could create a situation where water availability becomes a serious health and welfare issue.

PCWA has Unrestricted Reserves in excess of \$110 million. They need to consider the application of some of those reserves to improve the availability and dependability of potable water to all residents of Placer County.

The Placer County Grand Jury recommends that PCWA consider expanding their vision and mission to include assistance for Placer County neighborhoods and communities not currently in their service areas. This assistance might come in the form of emergency financial aid to other water districts to develop the necessary infrastructure to connect to existing PCWA treated drinking water during extreme drought conditions.

Review of Placer County Government and Special District/Agency Websites

The California Public Records Act (CPRA) requires full disclosure of actions taken by elected officials and public access to all public records, with some limited exceptions. Although not required by CPRA, the Grand Jury (GJ) holds that the public has come to expect such records are available, or can be made available, through government and agency websites.

The GJ investigated if, and to what extent, Placer County, local cities and special districts were providing these records on their websites. A survey of county, city and special districts websites was conducted by the GJ. Websites for the following entities were included in the survey:

County & Cities

- Placer County
- City of Auburn
- City of Colfax
- City of Lincoln
- Town of Loomis
- City of Rocklin
- City of Roseville

Special Districts/Agency

- Northstar Community Service District
- San Juan Water District
- Placer County Water Agency
- South Placer Municipal Utility District
- Truckee Tahoe Airport District

Survey results indicated that all the agencies had functioning websites and, through them, the public has access to an extensive array of useful information. Agendas, records of public meetings, budgets, access to governmental functions, and general information on services, taxes, contact information, helpful links and more were found to be available to varying degrees on the websites.

The GJ commends all the entities surveyed for their efforts to make records easily available to the public through their websites. However, as good as the websites are, the GJ found several areas for improvement.

The GJ found that a lack of consistency in websites makes locating similar information on different websites difficult and time consuming. It is recommended that a Placer county inter-agency committee should be convened to establish a best practices guide for city and county websites.

Some of the websites contain outdated information of questionable value to the public. It is recommended that all documents and information on government and special district websites be subject to an annual review to assure all information is still current and pertinent.

The GJ found that none of the surveyed websites posted operating policies covering employee travel and use of entity owned assets, such as vehicles, credit cards, cell phones and computers. The GJ recommends that these policies be available on the websites. In addition, many of the websites should improve in presenting information on opportunities to bid on government contracts and in displaying the results of such bids.

It was found that some websites included links to make CPRA public documents requests. The GJ recommends that all the websites include this capability.

Temporary Emergency Homeless Shelter

The homeless situation in Placer County has been under review since 2004 by the Board of Supervisors (BOS). In 2004 the Placer Consortium on Homeless and Affordable Housing Committee presented to the BOS a ten-year plan to end homelessness in Placer County. As of December of 2014, there was no temporary emergency homeless shelter in Auburn. Faced with the prospect of people living out in the open during a cold and wet winter, immediate action for a shelter, even if temporary, appeared in order. A number of citizens stepped forward with offers of resources and a proposal to repurpose two buildings on the DeWitt Center Campus as a temporary shelter. These buildings, which had recently been used to house minimum-security prisoners, appeared to be a ready solution to provide temporary shelter for the homeless.

When the issue appeared to stall before the BOS in December 2014, the Grand Jury decided to investigate. During the course of the investigation, the BOS held a special meeting in which they requested an expedited review and analysis by County staff. At the time of this writing, the BOS has given approval for a temporary shelter at the DeWitt Center with a conditional use permit for ninety (90) days. The need for a permanent solution remains.

A Five-Year Plan for Meeting the Needs of a Growing Senior Population in Placer County - A Continuation of a 2013-2014 Grand Jury Investigation

This report is a continuation of a recommendation from the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report on the DeWitt Center Costco Lease and its impact on seniors.

Finding 4 of last year's Grand Jury Report identified the need for the county to develop a five-year plan that will address the needs of its predicted growing senior and disabled populations. The Board of Supervisors (BOS) response to that finding appears to be incomplete.

Recommendation 2 of last year's report suggested that the county create a five-year plan for the creation of an umbrella organization that will bring together all governmental and not-for-profit organizations providing supportive services to disabled and senior populations. The purpose was to link all stakeholders that provide needed and supportive senior and disabled services under one entity. The County Director of Health and Human Services (HHS) would coordinate this effort.

The BOS response to this recommendation was that "this recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future". This response is lacking in specificity and could be considered a violation of Penal Code section 933.05, subdivision (b)(2), as it lacks a time frame for implementation.

Anti-Bullying Policies in Middle and High Schools: Are They Effective? Follow-up to the Responses to the 2013-2014 Report

The Grand Jury reviewed the Placer County schools responses to the 2013-2014 Grand Jury's recommendations on anti-bullying policies. In particular, the Grand jury was interested in determining if the school districts are able to gauge the effectiveness of their policies.

There are nineteen school districts within Placer County. Each district has demographic differences in geographical size, number of students, and types of policies covering bullying. School administrators recognize the bullying problem and have implemented anti-bullying policies and programs to conform to state law. Not all schools have a mechanism for the anonymous reporting of bullying. While there are data gathering systems available, e.g. Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) discussed below, to track behavior changes, these systems are not fully utilized throughout the county. Most of the districts that have data collection systems have not had sufficient time to develop statistically valid data to gauge the effectiveness of their programs.

The Grand Jury recommends that the districts continue developing reporting mechanisms and collecting data to measure the effectiveness of their programs. All schools should have a plan for anonymous reporting.

Placer County Meals on Wheels: A Failure to Communicate Response to a Response

This report is a response to and a continuation of a recommendation from the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report on the “Placer County Meals on Wheels: A Failure to Communicate”.

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury recommended that the Board of Supervisors (BOS) should establish a system of communication between the BOS and its appointees to Boards and Commissions. The BOS responded that it agreed with the recommendation; however, it gave no time frame for implementation. California Penal Code Section 933.05(b)(2) specifies that when a respondent replies that a recommendation will be implemented in the future, it needs to give a time frame for implementation.

As a part of this follow up, the Grand Jury (GJ) asked that a member of the BOS be interviewed to discuss the implementation of the BOS response. The BOS member who was contacted by the GJ to be interviewed contacted County Counsel. County Counsel (who acts as counsel for both GJ and the BOS) called the GJ and suggested the BOS member not be interviewed.

In the course of this follow up, the GJ determined that there appears to be an issue regarding BOS cooperation with the work of the GJ.

Transfer of DeWitt Center Enterprise Funds and Its Impact on Citizens

This report traces the paper trail that culminated in the transfer of the reserves in the DeWitt Enterprise Funds into a new Placer County Government Center Internal Services Fund (PCGC-ISF). It also asks the county executives to consider using this new fund as a potential source of the funding of the mandated relocation costs of the non-profit corporation, Seniors First, from the DeWitt Center to a new location in North Auburn. The report also questions the designation of this new fund for the exclusive use of the county for the needs of the DeWitt Government campus.

Auburn Police Department and Holding Facility Annual Inspection

This Grand Jury Report details the annual inspection conducted at the City of Auburn Police Department (APD), 1215 Lincoln Way, on September 2, 2014. The APD has a temporary holding area which consists of a bench and restraints. The Grand Jury finds that generally the operations are satisfactory with the exception of some health and cleanliness issues. The Grand Jury recommends that funds be allocated to procure an epi-pen and defibrillator. It is also recommends that staff more closely monitor cleanliness of the facility.

Placer County Jails and Holding Facilities: A Consolidated Report Annual Inspections

This report summarizes thorough inspections conducted at the six Placer County jails and holding facilities:

- Historic Courthouse in Auburn (September 2, 2014)
- Burton Creek Sheriff's Substation in Tahoe City (September 9, 2014)
- South Placer Main Jail in Roseville (October 17, 2014)
- South Placer Minimum Security Facility in Roseville (October 17, 2014)
- Santucci Courthouse in Roseville (October 24, 2014)
- Placer County Main Jail in Auburn (November 12, 2014)

On the whole, the jurors found these facilities to be clean, secure, and well-managed, with relatively few problems.

The main challenge facing Placer County correctional facilities has been overcrowding, primarily due to public safety realignment as the result of State legislation (AB109), which in April 2011, sought to reduce state prison overcrowding by:

- Sentencing most non-serious, non-violent, and non-sexual offenders to a county jail rather than to State prisons. Prior to realignment, any felony sentence of more than a year would routinely be served in State prison. Now offenders sentenced to serve up to seven or eight years can be housed in a county jail.
- Sentencing parole or probation violators to serve their violations in a county jail rather than being returned to a state prison.

Placer County, like most counties, is dealing with many issues that have arisen as a result of realignment. While many overcrowding issues will be alleviated by the recent opening of the new South Placer Main Jail, other issues associated with housing more sophisticated prisoners for longer periods of time are still being addressed. In the past, county jails have not had to deal with critical long-term health issues or rehabilitation needs of inmates.

In addition, State Proposition 47, which went into effect after the November 2014 election, has added a new burden to jail staff. Because it reduces penalties for drug and other nonviolent crimes, many county inmates have petitioned to have their convictions reclassified from felonies to misdemeanors, and sentences reduced or erased. An estimated 40,000 inmates in California are eligible. This creates a huge need for more jail and court personnel to facilitate this complicated process.

Placer County Juvenile Detention Facility - Annual Inspection

The 2014 - 2015 Placer County Grand Jury conducted its annual inspection of the County Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF) on October 15, 2014, followed by an interview with the JDF Superintendent on October 30, 2015. The facility is located at 11260 B Avenue, Auburn.

On the date of inspection, the JDF appeared to be clean and well-maintained; the staff is knowledgeable about pertinent legal requirements and genuinely dedicated to reducing the rate of return/repeat offenders. However the facility offers short-term counseling and self-help programs that are not ideally suited for detainees who are held at the JDF for extended periods of time. Similarly lacking is availability of outdoor recreation geared toward longer-termed detainees. Activities primarily consist of a concrete sports court with a few barred openings in the walls and a small open-air skylight. Although the facility has a large grassy area, it is rarely used due to limited security and staffing issues.

Finally, the JDF has incorporated a program which has been favorably received by the detainees. Positive Behavioral Intervention Support (PBIS) is a program wherein detainees can earn privileges and/or small luxury items through a merit system, based on good behavior and following the rules of the JDF. As reported by staff, PBIS has led to a decrease in poor behavioral incidents at the facility.

The Grand Jury added three additional areas of interest to its inspection agenda:

- A status update on implementation of policies and procedures mandated by the Department of Justice's final rule pursuant to the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003
- Policies and procedures at the JDF
- A status update on detainees access to the grass area

Rocklin City Jail - Annual Inspection

This Grand Jury Report details the annual inspection conducted at the City of Rocklin Police Department (RPD), located at 4080 Rocklin Road, on October 27, 2014. This facility includes six holding cells. The Grand Jury found this facility to be a well-managed and well-maintained jail. There are no recommendations at this time, and the jurors would like to commend the Rocklin Police Department for its upkeep of this facility.

Roseville Police Department and Holding Facility Annual Inspection

This report summarizes the Grand Jury inspection of the City of Roseville Police Department on October 14, 2014, to include ten two-person housing cells for 20 people, four multi-purpose sobering cells for 15 people, and four multi-purpose holding cells for 14 people. This facility is located at 1051 Junction Boulevard in Roseville.



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Eureka Union School District School Lunch Program Contract

Brown Act Open Meeting Concerns

Eureka Union School District School Lunch Program Contract Brown Act Open Meeting Concerns

Summary

The Grand Jury investigated the formation of a food services contract between the Eureka Unified School District (EUSD) and the Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) to determine whether the EUSD Board had violated the Brown Act in approving the contract.

The Grand Jury recommends that an individual Board member not be allowed to attend more than one information meeting in a given series of meetings set up by the Superintendent. Further, the Grand Jury is recommending that EUSD Board members and executive district staff obtain additional training regarding the Ralph M. Brown Act (hereinafter, Brown Act or Act; Government Code § 54950, et seq.), so that the district can avoid any violation of the Act and any appearance of violation of the Act.

Background

The Brown Act requires that public agencies make their decisions publicly. The Brown Act sets forth notice and opportunity for public input that legislative bodies of local public agencies must follow with respect to meetings “to hear, discuss, or deliberate on an item within” the agency’s subject matter jurisdiction. Further, the Act defines a meeting as a “congregation of a majority of the members of the” board, commission or council (Gov. Code § 54952.2, subd. a). The Act prohibits “use of direct communication personal intermediaries, or technological devices employed by a majority of the members [] to develop a collective concurrence as to action to be taken ...”. (Gov. Code § 54952.2, subd. b).

In the spring of 2014, EUSD was presented with a closing window of opportunity to secure a new vendor for their K-8 school lunch program for the 2014-15 school year. The 2013-14 vendor was providing school lunches from out of the area, and the School Board was facing a chorus of criticism over the quality and portion size of the lunches. In addition, the EUSD staff found that the school lunch program was taking more resources and staff time to properly manage the distribution of the lunches to the students than the prior lunch program had required.

Before EUSD contracted with the outside food vendor for the 2013-14 school year, the school lunches were furnished by the RJUHSD. The Board had decided not to renew the previous inter-agency agreement after students, parents and Board members complained about the quality of the meals being offered.

The EUSD Board asked district office staff to present options for food service for the 2014-15 school year. The Board was faced with renewing an unpopular school lunch program, having the lunches made on site or entering into an inter-agency agreement with a neighboring school district to provide meals. The prospect of restarting a kitchen at the different schools was ruled out because of cost and time. EUSD staff contacted neighboring districts, including the previous supplier of school lunches, RJUHSD, all of whom declined to bid due to various reasons.

As the deadline neared to either renew the existing contract or find a new vendor, several of the EUSD Board members reached out to Board members of the RJUHSD asking them to encourage the RJUHSD staff to reconsider bidding on the school EUSD lunch program. In mid-April of 2014 EUSD Board members received an email from the Superintendent to arrange what were called 2x2 meetings.

The structure of 2x2 meetings is deliberately set up to avoid violation of the Brown Act. **Specifically, 2x2 meetings consist of two Board members meeting with the district superintendent to informally discuss a range of topics. Restricting the number of Board members present to two is designed to avoid having a majority of the elected Board meeting and discussing official business outside of an official public meeting in violation of the Brown Act.**

The 2x2 meetings are usually held on a quarterly basis with the goal of increasing communication between the Superintendent and the Board members. The usual format of the EUSD 2x2 meetings is to have the Superintendent meet with two Board members, then have a separate meeting with two more Board members and a final meeting with the remaining Board member.

The Grand Jury learned that in a series of 2x2 meetings held in connection with the food services contract for school year 2014-15 the Board failed to follow its normal 2x2 meeting procedures. One of the Board members attended every one of the meetings.

The specific conditions RJUHSD required were that the contract had to be a multi-year contract, there could be no dissenting Board votes and there could be no negative comments made at the EUSD public board meeting at which the EUSD-RJUHS school lunch contract was considered. The inter-agency agreement was put on the May 6, 2014 agenda and was approved with no dissenting votes or negative comments. It was also noted in our interviews that there were two staff members from the RJUHSD in attendance at the Board meeting. The RJUHSD staff members did not offer any public comments and left after the vote was taken. The minutes of the EUSD reflected the attendance of two RJUHSD personnel.

Methodology of Investigation

The Grand Jury conducted several interviews of EUSD district office staff and Board members to determine the facts. One member of the Grand Jury was recused to avoid any conflict of interest and the appearance of bias.

Facts

- The EUSD Board wanted to change the vendor providing school lunches at its school sites.
- Special 2x2 meetings were held by the EUSD Superintendent to brief Board members about the school lunch inter-agency agreement with RJUHSD. These meetings were held before the Board meeting and had a common Board member present at all the meetings.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. The 2x2 meetings were held to disseminate information regarding the RJUHSD conditions of approval of the lunch contract in advance of the EUSD Board meeting.
- F2. EUSD understood that there would be no contract if there were any dissenting Board votes or any negative comments made at the EUSD public board meeting at which the EUSD-RJUHS school lunch contract was considered.
- F3. The presence of a common Board member at all 2x2 briefing meetings between EUSD staff and one other Board member is a violation of the serial meeting provisions of the Brown Act.

Conclusion

Each informational meeting contained only two members of the five-member board. Therefore, there was no meeting as defined in Government Code § 54952.2(a). In other words, there was no majority. The Grand Jury finds that having a common Board member in all of the informational meetings is the type of serial meeting Government Code § 54952.2(b) addresses.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. Informational 2x2 meetings between EUSD staff and Board of Trustee members should never include a common Board member present at all the meetings.
- R2. The EUSD staff should arrange an annual training seminar on the Brown Act provisions for all Board members and executive staff.

Request for Responses

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Board of Trustees Eureka Union School District 5455 Eureka Road Granite Bay, CA 95746	R1, R2	September 22, 2015
Ms. Linda Rooney Superintendent Eureka Union School District 5455 Eureka Road Granite Bay, CA 95746	R1, R2	September 22, 2015



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Examination of Fire Hydrant Inspection and Maintenance

Examination of Fire Hydrant Inspection and Maintenance

Summary

The Grand Jury conducted an investigation into whether fire hydrants in Placer County are being properly inspected and maintained and determined that the current system, though not standard throughout the county, is working.

Background

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury reported on a hydrant with inadequate flow located near an elementary school. The specific issue has been resolved. However, this led to a concern by the Grand Jury that fire hydrants may not be receiving adequate inspection and maintenance.

Investigation Methods

- Grand Jury members interviewed staff from both fire agencies and water agencies.
- Both rural and urban districts were included.

Facts

- Inspection and maintenance of fire hydrants in Placer County is provided by a patchwork of public and private entities.
- Within Placer County, fire services are provided by cities, a dozen special districts, Cal Fire, and the federal government.
- There are both public and private water providers.
- Water service providers are as diverse as the topography and the population of the county. There are in excess of 100 providers of water service.
- Some cities (such as Roseville and Lincoln) have their own water departments.

- Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) is a county-wide agency that provides water for a portion, albeit a significant portion, of the county's households and commercial enterprises.
- At the other end of the spectrum, a private service may supply only a handful of houses or a single business.
- Many households and some businesses rely on their own wells.
- The federal government is responsible for water service on federal land.
- PCWA has memorandums of understanding (MOUs) with all but two of the fire agencies serving the areas for which PCWA is the water purveyor. (Cal Fire and the South Placer Fire District are the two with which PCWA has no MOU.)
- The PCWA MOUs provide that the hydrants are the property of the fire agency, that the fire agency does the light maintenance, and that PCWA does the heavy maintenance, renewal and replacement.
- There are two types of fire hydrants: flow and draft. Each requires its own kind of hose coupling.
- Fire departments are generally responsible for color-coded painting of hydrant tops so that users can tell at a glance which coupling they need. Fire departments interviewed indicate that all hydrants within their districts are properly marked.
- The state Fire Code contains the requirements regarding placement and functionality of fire hydrants but no requirements for hydrant inspection and maintenance.
- The fire chiefs who were interviewed indicated that hydrants in their respective areas get inspected at least once every three years. They also indicated that inspecting every one or two years is preferred when resources are available.
- Some hydrants, such as those for high occupancy buildings or in commercial areas, are inspected every year as part of a targeted annual fire inspection programs.

- Because of the recent drought, not all inspections include a flow test, i.e., a measurement of the amount of water available in terms of volume per minute and in terms of how long the flow can be maintained.
- Some water agencies have virtual testing models which provide some assurances that adequate water will actually be there if a fire occurs.
- If problems are identified, getting the maintenance/repairs done does not appear to be a problem in areas with public water service.
- Local water and fire districts largely agree on how the tasks are to be split. One or the other will generally have insurance to cover hydrant replacement/repair in the event of a problem such as an auto accident.
- Availability of functioning hydrants is a primary factor in the Insurance Standards Organization (ISO) rating which determines property owners' fire insurance rates. The ISO reviews the ratings every three years.
- There is no county-wide master plan for regular inspection and maintenance of fire hydrants.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. Inspection and maintenance of hydrants within the county is not uniform. If a fire hydrant needs repair, replacement, etc., the responsiveness is not consistent.
- F2. Cost is often a factor for smaller private services such as those provided by homeowners associations and the like.
- F3. Availability of functioning hydrants is a primary factor in Insurance Standards Organization (ISO) ratings which determine property owners' fire insurance rates. This gives local districts an additional incentive to insure that their hydrants are maintained.
- F4. There is disagreement among some fire and water districts as to who actually owns the fire hydrants in some jurisdictions. Some water district personnel interviewed indicated

that the hydrants are owned by the fire department, while some fire department personnel indicated that hydrants are owned by the water agencies.

- F5. Improperly functioning fire hydrants are a threat to public health and safety.
- F6. Despite the lack of standardization, the Grand Jury did not identify any area in which hydrants are not kept operational.
- F7. The local water and fire districts seem to work well together to see that hydrants are maintained.
- F8. Some water and fire districts serving a given geographic area have entered into formal written agreements.
- F9. In some areas, there are less formal agreements between the fire and water agencies' respective management teams.
- F10. Generally, the fire district does inspection and light maintenance and the water districts do the heavier maintenance and repairs. Staff seemed to think that that arrangement makes sense in that it takes advantage of the skills of each agency's employees.
- F11. The Grand Jury did not find any specific inadequacies in the operation of fire hydrants.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. The Placer County CEO should consider whether a fire hydrant inspection and maintenance program be established to ensure uniformity throughout the county.

Request for Responses:

	<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Mr. David Boesch Placer County CEO 175 Fulweiler Avenue Auburn, CA 95603	R1	August 24, 2015

Copies Sent to:

Fire Districts

Alta Fire Protection Department 33950 Alta Bonnybrook Rd. Alta, CA 95701	Newcastle Fire Protection District P.O. Box 262 Newcastle, CA 95658
Auburn City Fire Department 1225 Lincoln Way Auburn, CA 95603	North Tahoe Fire Protection District P.O. Box 5879 Tahoe City, Ca 96145
California Department of Forestry 2840 Mt. Danaher Rd. Camino, CA 95709	Northstar Community Services District 910 Northstar Drive Truckee, CA 96161
Colfax City Fire Department P.O. Box 1233 Colfax, CA 95713	Penryn Fire Protection District P.O. Box 219 Penryn, CA 95663
Foresthill Fire Protection District P.O. Box 1099 Foresthill, CA 95631	Placer County Fire Protection Districts 13760 Lincoln Way Auburn, CA 95603
Lincoln City Fire Department 126 Joiner Parkway Lincoln, CA 95648	Placer Hills Fire Protection District P.O. Box 350 Meadow Vista, Ca 95722
Loomis Fire Protection District P.O. Box 606 Loomis, CA 95650	Rocklin City Fire Department 4060 Rocklin Road Rocklin, CA 95677

Roseville City Fire Department
401 Oak Street #402
Roseville, CA 95678

South Placer Fire Protection District
6900 Eureka Road
Granite Bay, Ca 95746

Squaw Valley Public Services District
P.O. Box 2522
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

Truckee Fire Department
P.O. Box 2768
Truckee, CA 96160

Public Water Agencies

Alpine Springs County Water District
270 Alpine Meadows Rd.
Alpine Meadows, CA 96146

Auburn Valley Community Service District
P.O. Box 8138
Auburn, Ca 95604

Christian Valley Park Community Service District
P.O. Box 3138
Auburn, Ca 95604

City of Lincoln
Water Department
600 Sixth Street
Lincoln, CA 95648

Heather Glen Community Service District
P.O. Box 715
Applegate, CA 95703

City of Roseville Water Department
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Donner Summit Public Utility District
P.O. Box 610
Soda Springs, CA 95728

Foresthill PUD
P.O. Box 266
Foresthill, CA 95631

Georgetown Public Utility District
P.O. Box 4240
Georgetown, CA 95634

Meadow Vista County Water District
P.O. Box 278
Meadow Vista, CA 95722

Midway Heights County Water District
P.O. 596
Meadow Vista, CA 95722

Tahoe City Public Utility District
P.O Box 5249
Tahoe City, CA 96145

North Tahoe Public Utility District
P.O. Box 139
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148

Truckee Donner Public Utility District
11570 Donner Pass Road
Truckee, CA 96161-4947

PCWA
P.O. Box 6570
Auburn, CA 95604

Sierra Lake County Water District
P.O. Box 1039
Soda Springs, CA 95728

San Juan Water District
P.O. Box 2157
Granite Bay, Ca 95746

South Tahoe PUD
1275 Meadow Crest Drive
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Squaw Valley Public Services District
P.O. Box 2026
Olympic Valley, Ca 96145-2026

Suburban Pines Community Service District
P.O. Box 576
Colfax, CA 95713



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Human Trafficking

Human Trafficking

Summary

The 2014-2015 Placer County Grand Jury (Grand Jury) conducted an investigation into the extent and pervasiveness of human trafficking in Placer County. The Grand Jury was most interested in the resources available to law enforcement to identify and assist victims and to ascertain whether law enforcement was able to successfully utilize existing county social service programs to best facilitate assistance to the victims of human trafficking.

The Grand Jury interviewed representatives of all entities and county officials tasked with the responsibility of identifying and assisting victims. Law enforcement agencies were interviewed as to the measures they take to identify a human trafficking situation and assist victims in obtaining the help they need. The Grand Jury found that Placer County recognizes the problem of human trafficking and continues to utilize programs which have been in place for years. Additionally, in 2014, Placer County Children's System of Care (CSOC) developed the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children Task Force (CSEC). This task force is comprised of members of law enforcement at every level, as well as county social services entities, and has the potential to adequately assist victims. One short-coming that must be addressed is the lack of a state-wide tracking system for victims already identified by law enforcement.

Glossary

Human Trafficking:

According to the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, which supplement the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime¹, trafficking in persons is defined as follows:

“ ‘Trafficking in Persons’ shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs.”

¹ Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, “Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, which supplements the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime”, p.2, “http://www.no-trafficking.org/content/pdf/guide_to_the_new_un_trafficking_protocol.pdf”

Background

Human trafficking is an age-old problem. However, it was recently brought to the forefront of awareness in this country in February of this year when, as reported by the Los Angeles Times on February 2, 2015, law enforcement agencies in 17 states arrested nearly 600 people and rescued 68 victims of human trafficking during a sting prior to Super Bowl XLIX.

Although laws against human trafficking have been on the books for years, in 2005, California enacted AB 22, which provides for higher penalties for the crime of human trafficking. In 2011, California enacted a law entitled “Transparency in Supply Chains Act”, which requires certain retailers disclose their efforts to eradicate slavery and human trafficking from their supply chains. Notwithstanding these efforts, however, a 2012, report by the Polaris Project², using data collected by the National Human Trafficking Resource Center, confirmed that between 2007 and 2012, most potential reports of human trafficking came from California, Texas, Florida and New York. In an effort to bring California to the front in combatting human trafficking, on September 28, 2014, California Governor Jerry Brown signed seven bills into law aimed at improving prosecution of this pervasive crime.

Human Trafficking in our neighboring Sacramento County has been well-documented. During our investigation, we were made aware of a sex trafficking ring within a Sacramento County high school involving 16 students. This ring was in operation as early as 2008, and went on for years undetected until 2012, when the Sacramento Division of the FBI arrested the two ring-leaders.

Within recent years, human trafficking has become a known issue in Placer County. In July, 2014, Auburn and Nevada City police, in conjunction with the Placer Special Investigation Unit, arrested two adults who owned massage parlors in Auburn and Nevada City, for pimping, pandering, human trafficking, and conspiracy. And, as recently as this year, The Placer County Sheriff, California Highway Patrol and Auburn Police, in conjunction with The Department of Justice, Special Incident Unit, conducted a two-month investigation into a prostitution ring which led to the arrest of a perpetrator on April 8, 2015.

The Placer County Grand Jury was interested in determining the extent to which human trafficking is an issue in Placer County and the programs which are available to the county to provide victim assistance, access to services and law enforcement training. The Grand Jury also investigated the county’s compliance with California’s Human Trafficking laws.

² A non-profit, non-governmental organization that works with world governments to combat and prevent modern day slavery and human trafficking.

Investigation Methods

The 2014-2015 Placer County Grand Jury:

- Interviewed a representative from a local Non-Profit home for juvenile victims of human trafficking.
- Reviewed numerous statistics, State and County informational documents and Penal Codes.
- Reviewed Placer County CSEC (Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children Task Force) Protocol and Screening for Human Trafficking.
- Interviewed local Children Services' representatives.
- Interviewed local law enforcement and special task force units specializing in Human Trafficking.
- Interviewed County officials.

One member of the Grand Jury was recused to avoid any conflict of interest and the appearance of bias due to previous employment.

Facts

- Placer County Children's System of Care (CSOC) falls under the Placer County Health and Human Services Agency.
- Placer County CSOC operates a 24-hour emergency shelter. The shelter houses and cares for children who are victims of neglect, abuse and/or abandonment in Placer County on an emergency basis while more permanent care is being arranged.
- In 2014, Placer County CSOC developed the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children Task Force (CSEC).
- The CSEC task force is comprised of representative's from :
 1. Placer Sexual Assault Response Team (SART)
 2. District Attorneys office
 3. County Counsel
 4. Lincoln and Roseville Police Department
 5. Placer County Sherriff's Office
 6. Stand up Placer
 7. Family and Children Services
 8. Placer County Office of Education (PCOE)

- The CSEC task force was established to enable agencies that work directly with commercially sexually-exploited youth, to strategically partner to identify and respond to the specific needs of these youth, and to hold their traffickers accountable.
- The CSEC task force joined forces with Placer County Special Investigation Unit (SIU). SIU is comprised of fifteen members of the various Placer County law enforcement agencies who have taken part in a three-day course on Human Trafficking. SIU will be contacting victims from Placer County Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF) and independently operated shelters. An important goal of SIU is to implicate pimps and other exploiters.
- CSEC Task Force has begun regular screening for possible CSEC activity in the shelter, in the JDF, and with ongoing child welfare workers.
- Another Placer County agency, System Management Advocacy and Resource Team (SMART), is comprised of four members: Presiding Judge of Juvenile Court, Chief Probation Officer, County Superintendent of Education and Director of Health & Human Services.
- Courage House, My Sister's House, and Stand Up Placer are organizations that offer a wide range of services including safe shelter, therapy, and legal help to human trafficking victims.
- In mid-2014 Roseville Police Department's entire staff completed P.O.S.T (Police Officers Standards and Training) program "Human Trafficking: Identify & Respond". This training fulfills requirement PC§13519.14 and Proposition 35 the "Californians Against Sexual Exploitation Act" Initiative, approved by voters on November 6, 2012.
- Foster care children are more at risk to become victims of human trafficking.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. Long-term placement for child victims of sex trafficking in Placer County is problematic.
- F2. An advocate, who has worked with victims for 15 years, uses stringent software to test for boundaries and sexual propensities (Diana Screening) in potential safe houses for victims. This advocate says that the use of this more extensive software could improve the probability of human trafficking victims to find a safe home.

- F3. In ten months, and as of the time of this interview, one facility had turned away 79 victims due to lack of beds.
- F4. Child victims are usually sent out of their local area for their own safety.
- F5. Law enforcement commented that monetary fines on massage parlors are not severe enough to stop the rotation of female victims. When law enforcement questions these females, they frequently have scripted answers (“just visiting from out of town, staying with a friend”, etc.) When law enforcement conducts follow-up investigations on the same businesses within a short period of time, those employees have moved on to new locations. New female employees have the same scripted responses to questions.
- F6. Law enforcement has much less control or power to protect adult victims since they are over 18, and unless charged with a crime, they can’t hold them.
- F7. Establishment of state-wide tracking systems for victims already identified by law enforcement is necessary.

Conclusion

Although Placer County does have instances of human trafficking, it is not on the scale of larger areas within California. The Grand Jury would like to commend Placer County Children’s System of Care and its partners in developing the CSEC task force. Although CSEC is a new task force, their research, services, and partnerships with other county services appear promising. Continued training for all County officials working with families is crucial for CSEC to fully realize its potential to identify risky situations, enforce the extensive laws already in place and to best assess and fulfill the needs of the victims.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. Health and Human Services continues to seek up to date information and state-of-the-art programs for human trafficking victim assistance.
- R2. The CSEC continue “active” coordination of all agencies involved in identifying and tracking human trafficking incidents in Placer County.
- R3. The CSEC develop human trafficking awareness programs to educate parents and children, with a special emphasis on foster parents and foster children.

Request for Responses

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Mr. Jeff Brown Director, Health and Human Services 3091 County Center Drive #290 Auburn, CA 95603	R1-R3	August 24, 2015

Copies Sent To

Mr. David Boesch
Placer County CEO
175 Fulweiler Ave.
Auburn, CA 95603

Board Of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Ave.
Auburn, CA 95603

Mr. Bill Olsen
Special Investigations Unit
4080 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Investigation of County and City Operational Policies

Investigation of County and City Operational Policies

Summary

The 2014-2015 Grand Jury (Grand Jury) reviewed the operational policies of the incorporated city governments and Placer County. These included Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville. The Grand Jury met with county and local government financial managers to understand their various individual local policies, their implementation, and their review procedures and control elements. Our intent was to determine if the policies for travel, use of government and private vehicles for official business, use of government credit cards, computers, and phones, contracting, bidding and purchasing were appropriate, up-to-date and complete.

The Grand Jury sought to determine how such policies are updated to address changes over time and as technology evolves. The Grand Jury also wanted to verify that the policies for travel and the use of technology applied to elected officials as well as government employees. The Grand Jury noted minor improvements were needed in documenting policies, their timeliness and maintaining an inventory of policies. Keeping policies in line with technology changes represents a continuing challenge.

Included in this report are several recommendations that the Grand Jury considers to be representative of *best practices* including:

- Schedule regular specific reviews of policies to assure they are current.
- Have employees verify they understand rules and policies on a recurring basis.
- Include a policy and form for whistleblower use.
- Consider cyber-security insurance.
- Clarify policies to include all aspects of technology.

Glossary

Operating Policies Principles, rules, and guidelines formulated or adopted by an organization to communicate how the organization conducts its operations.

Best practices Best practice is a form of program evaluation in public policy. It is the process of reviewing policy alternatives that have been effective in addressing similar issues in the past and could be applied to a current problem.

Background

Responsibilities of local government employees and elected officials cover a broad range of challenges. Administration of travel costs and the use of credit cards requires strict management controls. In order to satisfy a wide variety of needs, a transparent system of contract requirements, bidding, and awarding to various vendors is necessary. It is a continuing challenge to operate efficiently using an ever-expanding variety of technology tools (smart phones vs. mobile phones, laptops vs. tablets). Policies are necessary to set the rules for such activities and to assure inter-disciplinary coordination on the acquisition, use and management of new technology.

Investigation Methods

The Grand Jury attempted to review operational policies on-line using public web sites. When the Grand Jury was unable to locate the policies on-line, it was determined that further investigation of these policies was appropriate.

Under the Public Records Act, the Grand Jury requested the operational policies addressing:

- Travel
- Use of government and private vehicles for official business
- Use of government credit cards, computers, and phones
- Contracting, bidding and purchasing

The Grand Jury reviewed the operational policies of the six incorporated city governments and Placer County to determine if the policies are appropriate, current and realistic. The Grand Jury met with and interviewed the county auditor-controller and local government financial managers to understand their various individual local policies, the implementation of those policies, and how they are managed. The Grand Jury sought to determine how such policies addressed, coordinated and managed new technologies. The Grand Jury wanted to verify that policies for travel and the use of technology applied to elected officials as well as government employees. The Grand Jury also inquired into the initial and recurring training on operational policies.

Facts and Findings

For Placer County and the cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Loomis, Rocklin and Roseville, the Grand Jury determined the following:

Travel Policies

Facts

- All have budgets, controls and policies for travel of elected officials and employees.
- Travel plans and projected costs are developed in the fiscal budget process.
- Any out of state, out of the country, and unbudgeted travel requires pre-approval by the respective elected officials (Board of Supervisors for county, council members for cities).
- All policies for travel require the use of the lowest cost for airfare, ground transportation and lodging.
- Per Diem rates for employees on official travel use IRS or lesser rates.
- All governmental entities have personnel approving travel in advance and staff monitoring travel claims and payments.
- Elected officials and appointed employees are subject to the same operational policies in all entities.
- Colfax does not have a written policy on travel.

Findings

- F1. Policies for travel seemed appropriate and adequate while recognizing the wide differences in size of the workforce and responsibilities. Colfax has policies, but they are not in writing.
- F2. Travel controls for all entities are adequate.

Vehicle Policies

Facts

- County and all local governments have government vehicles. The majority of vehicle use is by public safety and public service departments.
- The use of personal vehicles for official travel is reimbursed at the IRS approved mileage rate.
- The Board of Supervisors and other elected local government officials are not assigned government owned vehicles.
- Elected officials receive set allowances to compensate for transportation expenses.
- Colfax does not have a written policy on vehicle use.

Findings

- F3. Vehicle policies for all jurisdictions are satisfactory, although Cofax's policy is not in writing.

Credit Card Policies

Facts

- The county and all cities use credit cards. The number of cards in use varies; for example, Loomis has only one credit card, while Roseville has over 300 credit cards.
- Managers or department heads are responsible for approving the issuance of cards and monitoring appropriate use.
- Typical credit card use includes:
 - Travel expenses such as airfare and conference fees payable in advance
 - Purchases for emergency repairs
 - Numerous other authorized routine field expenses
- Credit card expenses are reviewed and approved prior to payment.
- Monitoring of credit card expenses is routinely done by staff and, proactively by the issuing credit card banks.

Findings

- F4. Each government body has different policies and procedures for issuance and use of credit cards.
- F5. Credit cards are widely used by Placer County, Rocklin and Roseville. Use in other jurisdictions is more limited.
- F6. Monitoring and control of credit card use is adequate.

Cell-Phone Policies

Facts

- All entities issue and use cell-phones for employee use.
- The bulk of cell-phone use is by public safety and public service employees.
- Elected officials generally use their own cell-phones and are reimbursed or have allowances covering such use.
- Placer County and Roseville department heads authorize cell-phone issuances.

- Placer County and Roseville IT departments have responsibility for negotiating cell-phone contracts.

Findings

F7. Monitoring cell phone usage continues to be an on-going challenge for management.

Technology Policies

Facts

- All entities have a wide variety of hardware and software.
- Placer County, Auburn, Rocklin, and Roseville have inter-disciplinary groups to assess technology changes, their application and their costs.
- Some agencies monitor Internet access to preclude personal use.
- Rocklin has a social media policy.
- Roseville has e-mail and remote e-mail policies that employees must read, acknowledge and understand before signing.
- Roseville incorporates technology training in yearly ethics training.
- Cyber security insurance is purchased by Roseville.
- Auburn has a technical procedures policy that employees must sign.
- deleted

Findings

F8. Smart phones have blurred the lines between cell-phone and technology use policies.

F9. Management oversight and monitoring of technology usage is an evolving challenge.

F10. The extent of personal computer and tablet usage varies with the number of employees.

F11. Management approach and policies on technology vary.

Contracting, Bidding and Purchasing Policies

Facts

- Contracting and bidding practices vary but conform to state laws, regulations and appeared adequate.

Findings

F12. All entities have adequate policies on contracting and bidding.

Management and Administration of Policies

Facts

- Training policies and practices, both initial and recurring, vary.
- All operational policies apply to elected officials as well as employees.
- Not all policies were current and in writing.
- Not all policies were organized and indexed.
- Only Placer County has internal auditors on staff.
- Roseville does not have an internal auditor but is considering adding this role.
- Colfax has a policy and a complaint form for whistleblower reports. All others rely on Federal Law protecting whistleblowers but do not have a policy or form for written whistleblower reports.

Findings

F13. Policies are not being updated in a timely fashion.

F14. Some, but not all, policies identified the original date of issue or date of review.

F15. Issuance dates, recurring reviews and approvals of operational policies were only completed by Placer County, Colfax and Roseville. Other entities revised policies on an “as necessary” basis.

F16. Complete standardized numbered policies were only available from Placer County and Roseville.

F17. Initial training on operational policies is completed for newly elected officials and new employees in a variety of ways.

F18. Recurring training policies can be improved.

F19. Management of technology innovations requires an inter-disciplinary approach.

F20. On-going internal auditing serves to monitor internal controls and minimize non-compliance and abuse. The addition of internal auditors would be valuable for the larger cities.

F21. Providing forms for employees to submit whistleblower reports in writing would be of value.

Conclusions

The Grand Jury's review of the operating policies of the county and cities indicates they are appropriate. There are actions that the Grand Jury would consider *best practices* that should be instilled. Current policies apply equally to elected officials, appointed management and employees.

Significant variability exists in the level of detail included in the operating policies of the county and various cities. As the size of the government entity and number of employees increases, more reliance is placed on managerial control.

Recommendations

(Table 1 on the following page specifies which recommendations are applicable to each entity)

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. A written policy for travel and vehicle use be developed.
- R2. A regular schedule be established for reviewing all policies to assure they are current.
- R3. All policies should include, approval, adoption, and review dates. Policies should be indexed for improved access.
- R4. Cell phone policies be documented.
- R5. Computer and internet policies be documented.
- R6. Technology policies include computer, tablet, internet and email use.
- R7. Consideration should be given to the development of a Technology Resources Policy including a schedule of reviews and employee acknowledgements.
- R8. Consideration be given to procuring cyber security insurance.
- R9. Require that employees on a recurring schedule verify that they understand and acknowledge, by signature, operational policies and any changes thereto.
- R10. A whistleblower policy and reporting form be developed.
- R11. Consideration be given to adding one or more internal auditors to staff.

Table 1 – Recommendations

	Recommendations										
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11
Placer County								X		X	
City of Auburn		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	
City of Colfax	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		
City of Lincoln		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Town of Loomis		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
City of Rocklin		X	X					X	X	X	
City of Roseville										X	X

Key: X - indicates this recommendation applies.

Request for Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Mr. David Boesch Placer County CEO 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R8, R10	August 24, 2015
Mr. Andrew Sisk Placer County Auditor Controller 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R10	August 24, 2015
Mr. Tim Rundel City Manager, City of Auburn 1225 Lincoln Way Auburn, CA 95603	R2, R3, R6-R10	August 24, 2015
Mr. Mark Miller City Manager , City of Colfax 33 South Main St. Colfax, CA 95713	R1-R6, R08-09	August 24, 2015
Mr. Matt Brower City Manager, City of Lincoln 600 Sixth St. Lincoln, CA 95648	R2-R4, R6-R10	August 24, 2015
Mr. Rick Angelocci Town Manager, Town of Loomis 3665 Taylor Road Loomis, CA 95650	R2-R6, R8-R10	August 24, 2015
Mr. Ricky A. Horst City Manager, City of Rocklin 3970 Rocklin Rd. Rocklin, CA 95677	R2, R3, R8-R10	August 24, 2015

Mr. Ray Kerridge
City Manager, City of Roseville
311 Vernon St.
Roseville, CA 95678

R10, R11

August 24, 2015

Copies Sent to:

Mr. Keith Nesbitt,
Mayor, City of Auburn
1225 Lincoln Way
Auburn, CA 95603

Mr. Dylan Fisk
Administrative Services Director, City of Auburn
1225 Lincoln Way
Auburn, CA 95603

Mr. Kim Douglass
Mayor, City of Colfax
33 South Main St.
Colfax, CA 95713

Ms. Laurie Van Groningen
Finance Director, City of Colfax
33 South Main St.
Colfax, CA 95713

Mr. Paul Joiner
Mayor, City of Lincoln
600 Sixth St.
Lincoln, CA 95648

Mr. Steven Ambrose
Finance Director
600 Sixth St.
Lincoln, CA 95648

Ms. Rhonda Morillas
Mayor, Town of Loomis
3665 Taylor Road
Loomis, CA 95650

Mr. Roger Carroll
Treasurer, Finance Director, Town of Loomis
3665 Taylor Road
Loomis, CA 95650

Mr. George Magnuson
Mayor, City of Rocklin
3970 Rocklin Rd.
Rocklin, CA 95677

Ms. Kimberly Sarkovich
Chief Financial Officer, City of Rocklin
3970 Rocklin Rd.
Rocklin, CA 95677

Ms. Carol Garcia
Mayor, City of Roseville
311 Vernon St.
Roseville, CA 95678

Mr. Monty Hanks
Finance Director, City of Roseville
311 Vernon St.
Roseville, CA 95678



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Placer County Water Agency

**Enhanced Service to Placer County Residents
Utilizing Reserves from
Sale of Surplus Water and Electricity**

Placer County Water Agency

Enhanced Service to Placer County Residents Utilizing Reserves from the Sale of Surplus Water and Electricity

Summary

The Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) was authorized by the Placer County Water Agency Act (the Act) in 1957, to manage certain water resources for the public good of Placer County residents. PCWA has emerged as a financially secure agency with Unrestricted Reserves in excess of \$110 million plus a Water Systems Expansion Restricted Account balance of \$40 million. PCWA has done an admirable job of managing their water and infrastructure assets for their rate payers. What has not been legislatively specified is how PCWA should manage excess cash generated from either the sale of surplus water or from net revenues derived from the sale of electricity from their hydroelectric operations on the Middle Fork of the American River.

The realities of the ongoing nature of the drought, and its effect on some Placer County communities not part of the PCWA service area, could create a situation where water availability becomes a serious health and welfare issue.

PCWA has Unrestricted Reserves in excess of \$110 million. They need to consider the application of some of those reserves to improve the availability and dependability of potable water to all residents of Placer County.

The Placer County Grand Jury recommends that PCWA consider expanding their vision and mission to include assistance for Placer County neighborhoods and communities not currently in their service areas. This assistance might come in the form of emergency financial aid to other water districts to develop the necessary infrastructure to connect to existing PCWA treated drinking water during extreme drought conditions.

Background

The media has reported on the sale of 35,000 acre feet of surplus water by PCWA to Westlands Water District for \$325 per acre foot in 2014. The sale was approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and resulted in \$11.4 million of revenue for PCWA. The water became “surplus” because PCWA has no means of storing all of its appropriated water from the Middle Fork Project (MFP). The sale occurred at the same time as PCWA was instructing its customers to conserve water as a result of the drought. Revenue from this sale was

placed into an unrestricted reserve account from which the PCWA board can allocate funds for any type of project or purpose within the authority of the PCWA Act. The Grand Jury, aware of the ongoing drought and potential needs of county residents, decided to look at PCWA's future plans for use of reserve funds.

Investigation Methods

- Interviews of PCWA management staff and board member
- Review of current documents: 2015 Budget, 2013 Audit, 2014 draft Audit (portion only), 2015-19 Capital Investment Program (CIP), and PCWA Resolution 08-16 and accompanying Policy
- Review of information available on the PCWA web page including the Act, and, State Water Control Board (SWRCB) approved contract between PCWA and Westlands Irrigation District
- Media reports and PCWA Update newsletters

Facts

- Clean water for all Placer County residents is necessary to insure the health and welfare of the entire County.
- Pursuant to PCWA Act § 81-15.2, "Sec. 15.2 - The Board may by resolution create an advisory council for any zone to assist and advise the board on all matters pertaining to that zone." PCWA has not utilized this provision to date.
- PCWA's territory is contiguous with the boundaries of Placer County. However, PCWA does not provide water service to all residents in Placer County. Water services are provided to the balance of the county by other water suppliers.
- The December 31, 2014 PCWA draft Audit for 2014, shows \$61 million of Operating Revenues and \$49 million of Operating Expenses (excluding depreciation). In addition, Non-operating Income of \$32 million and Capital Contributions of \$14 million were received by PCWA during 2014. The Net Position increased \$4.5 million (2013 Audit) and \$35.7 million (2014 Audit).

- PCWA is an independent governmental entity with an elected Board that appears to have done an admirable job of managing their water and infrastructure assets for its rate payers.
- PCWA generates revenue from the sale of water and electricity.
- PCWA's Capital Investment Plan (CIP) is ongoing. Already completed projects include new water plants, tanks, pipelines, and extensive renewal and replacement of aging infrastructure of its canal and treated water systems.
- PCWA Board Resolution 08-16 sets forth policy that cash distributions from the sale of electricity are to be used toward water-related projects. This policy is also used as a template for PCWA's use of capital funds. One of the policy objectives is: "*Development of new or extension of existing water systems to serve existing homes, neighborhood and communities that do not have adequate domestic water supplies.*"
- PCWA receives water from PG&E and has water rights directly from the American River, including Folsom Reservoir. PCWA is negotiating with the US Bureau of Reclamation for Central Valley Water Project water (delivery from the Sacramento River to southwest portions of Placer County that are planned for future growth).
- PCWA staff is currently preparing a Water Master Plan, to be completed by the end of 2016 or early 2017.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. PCWA is a well-managed special district agency and uses its water and electrical assets to the advantage of its rate payers.
- F2. The ongoing reality of drought and reduced water inflows into all water districts serving Placer County residents and businesses is requiring PCWA to reevaluate how all county residents are served with water.
- F3. During the ongoing drought PCWA may benefit from utilizing advisory councils as provided by the Act.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. A significant portion of revenue from the sale of surplus water and some of the net revenues from the sale of electricity be used to extend delivery of potable water to neighborhoods and communities not currently served by PCWA.
- R2. Consideration be given to potential or emergency needs of existing underserved areas within Placer County in the Water Master Plan being prepared by PCWA.
- R3. For public water systems not currently served by PCWA, the Water Master Plan should include the opportunity to connect their water service to PCWA. PCWA should make emergency financial aid available for this purpose.
- R4. PCWA form zone advisory councils pursuant to PCWA Act § 81-15.2.

Request for Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
PCWA Board of Directors Placer County Water Agency P. O. Box 6570 Auburn, CA 95604	R1 – R4	September 22, 2015
Mr. Joseph Parker Director of Financial Services Placer County Water Agency P. O. Box 6570 Auburn, CA 9560	R1 – R4	September 22, 2015



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Review of Placer County Government and Special District/Agency Websites

Review of Placer County Government and Special District/Agency Websites

Summary

The California Public Records Act (CPRA) requires full disclosure of actions taken by elected officials and public access to all public records, with some limited exceptions. Although not required by CPRA, the 2014-2015 Grand Jury (Grand Jury) holds that the public has come to expect such records are available, or can be made available, through government and agency websites.

The Grand Jury investigated if, and to what extent, Placer County, local cities and special districts were providing these records on their websites. A survey of county, city and special districts websites was conducted by the Grand Jury. Websites for the following entities were included in the survey:

County & Cities

- Placer County
- City of Auburn
- City of Colfax
- City of Lincoln
- Town of Loomis
- City of Rocklin
- City of Roseville

Special Districts/Agency

- Northstar Community Service District
- San Juan Water District
- Placer County Water Agency
- South Placer Municipal Utility District
- Truckee-Tahoe Airport District

Survey results indicated that all the agencies had functioning websites and, through them, the public has access to an extensive array of useful information. Agendas, records of public meetings, budgets, access to governmental functions, and general information on services, taxes, contact information, helpful links and more were found to be available to varying degrees on the websites.

The Grand Jury commends all the entities surveyed for their efforts to make records easily available to the public through their websites. However, as good as the websites are, the Grand Jury found several areas for improvement.

The Grand Jury found that a lack of consistency in websites makes locating similar information on different websites difficult and time consuming. It is recommended that a Placer county inter-

agency committee should be convened to establish a best-practices guide for city and county websites.

Some of the websites contain outdated information of questionable value to the public. It is recommended that all documents and information on government and special district websites be subject to an annual review to assure all information is still current and pertinent.

The Grand Jury found that none of the surveyed websites posted operating policies covering employee travel and use of entity owned assets, such as vehicles, credit cards, cell phones and computers. The Grand Jury recommends that these policies be available on the websites. In addition, many of the websites should improve in presenting information on opportunities to bid on government contracts and in displaying the results of such bids.

It was found that some websites included links to make CPRA public documents requests. The Grand Jury recommends that all the websites include this capability.

Additional information on the survey, the Grand Jury findings and all the recommendation details are included in the following pages and in Attachment A.

Background

The California Public Records Act (CPRA) was signed into law in 1968. CPRA is designed to give the public access to information in possession of public agencies. Although there are some specific exceptions, the act generally requires immediate access to public records at all times during business hours. CPRA defines public records as:

“The public may inspect or obtain a copy of identifiable public records. Writings held by state or local government are public records. A writing includes all forms of recorded information that currently exist or that may exist in the future. The essence of the CPRA is to provide access to information, not merely documents and files.”¹

When CPRA was signed into law, the Internet was not yet available. The use of websites to distribute information to the public was not envisioned. Currently, the public takes the Internet and websites, whether business or government, for granted and relies on them to get information.

¹ California Attorney General’s Office, “Summary of the California Public Records Act 2004”, p.3, http://ag.ca.gov/publications/summary_public_records_act.pdf

With the dramatic rise of the Internet over the past two decades, the public’s approach to gathering information has changed. For many in the public, the Internet is utilized first to try and find information, and only as a last resort will they visit a physical office. It seems consistent with “the spirit of the CPRA”, that virtually all public records would be accessible via government and agency websites. The Grand Jury was interested in learning to what extent Placer County, local cities and special districts have migrated their records to websites and enabled easy online access to information on governance and finances.

Investigation Methods

In order to assess the extent of information available on government websites, the Grand Jury performed online reviews of the websites for the following entities:

County & Cities

- Placer County
- City of Auburn
- City of Colfax
- City of Lincoln
- Town of Loomis
- City of Rocklin
- City of Roseville

Special Districts/Agency

- Northstar Community Service District
- San Juan Water District
- Placer County Water Agency
- South Placer Municipal Utility District
- Truckee-Tahoe Airport District

The purpose of the online survey was to replicate the actions of the public in trying to access records through agency websites without having to make contact with the agency. The survey was designed to determine to what extent records that would be of interest to the public, including meeting agendas, minutes, audits, operating policies and other information, were available and easily accessible, through the websites. This information was considered by the Grand Jury to be pertinent to providing the public an opportunity to monitor the functioning of government “online” using the Internet and agency websites.

From October to December 2014, jurors independently completed a standardized survey questionnaire for each agency website. The survey focused on assessing the online availability of agendas, records of public meetings, operating policies, budgets, audits and annual reports. The data collected included whether desired documents could be located, how easy or difficult the information was to locate and the time required to navigate the website while trying to locate the desired documents. In trying to locate the information, both the website menus and the website search function were utilized.

Facts

The Grand Jury determined the following facts:

- CPRA does not require the subject documents to be available online.
- All entities surveyed have websites containing information of value to the public.
- Although the websites vary, some of them have more of a focus on general community information (i.e. visitor info, weather, schools, etc.) than on government CPRA information.
- Some websites contain extensive historical information such as economic reports, statistical information on labor forces, housing, business, etc.
- There is a lack of consistency in the organization of information on the various websites.
- The Special District Leadership Foundation has developed a best-practices checklist for what information should be included on a Special District/Agency website.² The Grand Jury was unable to locate any similar guide for cities and counties.
- Some websites include outdated information.
- None of the websites surveyed listed posting dates or expiration dates for information and documents posted.
- Most websites include agendas, minutes of meetings, budgets and financial reports.
- One agency website does not have current agenda and minutes.
- Some of the websites provide video records of meetings.
- Video recordings of county commission and city council meetings allow the public to view the entire proceeding.
- None of the websites have posting dates or sunset dates on information or posted documents.
- Only the Placer County website contains a summary of actions approved by the Board.
- Progress and performance reports on financial results versus budgets are generally only available as agenda exhibits.
- Only four websites provide on-going operating reports regarding expenditures vs. budget.
- All but three websites provide access to opportunities to bid on contracts. There is no consistency in displaying bid awards.

² Special District Leadership Foundation, “District Transparency Certificate of Excellence Checklist”, p.1, http://media.wix.com/ugd/e1128e_4ad2fb79879944249dfc30c4a71b8ba3.pdf

- None of the websites include current operating policies, such as employee and elected officials travel, use of government owned vehicles, computers, cell-phones and credit cards; nor do they include policies on purchasing and contract bidding processes.
- Only two of the websites included access to make public CPRA document requests.
- Only the Placer County website provided a link to the Grand Jury website to allow easy access to the Grand Jury complaint form “Confidential Citizen Complaint”.

The survey results are shown in Tables 1 and 2 on the following pages.

Table 1 - County, Cities and Towns

	Placer County	City of Auburn	City of Colfax	City of Lincoln	Town of Loomis	City of Rocklin	City of Roseville
Agendas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Calendars	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minutes	Yes, +V	Yes, +V	Yes, A	Yes, A	Yes, NW	Yes, NW	Yes, A
Public Records Request	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
<u>Current Financial Reports & Audits</u>							
Annual Financial Statement	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Budget	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Operating Statements (Expenditures vs. Budget)	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Independent Auditors Report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<u>Operating Policies</u>							
Contracting	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Bid Opportunities	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Bid Awards	Yes, OA	Yes, OA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, OA	Yes, OA
Travel	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Vehicle Use	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Computer, Phone & Credit Card Use	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table Key

Yes Available on the website
 No Not available on the website
 +V Meeting video record available
 A Consent calendar action items are considered minutes
 NW Link Not Working
 OA Only specified in the agenda/minutes

Table 2 - Special Districts/Agency

	Northstar Community Service District	Placer County Water Agency	San Juan Water District	South Placer Municipal Utility District	Truckee Tahoe Airport District
Agendas	Yes, NC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Calendars	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minutes	Yes, NC	Yes, A	Yes, A	Yes, A	Yes, A
Public Records Request	No	No	No	Yes	No
<u>Current Financial Reports & Audits</u>					
Annual Financial Statement	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
FY Budget	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Operating Statements (Expenditures vs. Budget)	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Independent Auditors Report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<u>Operating Policies</u>					
Contracting	No	No	No	No	No
Bid Opportunities	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Bid Awards	N/A	Yes, OA	Yes, OA	Yes, OA	Yes, OA
Travel	No	No	No	No	No
Vehicle Use	No	No	No	No	No
Computer, Phone & Credit Card Use	No	No	No	No	No

Table Key	Yes	Available from website
	No	Not available from website
	+V	Meeting video record available
	A	Agenda approved actions considered minutes
	N/A	No information available
	NC	Information not current
	OA	Only specified in the agenda/minutes

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. The websites provide a large variety of information, making many documents readily available to the public without necessitating a CPRA request or physical visit. This information includes data such as:
- locations
 - services
 - business hours
 - governance
 - fees
 - taxes
 - licenses
 - annual financial reports and
 - other governmental or special agency procedures.
- F2. Due to the lack of consistency between websites, locating similar information on different websites is time consuming and exasperating.
- F3. The inclusion of outdated information on the website, besides being of limited value, clutters the website and calls into question other postings on the website. An example is that one website includes labor force statistics and economic reports from 2006.
- F4. The lack of document information, including posting dates and sunset dates, decreases confidence in the validity of data found on the websites.
- F5. Some meeting minutes are not being posted in a timely manner.
- F6. It is generally more difficult to distinguish the minutes when they are embedded in agendas or in videos, rather than posted separately.
- F7. Posting of summarized minutes (abstracts), or a summary of actions taken, would improve the public's experience in trying to understand what governance actions were taken, or what decisions were made or deferred.
- F8. Video recordings of proceedings are beneficial to the public's understanding of their representatives actions in council and board meetings.
- F9. The ability to locate current financial results is improved when financial performance reports are directly posted on the website.

- F10. Lack of consistency in posting of bid opportunities and awards on websites makes it difficult for the public to discern available contracting opportunities and what awards have been approved.
- F11. The public's access to operating policies, applying to elected officials and employees, would be enhanced if these documents were available through the website.
- F12. A link on the website to fill out CPRA document requests improves the public's ability to submit requests.
- F13. A link to the Grand Jury website where the Grand Jury complaint form "Confidential Citizen Complaint" is available enables public access for registering a confidential complaint on line.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. A website best-practices guide be considered for development in the next 12 months by representatives from Placer County and the Cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville and the town of Loomis.
- R2. All Special Districts/Agencies should assure that their websites, at a minimum, meet the best- practices checklist from the Special District Leadership Foundation.
- R3. All website information should be subject to annual reviews to ensure information is still pertinent.
- R4. All documents have a posting and sunset (required removal) date that triggers an automatic archiving of the document.
- R5. All city and special districts webpages should include current written minutes, which include a summary of actions taken and decisions made.
- R6. Posting of complete video recordings of meetings should be investigated to determine if it is economically feasible.
- R7. All websites should include direct links to financial reports, including on-going progress and performance reports on financial results versus budgets.

- R8. Placer County, City of Auburn, City of Colfax, and all special district/agency websites should include access to the policy, process, and posting of current contracting opportunities. Results of bid awards should also be posted.
- R9. Current operating policies covering travel and use of entity owned assets, including vehicles, cell phones, computers, and credit cards should be available on websites or by online CPRA requests.
- R10. Placer County, Auburn and Colfax, along with all special districts, should incorporate into their websites a link to make CPRA Public Records Requests.
- R11. Websites should include a link to the Grand Jury website where the public can access the Grand Jury complaint form “Confidential Citizen Complaint”.

Tables 3 and 4 on the following pages specify which recommendations are applicable to each surveyed entity.

Attachment A demonstrates the linkages between the multiple facts, findings and recommendations in this report.

Table 3 – Recommendations for County, Cities and Towns

	Recommendations										
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11
Placer County	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	
City of Auburn	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
City of Colfax	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
City of Lincoln	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X
Town of Loomis	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X
City of Rocklin	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X
City of Roseville	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X

Key: X - indicates this recommendation applies.

Table 4 – Recommendations for Special Districts/Agency

	Recommendations											
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	
Northstar Community Service District		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Placer County Water Agency		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Juan Water District		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
South Placer Municipal Utility District		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Truckee Tahoe Airport District		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Key: X - indicates this recommendation applies.

Request For Responses

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Mr. David Boesch Placer County CEO 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R1, R3, R4, R7-R10	August 24, 2015
Mr. Keith Nesbitt Mayor, City of Auburn 1225 Lincoln Way Auburn, CA 95603	R1, R3-R5, R7-R11	August 24, 2015
Mr. Kim Douglass Mayor, City of Colfax 33 South Main St. Colfax, CA 95713	R1, R3-R11	August 24, 2015
Mr. Paul Joiner Mayor, City of Lincoln 600 Sixth St. Lincoln, CA 95648	R1, R3-R7, R9, R11	August 24, 2015
Ms. Rhonda Morillas Mayor, Town of Loomis 3665 Taylor Road Loomis, CA 95650	R1, R3-R7, R9, R11	August 24, 2015
Mr. George Magnuson Mayor, City of Rocklin 3970 Rocklin Rd. Rocklin, CA 95677	R1, R3-R7, R9, R11	August 24, 2015
Ms. Carol Garcia Mayor, City of Roseville 311 Vernon St. Roseville, CA 95678	R1, R3-R7, R9, R11	August 24, 2015

Board of Directors Northstar Community Service District 908 Northstar Drive Northstar, CA 96161	R2 – R11	September 22, 2015
Board of Directors San Juan Water District 9935 Auburn Folsom Road, Granite Bay, CA 95746	R2 – R11	September 22, 2015
Board of Directors Placer County Water Agency P.O. Box 6570, Auburn, CA 95604	R2 – R11	September 22, 2015
Board of Directors South Placer Municipal Utility District 5807 Springview Drive Rocklin, CA 95677	R2 – R11	September 22, 2015
Board of Directors Truckee Tahoe Airport District 10356 Truckee Airport Road Truckee, CA 96161	R2 – R11	September 22, 2015

<i>Facts</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>The Grand Jury recommends that:</i>
<p>CPRA does not require the subject documents to be available on-line.</p>	<p>F1- The websites provide a huge amount of information, making many documents readily available to the public without necessitating a CPRA request or physical visit. This information includes data such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • locations, • services, • business hours, • governance, • fees, • taxes, • licenses, • annual financial reports and, • other governmental or special agency procedures. 	<p>No recommendation needed.</p>
<p>All entities surveyed have websites containing information of value to the public.</p>		
<p>Although the websites vary, some of them have more of a focus on general community information (i.e. visitor info, weather, schools, etc.) than on government CPRA information.</p>		
<p>Some sites contain extensive historical information such as economic reports, statistical information on labor forces, housing, business, etc.</p>		

<i>Facts</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>The Grand Jury recommends that:</i>
<p>There is a lack of consistency in the organization of information on the various websites.</p>	<p>F2. Due to the lack of consistency between websites, locating similar information on different websites is time consuming and frustrating.</p>	<p>R1. A website best practices guide be considered for development in the next 12 months. by representatives from Placer County and the Cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville and the town of Loomis.</p> <p>R2. All Special Districts/Agencies should assure that their websites, at a minimum, meet the best practices checklist from the Special District Leadership Foundation.</p>
<p>Although the websites vary, some of them have more of a focus on general community information (i.e. visitor info, weather, schools, etc.) than on government CPRA information.</p>		
<p>The Special District Leadership Foundation has developed a best practices checklist for what information should be included on a Special District/Agency website. The GJ was unable to locate any similar guide for cities and counties.</p>		
<p>Some sites contain extensive historical information such as economic reports, statistical information on labor forces, housing, business, etc.</p>		
<p>Some sites include outdated information.</p>	<p>F3. The inclusion of outdated information on the website, besides being of limited value, clutters the website and calls into question other postings on the website. An example is that one website includes labor force statistics and economic reports from 2006.</p>	<p>R3. All website information should be subject to annual reviews to ensure information is still pertinent.</p>

<i>Facts</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>The Grand Jury recommends that:</i>
None of the websites have posting dates or sunset dates on information or posted documents.	F4. The lack of document information, including posting dates and sunset dates, decreases confidence in the validity of data found on the websites.	R4. All documents have a posting and sunset (required removal) date that triggers an automatic archiving of the document.
All sites include agendas, minutes of meetings, budgets and financial reports.	F5. Some minutes are not being posted in a timely manner.	R5. All city and special districts webpages should include current written minutes, which include a summary of actions taken and decisions made.
One agency website does not have current agenda and minutes.	F6. It is generally more difficult to distinguish the minutes when they are embedded in agendas or in videos, rather than posted separately	
Some of the sites provide video records of meetings.	F7. Posting of summarized minutes (abstracts), or a summary of actions taken, would improve the public’s experience in trying understand what governance actions were taken, or what decisions were made .	
Only the Placer County website contains a summary of actions approved by the Board.		
Some of the sites provide video records of meetings.	F8. Video recordings of proceedings are beneficial to the public’s understanding of their representatives actions in council and board meetings	R6. Posting of complete video recordings of meetings should be investigated to determine if it is economically feasible .
Video recordings of county board and city council meetings allow the public to view the entire proceeding.		

<i>Facts</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>The Grand Jury recommends that:</i>
<p>Progress and performance reports on financial results versus budgets are generally only available as agenda exhibits.</p> <p>Only four websites provide on-going operating reports regarding expenditures vs. budget.</p>	<p>F9. The ability to locate current financial results is improved when operating reports and financial performance reports are directly posted on the website.</p>	<p>R7. All websites should include direct links to financial reports, including on-going progress and performance reports on financial results versus budgets .</p>
<p>All but three sites provide access to opportunities to bid on contracts. There is no consistency in displaying bid awards.</p>	<p>F10. Lack of consistency in posting of bid opportunities and awards, on websites, makes it difficult for the public to discern available contracting opportunities and what awards have been approved.</p>	<p>R8. Placer County, Auburn and Colfax and all special district/agency web sites should include access to the policy, process and posting of current contracting opportunities. Results of bid awards should also be posted.</p>
<p>None of the websites include current operating policies, such as employee and elected officials travel, use of government owned vehicles, computers, cell-phones and credit cards; nor do they include policies on purchasing and contract bidding processes.</p>	<p>F11. The public’s access to operating policies, applying to elected officials and employees, would be enhanced if these documents were available through the website.</p>	<p>R9. Current operating policies covering travel and use of entity owned assets including vehicles, cell-phones, computers, and credit cards should be available on websites or by on-line CPRA requests.</p>
<p>Only two of the websites included access to make public CPRA document requests.</p>	<p>F12. A link on the website to fill out CPRA document requests, improves the public’s ability to submit requests.</p>	<p>R10. Placer County, Auburn and Colfax should incorporate into their websites a link to make CPRA Public Records Requests.</p>

<i>Facts</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>The Grand Jury recommends that:</i>
Only the Placer County website provided a link to the Grand Jury website to allow easy access to the Grand Jury complaint form “Confidential Citizen Complaint”.	F13. A link to the Grand Jury website where the GJ complaint form “Confidential Citizen Complaint” is available enables public access for registering a confidential complaint on line.	R11. Websites should include a link for the public to make a Grand Jury complaint.



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Temporary Emergency Homeless Shelter

Temporary Emergency Homeless Shelter

Summary

The homeless situation in Placer County has been under review since 2004 by the Board of Supervisors (BOS). In 2004 the Placer Consortium on Homeless and Affordable Housing Committee presented to the BOS a ten-year plan to end homelessness in Placer County. As of December of 2014, there was no temporary emergency homeless shelter in Auburn. Faced with the prospect of people living out in the open during a cold and wet winter, immediate action for a shelter, even if temporary, appeared in order. A number of citizens stepped forward with offers of resources and a proposal to repurpose two buildings on the DeWitt Center Campus as a temporary shelter. These buildings, which had recently been used to house minimum-security prisoners, appeared to be a ready solution to provide temporary shelter for the homeless.

When the issue appeared to stall before the BOS in December 2014, the Grand Jury decided to investigate. During the course of the investigation, the BOS held a special meeting in which they requested an expedited review and analysis by County staff. At the time of this writing, the BOS has given approval for a temporary shelter at the DeWitt Center with a conditional use permit for ninety (90) days. The need for a permanent solution remains.

Background

In September 2014, the BOS commissioned a study to identify the needs of the homeless in Placer County. The study, expected in March 2015, would not come in time to help the homeless people. In December 2014, the homeless were camped in the fields and parking lot adjacent to the DeWitt Government Center in North Auburn.

As of this writing, numerous homeless people are camped in the DeWitt Center fields, parking lots, and under buildings. During December 2014, a month with record rainfall, the homeless had no choice but to huddle together under the awnings and decks of the DeWitt buildings in a vain attempt to stay dry.

The Grand Jury became aware of widespread community sentiment to address this urgent need. One group, Right Hand Auburn, working in conjunction with Volunteers of America, came forward with a proposal to operate a shelter in a recently vacated barracks on the DeWitt government campus. The building in question had been used to house minimum security inmates and appeared relatively well equipped to handle the basic needs of the homeless. Concerned citizens attempted to get the BOS to consider the matter at their December meeting. Initially, the issue did not appear on the January 2015 BOS agenda and the Grand Jury moved to investigate the homeless shelter issue. Ultimately, the BOS called a special meeting for January 22, 2015, to address this issue.

Investigation Methods

- Interviews
- On-site visits
- Attendance at Board of Supervisor meetings
- Reviewed the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in Placer County, dated 2004
- Reviewed various news articles dating from September 2014 in the Auburn Journal and Sacramento Bee

Facts

- In 2004 the Placer Consortium on Homeless and Affordable Housing committee presented a ten-year plan to the Board of Supervisors to end homelessness in Placer County. The plan covered the years 2004-2014.
- As of the December of 2014, there was no county sponsored permanent location dedicated to sheltering the homeless in Auburn.
- In September 2014 the Placer County Board of Supervisors allocated \$50,000 to fund a study of the county's homeless needs by consultant Robert Marbut. The results of the study were presented to the Board of Supervisors on April 7, 2015.
- As of the end of 2014, Right Hand Auburn was supporting approximately 80 homeless people in the Auburn area. A number of homeless were encamped in the field and parking lot at the DeWitt government campus, many of whom were taking shelter under the awnings and steps of the buildings there to avoid the weather.

- According to the Marbut study, there are 540 homeless people in Placer County.
- At the December 9, 2014 BOS meeting many citizens voiced the need for a homeless shelter. Citing concern for adhering to the Brown Act¹, the BOS could not take action on this matter because it was not on the published agenda.
- On December 11, 2014, Placer County worked with the American Red Cross and The Gathering Inn, to open space at the Gold Country and Placer County Fairgrounds as emergency shelter from a single large storm. In addition, the day time operating hours for the Welcome Center at the DeWitt Center were extended, and the Placer County Animal Shelter was made available as a place to shelter pets during the storm.
- Two organizations, Right Hand Auburn, Inc. and Volunteers of America offered resources and experience to administer a temporary emergency homeless shelter.
- There are two buildings (303A and 303B) known as the “Barracks” on the Dewitt campus. One is totally empty and the other partially empty. They were formerly used for minimum security inmates until the relocation of the inmates to the Santucci Justice Center in May of 2014.
- There are county services located on the Dewitt campus such as “The Welcome Center” (a day program for homeless), Health and Human Services and the medical clinic that are currently utilized by homeless citizens.
- The BOS held a special meeting to address the issue on January 22, 2015. Under consideration was the proposed use of the Barracks as a temporary emergency shelter. At the meeting, the BOS directed staff to set a public hearing for February 3, 2015 to “consider the issuance of a temporary use permit for buildings 303A and 303B” (Barracks).
- On February 3, 2015 the BOS approved a temporary conditional use permit for use of the Barracks as a temporary, emergency shelter.

¹ Ralph M. Brown Act, California Government Code § 54950-54963

- On February 24, 2015, the BOS authorized the Chairman to complete a site access agreement with Right Hand Auburn, Inc. for the operation of a temporary homeless shelter.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. In December 2014, the homeless people camping at the DeWitt campus in harsh weather conditions represented an urgent, unmet need for temporary shelter.
- F2. The Barracks seemed to be in acceptable condition and relatively simple to convert to a temporary emergency shelter for homeless individuals.
- F3. In January and February 2015, the BOS began to address the issue by calling a special meeting and a public hearing.
- F4. The need for a permanent solution to the homeless situation continues.

Conclusion

In ten years of attempting to address the homeless situation, Placer County has not produced a permanent solution to this compelling issue. In September 2014, the BOS commissioned a study to identify the needs of the homeless in Placer County. The results of the study were presented to the Board of Supervisors on April 7, 2015. However, in December 2014, the homeless population needed immediate shelter due to inclement weather. At the time of this writing, the BOS gave approval for a temporary shelter on the DeWitt campus with a temporary conditional use permit for ninety (90) days. The need for a permanent solution remains.

Through the good work of Right Hand Auburn, Volunteers of America and others, it appears that tangible work on a temporary housing solution for the homeless has begun. The Grand Jury commends these organizations for stepping up to assist our homeless citizens by providing a safe, warm place to stay. The Grand Jury acknowledges the BOS for their actions on this matter and, in particular, the county staff for their expedited efforts.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. An evaluation of the use of the DeWitt Barracks as emergency homeless housing should be conducted at the end of the 90-day period for the conditional-use permit, and on a recurring schedule thereafter.
- R2. The BOS and county staff should promptly review Marbut Consulting's final report to determine its impact on the need for a temporary emergency shelter. In addition, the BOS should monitor the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan referred to in the final report.
- R3. The 2015-2016 Grand Jury continue to monitor the BOS progress on implementing a more permanent solution to the homeless issue in Placer County.

Request for Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Mr. David Boesch Placer County CEO 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R1, R2	August 24, 2015
Placer County Board of Supervisors 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R1, R2	September 22, 2015

Copies Sent to:

Ms. Mary Dietrich
Placer County Director of Facility Services
11476 C Ave.
Auburn CA 95603



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

A Five-Year Plan for Meeting the Needs of a Growing Senior Population in Placer County

**A Continuation of a 2013-2014
Grand Jury Investigation**

A Five-Year Plan for Meeting the Needs of a Growing Senior Population in Placer County

A Continuation of a 2013-2014 Grand Jury Investigation

Summary

This report is a continuation of a recommendation from the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report on the DeWitt Center Costco Lease and its impact on seniors.

Finding 4 of last year's Grand Jury Report identified the need for the county to develop a five-year plan that will address the needs of its predicted growing senior and disabled populations. The Board of Supervisors (BOS) response to that finding appears to be incomplete.

Recommendation 2 of last year's report suggested that the county create a five-year plan for the creation of an umbrella organization that will bring together all governmental and not-for-profit organizations providing supportive services to disabled and senior populations. The purpose was to link all stakeholders that provide needed and supportive senior and disabled services under one entity. The County Director of Health and Human Services (HHS) would coordinate this effort.

The BOS response to this recommendation was that "this recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future". This response is lacking in specificity and could be considered a violation of Penal Code § 933.05, subdivision (b)(2), as it lacks a time frame for implementation.

Background

The 2014-2015 Grand Jury reviewed the County Board of Supervisors (BOS) and county staff responses to the DeWitt Center report. The 2014-2015 Grand Jury felt it was important to re-address Finding 4, the BOS response to Finding 4, Recommendation 2, and the BOS response to Recommendation 2.

Investigation Methods

- Interviews
- Review of the BOS agendas
- BOS actions in 2014
- Research

Facts

- Finding 4 of the 2013-2104 Final Report states:

“The Grand Jury found no evidence of any long term (5 years or more) planning on the part of the County to identify the needs of the growing senior population, and the consolidation of resources necessary to satisfy these needs.”

- The Board of Supervisors Response to Finding 4 was:

“The BOS disagrees with this finding. The BOS established the Older Adult Advisory Commission in 2004, in order to provide older adults with a voice in community matters. This committee advises the BOS, as well as Health and Human Services (H&HS), on the creation and delivery of services for this demographic. The BOS also recently approved \$100,000 for a feasibility study of a multi-generational facility.”

- Recommendation 2 of the 2013-2014 Final Report states:

“Placer County move proactively to create a five-year plan for the creation of an umbrella organization that will bring together all governmental and non-profit organizations providing supportive senior services under one entity to county seniors, both able and disabled; and that the County Director of H&HS coordinate this effort on behalf of the County.”

- The Board of Supervisors Response to Recommendation 2:

“This recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The BOS agrees that it is important to move forward to create a plan in order to address the needs of the increasing population of seniors. The Placer County H&HS will participate in this effort along with the key stakeholder organizations; including the Placer County Older Adult Advisory Commission and Area 4 Agency on

Aging. The BOS does not, however, believe that there needs to be the creation of a new, potentially duplicative umbrella organization, and instead suggests that working closely with existing organizations and groups dedicated to serving seniors would be a more effective and sustainable strategy.”

- Nevada County has joined with Riverside, Orange, San Diego, San Francisco, and Humboldt counties in taking the steps to create a collaboration of agencies providing services to older and disabled persons. The California Health and Human Services Agency has published and presented ADRC models. There is an abundance of information regarding how ADRCs are formed, how well they work, and why an ADRC model could be developed in Placer County.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. The Older Adult Advisory Commission (OAAC) is advisory only. It is a county-wide volunteer advisory commission, which has no budget, meets monthly, reports to the BOS once yearly, and has no direct authority to act. The OAAC has been given no responsibility for creating a five-year plan, nor does it have the resource capacity to do so. It primarily functions as an interagency coordinator and information sharing group.
- F2. The BOS agrees that the needs of the county’s seniors and disabled population ought to be addressed by a plan. Stating that it will happen in the future lacks the specificity that the response requires.
- F3. It is not clear how the \$100,000 contract for the multi-generational facility feasibility study would fit into a five-year plan in terms of service to the senior and disabled population.

Conclusion

The Board of Supervisors and county staff need to reconsider their response to 2013-2014 Grand Jury Final Report with reference to applicable Penal Code section(s). The focus should be on the necessity for a five-year plan to meet the needs of a growing older and disabled population in the county.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that the BOS, in developing the five-year plan, include the following actions:

- R1. County staff should research collaboration models such as Nevada County's Aging Disability Resource Connection (ADRC) Program.
- R2. With county staff recommendations, the BOS should designate an existing agency to take the lead, to seek grant funding, and to move the ADRC model forward to service providers.
- R3. Involve the Director of HHS as a proponent of the ADRC model and have key staff research the model in order to become subject matter experts in how to adapt the ADRC model to meet Placer County needs within the next fiscal year.
- R4. If it is determined that the ADRC model is not appropriate as a five-year plan for Placer County, then the county should implement another model for providing necessary single points of entry into a long-term support and services system for older adults and people with disabilities.
- R5. Provide a time frame for the implementation of these recommendations in accordance with subdivision (b)(2) of Penal Code § 933.05.

Request for Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Placer County Board of Supervisors 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R1 – R5	September 22, 2015
Mr. David Boesch Placer County CEO 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R1 - R5	August 24, 2015

Copies Sent to:

Mr. Jeff S. Brown
Director, Placer County
Health and Human Services
3091 County Center Dr. #290
Auburn, CA, 95603



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Anti-Bullying Policies in Middle and High Schools: Are They Effective?

Follow-up to the Responses to the 2013-2014 Report

Anti-Bullying Policies in Middle and High Schools: Are They Effective

Follow-Up to the Responses to the 2013-2014 Report

Summary

The Grand Jury reviewed the Placer County schools responses to the 2013-2014 Grand Jury's recommendations on anti-bullying policies. In particular, the Grand jury was interested in determining if the school districts are able to gauge the effectiveness of their policies.

There are nineteen school districts within Placer County. Each district has demographic differences in geographical size, number of students, and types of policies covering bullying. School administrators recognize the bullying problem and have implemented anti-bullying policies and programs to conform to state law. Not all schools have a mechanism for the anonymous reporting of bullying. While there are data gathering systems available, e.g. Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) discussed below, to track behavior changes, these systems are not fully utilized throughout the county. Most of the districts that have data collection systems have not had sufficient time to develop statistically valid data to gauge the effectiveness of their programs.

The Grand Jury recommends that the districts continue developing reporting mechanisms and collecting data to measure the effectiveness of their programs. All schools should have a plan for anonymous reporting.

Background

Bullying and cyber-bullying continue to be a pervasive problem in middle schools and high schools in Placer County. Persistent bullying can cause significant and long term problems, not only for the victims and their families, but also for the perpetrators. Sometimes bullying ends with tragic results.

The 2013-2014 Placer County Grand Jury investigated what anti-bullying policies and procedures are being used in Placer County schools and whether those policies are effective in

reducing the bullying problem. That report on that investigation included seven significant findings and seven recommendations.

The responses to that 2013-2014 report indicated that there is a wide variety of anti-bullying policies and programs in place across the schools in the county. However, the responses were vague as to what was being done to evaluate the effectiveness of those programs and to provide a safe environment for reporting bullying.

The 2014-2015 Grand Jury followed up on the responses to recommendations 1 and 5 of the previous Grand Jury Report.

Recommendation 1 of that report is that:

“High schools and middle schools provide an environment that is safe for reporting both bullying and cyber-bullying.”

Recommendation 5 of that report is that:

“Schools should develop a comprehensive means to evaluate the effectiveness of their anti-bullying programs and policies. Schools should conduct semi-annual anonymous surveys of the student body to measure the effectiveness of anti-bullying programs. In addition to gathering information regarding the amount and type of bullying that the student has experienced, the survey should seek student perceptions of the attitudes of teachers and administrators toward bullying.”

The current Grand Jury wanted to know:

- How the schools are measuring the effectiveness of their programs.
- If changes were made to the Placer County schools policies and procedures to assure a safe environment for reporting bullying.

Definitions:

Bullying may include any physical or verbal act or conduct by an individual or group of individuals, including communications made in writing or electronically, that a student has or may reasonably be predicted to experience fear of harm to their person or property, a

detriment to their physical or mental health, an interference with their academic performance, or with their ability to participate in or benefit from the services, activities or privileges provided by a school or county office program.

Cyber-bullying may include the creation or transmission of harassing communications, direct threats, or other harmful texts, sounds or images on the Internet, social media, or other technologies using a telephone, computer or any wireless communication device. Cyber-bullying also includes breaking into another person's electronic account and assuming that person's identity in order to damage that person's reputation. Source: Placer County Office of Education Policy SR 5131.2 (a).

Investigation Methods

The investigation was performed through interviews, reviewing documents and the responses to the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report. Specifically, the 2014-2015 Grand Jury:

- Interviewed the leadership of the Placer County Office of Education (PCOE), several school district superintendents, as well as high school and middle school principals.
- Reviewed policies regarding bullying and harassment provided by school administrators and County Office of Education management.
- Reviewed 2013-14 Grand Jury report and the 13 responses received in response thereto.

One member of the Grand Jury was recused to avoid any conflict of interest and the appearance of bias.

Facts

- Placer County Office of Education has updated its anti-bullying policies.
- Schools are aware of bullying as an issue; some schools are ahead of others. In particular, 49 schools in Placer County have implemented PBIS. There are 110 public schools in Placer County, including alternative high schools and public charter schools.
- The following school districts have graduated enforcement policies that could result in suspension or expulsion of a student for bullying and/or cyber-bullying:
 1. Placer Union High School District

2. Roseville Joint Union High School District
3. Rocklin Unified School District

- Not all schools have a means for anonymous reporting.
- Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) is a Program developed by the University of Oregon with support from University of North Carolina “to establish the social culture and behavioral supports needed for a school to be an effective learning environment for all students.”¹
- PBIS emphasizes four integrated elements: (a) data for decision making, (b) measurable outcomes supported and evaluated by data, (c) practices with evidence that these outcomes are achievable, and (d) systems that efficiently and effectively support implementation of these practices.
- PBIS has a data collection component that allows schools to generate reports.
- PBIS collects both “behavior data” (who, what, where, when) and “fidelity data” (how the plans are being implemented).
- Schools using PBIS have teams of staff (administrators, certificated, non-certificated, parents) that analyze data to measure the effectiveness of the program and develop solutions to problems.
- For most schools, there has not been enough baseline data collected in PBIS to develop trends showing if the school’s programs are effective in reducing bullying incidents.
- Placer County Juvenile Detention Facility reports that using PBIS has led to a decrease in poor behavior incidents since they began using the program in February, 2013.

¹ Placer County Office of Education, PCOE Board Review “Student Support Services” October 9, 2014,
[http://www.boarddocs.com/ca/pcoe/Board.nsf/files/9PMN7N5CD799/\\$file/PCOE%20Board%20Overview%20of%20PBIS%2010%204%2014.pdf](http://www.boarddocs.com/ca/pcoe/Board.nsf/files/9PMN7N5CD799/$file/PCOE%20Board%20Overview%20of%20PBIS%2010%204%2014.pdf)

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. During interviews, school district personnel indicated that they either have implemented, or are implementing, mechanisms for the safe reporting of bullying and cyber-bullying.
- F2. Some schools do not have a means for anonymous reporting.
- F3. Schools are measuring the effectiveness of the programs, but with a few exceptions, do not yet have enough data to draw statistically valid conclusions.
- F4. Schools are utilizing PBIS to collect behavior data that includes bullying incidents.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. Schools should continue to develop and refine mechanisms for the safe reporting of bullying and cyber-bullying.
- R2. Schools with no provisions for the anonymous reporting of bullying should create them. As part of their response, all schools are to provide a copy of their anonymous bullying reporting policy.
- R3. Schools should continue to measure the effectiveness of their anti-bullying policies and utilize that data to improve school climate, including creating a safe environment for all.
- R4. Schools utilizing PBIS should continue its use and foster its expansion to other schools as training is available.

Request for Responses

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Ms. Gayle Garbolino-Mojica Placer County Supt. Of Schools 360 Nevada Street Auburn, CA 95630	R1, R2, R3, R4	August 24, 2015
Mr. George Sziraki Placer Union High School Dist. Supt. 13000 New Airport Rd. Auburn, CA 95603	R1, R2, R3, R4	September 22, 2015
Mr. Roger Stock Rocklin Unified School Dist. Supt. 2615 Sierra Meadows Dr. Rocklin, CA 95677	R1, R2, R3, R4	September 22, 2015
Mr. Ron Severson Roseville Joint Union High School Dist. Supt. 1750 Cirby Way Roseville, CA 95661	R1, R2, R3, R4	September 22, 2015
Mr. Scott Leaman Western Placer Unified School Dist. Supt. 600 6 th St. Suite 400 Lincoln, CA 95648	R1, R2, R3, R4	September 22, 2015
Mr. Robert Leri Tahoe-Truckee Unified School Dist. Supt. 11603 Donner Pass Rd. Truckee, CA 96161	R1, R2, R3, R4	September 22, 2015



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Placer County Meals on Wheels: A Failure to Communicate

Response to a Response

Placer County Meals on Wheels: A Failure to Communicate

Response to a Response

Summary

This report is a response to and a continuation of a recommendation from the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report on the “Placer County Meals on Wheels: A Failure to Communicate”.

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury recommended that the Board of Supervisors (BOS) should establish a system of communication between the BOS and its appointees to Boards and Commissions. The BOS responded that it agreed with the recommendation; however, it gave no time frame for implementation. California Penal Code § 933.05(b)(2) specifies that when a respondent replies that a recommendation will be implemented in the future, it needs to give a time frame for implementation.

As a part of this follow up, the 2014-2015 Grand Jury (Grand Jury) asked that a member of the BOS be interviewed to discuss the implementation of the BOS response. The BOS member who was contacted by the Grand Jury to be interviewed contacted County Counsel. County Counsel (who acts as counsel for both Grand Jury and the BOS) called the Grand Jury and suggested the BOS member not be interviewed.

In the course of this follow up, the Grand Jury determined that there appears to be an issue regarding BOS cooperation with the work of the Grand Jury.

Background

The 2014-2015 Grand Jury reviewed the BOS response to the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report; “Placer County Meals on Wheels: A Failure to Communicate”. The Grand Jury found the BOS response to be lacking in specificity as required by Penal Code § 933.05(b)(2).

Investigation Methods

- Interviews
- Review of BOS agendas and minutes
- Research

Facts

- Finding 1 of the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report stated *“No documented policy defines the relationship between the BOS and its appointed commission representatives to insure that the BOS receives complete and timely information.”*
- The BOS agreed with Finding 1 of the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report. It replied that *“the county is in the process of clarifying the communication channels between the BOS and its representatives for the future”*.
- Recommendation 1 of the 2013-2014 Grand Jury report stated: *“The Board of Supervisors should establish a documented understanding between itself and its appointees regarding the expected information flow to ensure that it receives complete, timely and accurate information from its appointees. This flow should be bi-directional and conducted on a routine schedule.”*
- The BOS response to Recommendation 1 was, *“This recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The County is in the process of defining the roles of representatives to provide for more effective communication.”*
- California Penal Code, § 933.05(b)(2) states that *“For purposes of subdivision (b) of § 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions: ... (2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.”*
- The Grand Jury attempted to interview a member of the BOS to get information on the implementation status of the recommendation. The BOS member did not respond to the Grand Jury request for an interview.
- In a conversation with the Grand Jury, County Counsel did not endorse the Grand Jury’s request to interview a member of the BOS.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. The BOS response to Recommendation 1 of the 2013-2014 Grand Jury report lacks a time frame for implementation of the recommendation. It is in violation of Penal Code § 933.05(b)(2).

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. The BOS provide a time frame for the implementation of Recommendation 1 of the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report regarding the establishment of a written policy or procedure for information flow between itself and its Board and Commission appointees.

Request for Responses

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Placer County Board of Supervisors 175 Fulweiler Avenue Auburn, CA 95603	R1	September 22, 2015

Copies sent to:

Mr. Gerald Carden
Placer County, County Counsel
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Mr. David Boesch
Placer County CEO
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Transfer of Dewitt Center Enterprise Funds and Its Impact on Citizens

Transfer of DeWitt Center Enterprise Funds and Its Impact on Citizens

Summary

This report traces the paper trail that culminated in the transfer of the reserves in the DeWitt Enterprise Funds into a new Placer County Government Center Internal Services Fund (PCGC-ISF). It also asks the county executives to consider using this new fund as a potential source of the funding of the mandated relocation costs of the non-profit corporation, Seniors First, from the DeWitt Center to a new location in North Auburn. The report also questions the designation of this new fund for the exclusive use of the county for the needs of the DeWitt Government campus.

Background

Recommendation 1 of the 2013–2014 Grand Jury report asked that *“Placer County consider the use of monies from the DeWitt Center Enterprise Funds to offset the cost of relocation of Seniors First as the funds source is monies derived from leases and rental of space at the DeWitt Center. Because the proposed lease with Costco will generate significant income to the County for the next 50 years, this relocation support is warranted”*.

Facility Services responded: *“The Department disagrees with this Recommendation. As noted, the DeWitt Center Enterprise Fund no longer exists and its fund reserves were intended for use for improvements to benefit all of the occupants at the Government Center. The County has assisted the Seniors First relocation by identifying available properties in the local market, the forgiveness of their last months rent, and connection with the Probation Department who is now providing meal preparation for Seniors First”*.

In anticipation of the Costco lease, the Multipurpose Senior Center, Seniors First, and other for-profit and not-for-profit businesses were notified that their current leases would not be renewed in 2015.

The 2014–2015 Grand Jury found that the use of the new PCGC-ISF is similar to the use of the DeWitt Center Enterprise funds; whose reserves were transferred to the PCGC-ISF account.

The County Executive Officer (CEO) has the discretion to use monies in the PCGC-ISF account for uses outside of the DeWitt Government Center upkeep and development.

Investigation Methods

- Conducted interviews
- Reviewed the e-mail paper trail regarding the transfer of the Enterprise Funds to the PCGC- ISF
- Reviewed budget comments

Facts

- On May 21, 2014, The Placer County Department of Facility Services notified Seniors First, by mail, that its lease for office space at Building No. 312A/B at the DeWitt Government Center would expire on December 31, 2014, and they would not be able to exercise a renewal option for the premises. The reason for the renewal denial was that the Seniors First location was part of the footprint for a lease agreement that was being negotiated with Costco.
- Several other non-profit occupants of lease space within the Costco footprint, including the Multipurpose Senior Center and the Dewitt Theater operated by the non-profit Music & More were given similar notices.
- Seniors First abided by the Facility Services notification and found a location suitable for their relocation to 12183 Locksley Lane, Suite 205, in North Auburn.
- In October of 2014, Seniors First accomplished its relocation with the help of approximately \$50,000 worth of goods and services obtained through donations. However, the final out-of-pocket cost for the relocation to Seniors First was approximately \$29,000.
- Seniors First submitted a letter to the Placer County CEO's office requesting reimbursement for their out-of-pocket relocation costs.

- Seniors First has not received a decision from the CEO as of this writing.
- The 2013-2014 Grand Jury recommended use of the DeWitt Center Enterprise Fund to offset Seniors First relocation costs.
- DeWitt Center Enterprise Funds were transferred to a new PCGC-ISF as part of the 2014–2015 budget process. The process to transfer those funds was ongoing prior to the release of the 2013–2014 Grand Jury report.
- In early 2015, Costco terminated its negotiations with the county.
- While Seniors First relocated, the Multipurpose Senior Center and Music & More have not relocated despite the county’s notification letter.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. Seniors First provides Placer County senior and disabled citizens with the following services at no or reduced costs for the following services:
- Assisted Living Placement
 - Door-to-Door Rides for shut-in citizens for medical/dental appointments, food shopping, and other out-of-home appointments
 - Friendly Visitor Program for shut-ins
 - Senior nutrition at senior cafes throughout the county
 - Health Express for hospital needs
 - Handy Person Program assist for home repairs
 - Information and referrals to other programs serving disabled and senior residents
- F2. Seniors First contracts for funding with the California Area 4 Agency on Aging and other Community Foundations. They also solicit donations and hold fundraisers. A majority of their services are offered free of charge to the citizens they serve. This population consists primarily of persons who are disabled, or seniors in need. Many are shut-ins without other family in the area or families unable to provide for their needs. These clients have little political advocacy or presence in the county.
- F3. Seniors First relocated from their offices at the DeWitt Center due to the cancellation of their lease. In absorbing the costs of the relocation, they have \$29,000 less to spend

serving seniors, including the disabled and shut-ins. Additionally, their monthly rental payments have increased from \$708.92 to \$1,129.80 a month at their new location.

- F4. The reclassification of the DeWitt Center Enterprise funds to the PCGC-ISF does not obviate the recommendation of the 2013-2014 Grand Jury that these funds might be used to offset the costs of relocation for Seniors First.
- F5. Placer County Officials indicated that the revenues from the DeWitt Government Center are dedicated exclusively to the county government offices. All income derived from external leases on the DeWitt Government Center Campus (Home Depot, as an example) are earmarked for DeWitt Government Center growth, maintenance, and building needs.
- F6. The Grand Jury views county government and the Board of Supervisors as stewards of the DeWitt Government Center for the people of Placer County. The income earned through management of that asset may be used in any manner at their discretion.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. Income generated by the DeWitt Government Center be considered to be available to the people of Placer County and not just dedicated to DeWitt Government Center needs.
- R2. Placer County considers reimbursing Seniors First for their out-of pocket costs (\$29,000) expended in their forced relocation.

Request for Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Ms. Mary Dietrich Placer County Director of Facility Services 11476 C Ave, Auburn CA 95603	R1, R2	August 24, 2015
Placer County Board of Supervisors 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R1, R2	September 22, 2015

Copies Sent to:

Mr. David Boesch
Placer County CEO
175 Fulweiler Ave.
Auburn, CA 95603

Seniors First
12183 Locksley Lane, Suite 205
Auburn, CA 95603



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Auburn Police Department and Holding Facility

Annual Inspection



Auburn Police Department and Holding Facility Annual Inspection

Summary

This Grand Jury Report details the annual inspection conducted at the City of Auburn Police Department (APD), 1215 Lincoln Way, on September 2, 2014. The APD has a temporary holding area which consists of a bench and restraints. The Grand Jury finds that generally the operations are satisfactory with the exception of some health and cleanliness issues. The Grand Jury recommends that funds be allocated to procure an epi-pen and defibrillator. It is also recommends that staff more closely monitor cleanliness of the facility.

Background

“The Grand Jury shall inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the county” as mandated in §919(b) of the California Penal Code.

Investigation Methods

On September 2, 2014, Placer County Grand Jury conducted an inspection of the APD, which was led by Police Department Lieutenant Victor Pecoraro. Lt. Pecoraro provided information regarding daily operations and the impacts of newly implemented laws.

Facts

- The APD includes dispatch, officer work stations, interviewing rooms, evidence storage, and officers’ personal gym.
- No detainees were present during the inspection. Seldom are the premises used for holding detainees. Booking is normally done at the Auburn Main Jail.

- Efforts to reunite juvenile detainees with a parent or caretaker are first preference when possible.
- The holding area has procedural binders and drug-identifying posters available as quick reference guides.
- The jail has no epi-pen or defibrillator on the premises.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. The interview room known as the “soft room”, while having a comfortable appearance, was uncomfortably chilly.
- F2. On the day of the inspection, cleanliness issues were noted that included fecal matter on the toilet seat in the men’s lobby restroom.
- F3. Notable stains and scratches on the door trim in the hallway were observed.
- F4. On the day of the inspection, what appeared to be blood stains were noted on the exterior stairway entrance/exit to the building. The jurors also observed bodily fluids on the exterior stairway entrance/exit to the building.
- F5. The lack of an epi-pen and defibrillator puts the detainees at risk in case of a medical emergency.

Conclusion

The Grand Jury was generally satisfied with the operation of the Auburn Police Department facility, although there were some health and cleanliness concerns.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. Funds be allocated for the purchase of at least one epi-pen and defibrillator for the premises, including the training of personnel.
- R2. The APD monitor the temperature in the “soft room” to ensure comfort during interviews.
- R3. The APD monitor the public restrooms to alleviate health hazards.
- R4. A fresh coat of paint be applied over stains and scratches on the door trim in the hallway.
- R5. Staff more closely monitor cleanliness of the exterior stairway entrance/exit to the building.

Request For Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Mr. John Ruffcorn Police Chief, City of Auburn 1215 Lincoln Way Auburn, CA 95603	R1- R5	August 24, 2015

Copies sent to:

Mr. Tim Rundel
Auburn City Manager
1225 Lincoln Way
Auburn, CA 95603

Mr. Keith Nesbitt
Auburn City Mayor
1225 Lincoln Way
Auburn CA 95603



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Placer County Jails and Holding Facilities: A Consolidated Report

Annual Inspections



Santucci Courthouse

Photo courtesy of Placer County Sheriff's Office

Placer County Jails and Holding Facilities: A Consolidated Report Annual Inspections

Summary

This report summarizes thorough inspections conducted at the six Placer County jails and holding facilities:

- Historic Courthouse in Auburn (September 2, 2014)
- Burton Creek Sheriff's Substation in Tahoe City (September 9, 2014)
- South Placer Main Jail in Roseville (October 17, 2014)
- South Placer Minimum Security Facility in Roseville (October 17, 2014)
- Santucci Courthouse in Roseville (October 24, 2014)
- Placer County Main Jail in Auburn (November 12, 2014)

On the whole, the jurors found these facilities to be clean, secure, and well-managed, with relatively few problems.

The main challenge facing Placer County correctional facilities has been overcrowding, primarily due to public safety realignment as the result of State legislation (AB109), which in April 2011, sought to reduce state prison overcrowding by:

- Sentencing most non-serious, non-violent, and non-sexual offenders to a county jail rather than to State prisons. Prior to realignment, any felony sentence of more than a year would routinely be served in State prison. Now offenders sentenced to serve up to seven or eight years can be housed in a county jail.
- Sentencing parole or probation violators to serve their violations in a county jail rather than being returned to a state prison.

Placer County, like most counties, is dealing with many issues that have arisen as a result of realignment. While many overcrowding issues will be alleviated by the recent opening of the new South Placer Main Jail, other issues associated with housing more sophisticated prisoners for longer periods of time are still being addressed. In the past, county jails have not had to deal with critical long-term health issues or rehabilitation needs of inmates.

In addition, State Proposition 47, which went into effect after the November 2014 election, has added a new burden to jail staff. Because it reduces penalties for drug and other nonviolent crimes, many county inmates have petitioned to have their convictions reclassified from felonies to misdemeanors, and sentences reduced or erased. An estimated 40,000 inmates in California are eligible. This creates a huge need for more jail and court personnel to facilitate this complicated process.

Background

“The Grand Jury shall inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the county” as stated in §919(b) of the California Penal Code.

Investigation Methods

Inspections were led by the following Placer County Sheriff’s Officers:

Historic Courthouse:	Deputy Kathryn Raffetto
Burton Creek Substation:	Lt. John Weaver
South Placer Main Jail:	Stacey Toy-DeNardi, Compliance Officer
South Placer Minimum Security:	Stacey Toy-DeNardi, Compliance Officer
Santucci Courthouse:	Lt. Carol Walsh
Placer County Main Jail:	James Rashid, Compliance Officer

Facts

- Three of these six facilities (Historic Courthouse, Burton Creek, and Santucci Courthouse) are temporary holding facilities, usually used only for a few hours, while inmates are awaiting scheduled court proceedings. Court appearances occur between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., and if an inmate is held during mealtimes, a sack lunch and drink are provided.
- The three other facilities (both South Placer facilities and the Auburn Main Jail) are designed to house inmates awaiting court dates or serving out their sentences, some of which can last as long as eight years.

- All six facilities have a sally port through which inmates are brought into a secure area and then escorted by one or more deputies to a holding cell. All facilities have a weapons screening device, and all bags are subject to inspection. They also are well-covered and monitored by numerous security cameras.
- All holding cells have a toilet, sink, and concrete bench. The toilet is out of direct view of officers and the security camera. Each holding cell is capable of housing up to five inmates. Inmates are checked every 30 minutes, but inmates on security watch are checked every 15 minutes.
- The **Historic Courthouse** was dedicated in 1898, has three holding cells and six courtrooms. Deputy Raffetto was an excellent guide and displayed great public relations. Jurors did observe the following areas of concern:
 - In Dept. 1, the glass is transparent enough for inmates to look into the judge's office area.
 - There was no epi-pen on the premises.
 - There were no cameras focused on the back parking lot.
 - The metal detector in the lobby was triggered by the movement of the elevator.
 - There is an unbarred window in the stairwell where inmates pass.
 - The emergency PA is not building-wide.
- The **Burton Creek** facility was built in 1959; it has four holding cells and one small courtroom. Placer County has a contract with the Truckee Jail in Nevada County, for housing inmates as needed. The county has made excellent use of a very outdated facility, including using modern technology. They have staff capable of speaking five languages. Jurors did observe the following areas of concern:
 - The sally port needs securing, and flares need to be locked up.
 - There was no epi-pen or defibrillator on the premises.
 - The heater was broken.
 - Staff was concerned about the security of evidence.
 - The facility is not fully ADA-compliant (some examples: no elevator to the second floor and hallways are narrow).
- The **Santucci Courthouse** opened in 2008, has 12 basement holding cells (connected via a tunnel to the adjacent Main Jail), six holding cells between the courtrooms on the first floor, and four holding cells between courtrooms on the second floor, with nine total

courtrooms. The jurors did not observe any areas of concern and thought it was a beautiful, modern facility that was well-managed.

- The **South Placer Main Jail** (the main part of the South Placer Adult Corrections Facility or SPACF) at the Santucci Justice Center opened in May 2014 with 200,000 square feet and a rated capacity of 420. Currently in Phase I, it has 120 medium-security inmates in Housing Unit 2, but is designed to accommodate 980 when the eventual build out to 319,000 square feet is completed. It has 31 various types of holding cells in the basement, which is connected to the basement holding cells for the Santucci Courthouse by a 320-foot tunnel. Because this facility has not completed setting up its booking area, local booking is done at the Auburn Main Jail. This is a very modern facility with lots of room for expansion. The kitchen is very modern and prepares 10,000 to 14,000 meals daily, many being transported to the Auburn Main Jail and Burton Creek. The jurors had one main concern:
 - There were numerous cracks in the concrete flooring.

- The **South Placer Minimum Security Facility** opened in May 2014, when 120 inmates were moved from the old World War II U.S. Army hospital warehouse barracks built in the DeWitt Center in Auburn in 1941. Still in Phase I, it currently houses 120 minimum-security inmates in the new facility, which is divided into two pods of 60 each, in a building adjacent to the South Placer Main Jail. Currently the female minimum-security inmates are housed in the main jail next door, until a new female minimum-security facility is built on the property. The Grand Jury was pleased to see so many minimum-security inmates working in the laundry (30 females) and kitchen (up to 40 males), and doing custodial work in the South Placer Main Jail. About four male inmates are transported daily to clean Burton Creek. We were told that for every 5 hours they work, they can deduct 4 hours off their sentences. Staff indicated that female inmates need more opportunity for work hours.

- The **Auburn Main Jail** opened in 1985 with a California State Board of Corrections (BOC) rating of 108 inmates, a population which was immediately exceeded. A new housing wing was built in 1992 to bring the rating up an additional 260 beds. This wing contains three medium-security dorms or pods, two with a capacity of 92 inmates each, and one with a capacity of 44 inmates; and one maximum-security module with a capacity of 32 inmates. The dormitory housing units are of the direct-supervision type, with a custody officer stationed inside each of the dorms, and indirect supervision from a housing booth. With BOC approval, most of the cells have been doubled-bunked. After

the recent Phase I transfer of 120 inmates to South Placer Main Jail, the Auburn facility now houses about 420 medium- and maximum-security inmates. The staff that guided us through our inspection was very resourceful and courteous. We had a new appreciation for their constant classifying and reclassifying of inmates, in order to ensure better compatibility within the housing units. The staff is meeting all Title 15 requirements and is encouraging inmates to make positive change. The Auburn Main Jail has 11 booking cells, 2 holding cells and one courtroom. The Grand Jury only had one concern:

- According to staff, leak problems seem to be an on-going issue.

Findings

The Grand Jury Found that:

- F1. In general, all six Placer County jails and holding facilities are clean, well-maintained, and well-managed. It is clear that all staff is proud of the facilities.
- F2. The Burton Creek Substation Jail/Holding Facility is functional and well-coordinated, especially, considering its age.
- F3. The South Placer Main Jail and the Auburn Main Jail are the most impacted by AB109, which creates overcrowding, as discussed in the Summary section. Long-term rehabilitation and extended medical services are now more vital for those with longer sentences. County facilities were not built to accommodate this AB109 mandate.
- F4. Proposition 47 places a burden on the correctional system because of the sudden surge in petitions for inmates to have their classifications and sentences reduced. Future plans to build a second minimum-security facility on the South Placer property may help alleviate the increase in population of those with lesser sentences, but this is just a small step toward a more permanent solution.

Conclusion

All Placer County jails and holding cells are well-managed and maintained, in spite of the recent significant legislative challenges. While the State has allocated some funds to the counties to help defray the costs of realignment, the impact highlights the degree to which additional services need to be added. The need to increase staff at both main jails is critical and should be a county budget priority.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that the county make the following improvements:

Auburn Historic Courthouse Recommendations:

- R1. Obscure the glass in Dept. 1, so inmates cannot see into the judge's office area.
- R2. Train and supply staff with epi-pens in case of emergency (bee stings, mosquito bites, food allergies, etc.)
- R3. Install security cameras in the back parking lot (a recurring Grand Jury recommendation from the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report).
- R4. Adjust the sensitivity of the metal detector in the lobby, so it is not triggered by the movement of the elevator.
- R5. Install bars on the window in the stairwell that the inmates utilize.
- R6. Improve the emergency public announcement (PA) system, so it is site-wide.

Burton Creek Recommendations:

- R7. Increase the security of the sally port and lock up the flares stored there.
- R8. Train and supply staff with epi-pens, in case of emergency.
- R9. Repair the heating system.
- R10. Increase the security of the storage of evidence.
- R11. Implement changes to make the facility more ADA-compliant.

South Placer Main Jail Recommendations:

- R12. Assign responsibility for the cracks in the concrete flooring and repair them.

South Placer Minimum Security Facility Recommendations:

- R13. Provide more opportunity for work hours for the female inmates.

Auburn Main Jail Recommendations:

R14. Repair the numerous, on-going ceiling water leak problems inside the facility.

Request for Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Mr. Edward Bonner Placer County Sheriff-Coroner-Marshal 2929 Richardson Drive Auburn, CA. 95603	R1-R14	August 24, 2015
Mr. David Boesch Placer County CEO 175 Fulweiler Avenue Auburn, CA 95603	R1-R14	August 24, 2015

Copies sent to:

Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Placer County Juvenile Detention Facility Annual Inspection

Placer County Juvenile Detention Facility

Annual Inspection

Summary

The 2014 - 2015 Placer County Grand Jury conducted its annual inspection of the County Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF) on October 15, 2014, followed by an interview with the JDF Superintendent on October 30, 2015. The facility is located at 11260 B Avenue, Auburn.

On the date of inspection, the JDF appeared to be clean and well-maintained; the staff is knowledgeable about pertinent legal requirements and genuinely dedicated to reducing the rate of return/repeat offenders. However the facility offers short-term counseling and self-help programs that are not ideally suited for detainees who are held at the JDF for extended periods of time. Similarly lacking is availability of outdoor recreation geared toward longer-termed detainees. Activities primarily consist of a concrete sports court with a few barred openings in the walls and a small open-air skylight. Although the facility has a large grassy area, it is rarely used due to limited security and staffing issues.

Finally, the JDF has incorporated a program which has been favorably received by the detainees. Positive Behavioral Intervention Support (PBIS)¹ is a program wherein detainees can earn privileges and/or small luxury items through a merit system, based on good behavior and following the rules of the JDF. As reported by staff, PBIS has led to a decrease in poor behavioral incidents at the facility.

The Grand Jury added three additional areas of interest to its inspection agenda:

- A status update on implementation of policies and procedures mandated by the Department of Justice's final rule pursuant to the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003²

¹ Positive Behavior Intervention Support is a program developed by the University of Oregon with support from University of North Carolina "to establish the social culture and behavioral supports needed for a school to be an effective learning environment for all students."

² Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA): PREA is federal legislation requiring all prison and detention facilities to comply with new federal standards specified in regulations implementing the National Standards to

- Policies and procedures at the JDF
- A status update on detainees access to the grass area

Background

The Placer County Grand Jury is mandated to inspect all jails and holding facilities in Placer County. As part of the inspections, the Grand Jury also includes the JDF, a detention facility for juveniles eighteen (18) years of age and younger. The JDF is operated by the Placer County Probation Department in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 15, and Section 5; Welfare and Institutions Code Section 210, and Juvenile Court law.

Investigation Methods

The Grand Jury familiarized themselves with California Code of Regulations, Minimum Standards for Juvenile Facilities Title 15 effective April 1, 2014 and the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) National Standards for Juvenile Detention Facilities.

The Grand Jury conducted an on-site inspection of the JDF facilities led by the JDF Superintendent. The Grand Jury also interviewed the on-site JDF nurse. In addition to observations made during the course of the inspection, the Grand Jury utilized a JDF Inspection checklist.

Facts

During the inspection the Grand Jury was informed of or observed the following:

- The JDF had twenty-four (24) detainees, fourteen (14) in the general population and ten (10) in maximum-security. The JDF has a maximum capacity of 78 juveniles, and has yet to exceed that capacity.

prevent, detect, and respond to prison rape. In March 2012, the Department of Justice issued a final rule adopting national standards to prevent, detect, and respond to prison rape.

- The average stay for detainees varies from days to weeks. However, several detainees had been at the facility for a period of months. One detainee has been held in maximum security for two (2) years and is expected to remain there at least another year.
- Detainees have limited access to direct sunlight and fresh air. The JDF has a cement sport court, with a small opening in the roof for sunlight and air that detainees can access on a daily basis. Detainees in the general population also have periodic access to a small garden area.
- A large grass outdoor area is not available for use by detainees in maximum security and is seldom used by detainees in the general population because of perceived security risks caused by the open chain-link fencing and large size of the area. The chain-link, which is not covered with slats, is open to people outside the detention facility who could pass contraband to the detainees. Despite the presence of razor wire, JDF staff believes there is a credible risk of a detainee scaling the fence to escape. In addition, it was reported that the large size of the grass field makes it difficult to adequately supervise the detainees with current staffing levels.
- There are on-site anger management classes, drug and alcohol counseling, and a journal writing program that repeat on a regular basis. Detainees who are at the JDF for an extended period of time repeat the classes.
- The JDF has social awareness programs and have implemented a merit plan, Positive Behavior Intervention Support, where detainees earn additional privileges for good behavior and following rules.
- Because the JDF has excess capacity, it has converted one housing unit into classroom and storage space.
- The staff ratios meet California State requirements of 1 to 10 during the day and 1 to 30 during sleeping hours.
- Some staff members are multi-lingual. In addition, a language translation phone line is available as needed.
- Staff is diverse relative to gender, race and ethnicity.
- All health and fire inspections are current.

- Food service is provided by the South Placer Jail kitchen and delivered to the JDF daily. Special dietary requirements for medical conditions, allergies, or religious beliefs are accommodated. The kitchen (reheating) area was clean.
- Meals are served in the dayroom, not the cafeteria.
- A nurse is on site from 7am to 7pm, seven days a week.
- A doctor visits two days per week.
- All current prescriptions for incoming detainees are reviewed and evaluated by the JDF Doctor. The JDF Doctor may consult with the detainee's physician and parents to determine the requirement for these medications. If the JDF Doctor authorizes the medication, it is delivered to the facility by the parents. The JDF Doctor has the final decision on whether to issue any medication.
- Psychiatric services are available on site and via video conferencing. Incoming mail is opened and checked for contraband, but not routinely read by staff.
- Instructional staff consists of two accredited teachers, one non-accredited teacher and a special education teacher.
- School supplies are available and appear adequate.
- School programs appear to comply with state education code requirements.
- General Education Development (GED) preparation is available.
- Religious programs are provided on a voluntary basis.
- Interior of buildings were clean and well maintained; however the floor of one maximum security cell and some desks in the classroom/lunchroom had graffiti carved into them.
- The JDF has not experienced a PREA audit. Their policies and procedures appear to comply with requirements; all detainees sign a PREA contract when entering the facility; PREA related phone numbers are posted; and PREA calls are free.

- The detainees have access to a pay phone with a list of reference numbers posted.
- A confidential grievance box is mounted on the wall in the dayroom.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. The JDF was clean and well maintained.
- F2. The design of the outdoor grass area at the JDF facility is inherently flawed.
- F3. The JDF Staff exhibited a good rapport with the detainees. They have implemented a merit/point system and their focus is preparing the detainees for release with a view to minimizing the recidivism rate.
- F4. The JDF Staff appear to run a good program for detainees who are there for a short time (i.e., days to weeks). However, certain aspects of the program, namely the repetition of class offerings and limited access to the grass field could be detrimental to detainees held for a longer period of time (i.e., months to years).
- F5. The JDF Staff stated that serving food in the dayroom rather than the cafeteria saves time, and limits security risks caused by traveling back and forth. This procedure also allows detainees more time to eat in a more relaxed atmosphere.

Conclusion

The Grand Jury found the JDF to be clean, well maintained, and well-staffed with trained personnel.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that the Juvenile Detention Facility:

- R1. Seek funding from the Placer County Executive office to address the fencing security and staffing issues relating to the use of the grassy outdoor area.
- R2. Provide additional behavior and social development classes for detainees who have already taken the basic courses.

Request for Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Mr. Marshall Hopper Chief Probation Officer Placer County Probation Department 2929 Richardson Drive, Suite B Auburn, CA 95603	R1, R2	August 24, 2015
Mr. David Boesch Placer County CEO 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R1	August 24, 2015

Copies Sent To:

Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Mr. Jeffery Cann
Superintendent, Placer County Juvenile Detention Center
11260 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Rocklin City Jail

Annual Inspection



Rocklin Police and Fire Department Headquarters

Photo courtesy of Rocklin Police Department

Rocklin City Jail

Annual Inspection

Summary

This Grand Jury Report details the annual inspection conducted at the City of Rocklin Police Department (RPD), located at 4080 Rocklin Road, on October 27, 2014. This facility includes six holding cells. The Grand Jury found this facility to be a well-managed and well-maintained jail. There are no recommendations at this time, and the jurors would like to commend the Rocklin Police Department for its upkeep of this facility.

Background

“The Grand Jury shall inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the county” as stated in §919(b) of the California Penal Code.

Investigation Methods

The Grand Jury inspection was led by RPD Patrol Sergeant Thomas Dwyer.

Facts

- Our inspection of the RPD jail on October 27, 2014, found a modern facility. There is space available to accommodate not only the police department, but also some fire department administration staff and city emergency dispatch.
- There were no inmates present in any cells during our inspection.
- There are six holding cells that are utilized for a maximum of 24 hours. These cells were all clean.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. The Rocklin Police Department is to be commended for its upkeep of its modern facility.
- F2. The RPD is also to be commended for its willingness to make this facility available to fire department personnel as well.

Conclusion

The Rocklin city jail and holding cells appeared to be well-managed and maintained by staff.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury has no recommendations at this time.

Request For Responses:

None required.

Copies sent to:

Mr. Ron Lawrence
Rocklin Chief of Police
4080 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677

Rocklin City Council
3970 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

Roseville Police Department and Holding Facility

Annual Inspection



Roseville Police Department and Holding Facility

Annual Inspection

Summary

This report summarizes the Grand Jury inspection of the City of Roseville Police Department on October 14, 2014, to include ten two-person housing cells for 20 people, four multi-purpose sobering cells for 15 people, and four multi-purpose holding cells for 14 people. This facility is located at 1051 Junction Boulevard in Roseville.

Background

“The Grand Jury shall inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the county” as stated in §919(b) of the California Penal Code.

Investigation Methods

The inspection and tour was primarily led by Roseville Police Department Corrections Supervisor Carter Christiansen.

Facts

- There was what appeared to be blood-stained paper napkins and debris at the secondary entrance door.
- Holding Cell Two appeared to have a crack in the bench.
- There was writing on the floor of Sober Cell One.
- Roseville Police Department is utilizing a UV-Germicidal lamp to decrease germs for both staff and detainees in the holding area.
- Roseville Police Department offers a Sentenced-Prisoner Program (SPP), where low-level offenders can serve their time evenings and weekends for a fee.

- Roseville Police Department collects revenue from bailbond ads posted in the lobby and cell area.
- Roseville Police Department provides an important function in arresting, booking and holding misdemeanor offenders, thus partially relieving the county jails of this responsibility.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. There are maintenance issues at the secondary entrance.

Conclusion

This jail continues to serve a valuable use to local police providing a unique program (SPP) for low-level non-violent offenders that continue to utilize the cells. These detainees check in and out of the jail at varying times through a specific designated outside entrance. The jails and holding cells are well-managed and maintained by staff. The Grand Jury concludes that the Roseville jail performs an important function in this community.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- R1. The Roseville Police Department conduct regular maintenance of the secondary entrance door area.

Request For Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Mr. Daniel Hahn Chief of Police Roseville Police Department 1051 Junction Blvd Roseville, CA 95678	R1	August 24, 2015
Roseville City Council 311 Vernon St Roseville, CA 95678	R1	September 22, 2015