

DATE: September 28, 2004

TO: The Honorable Garrett Olney, Presiding Judge

FROM: The Honorable Board of Supervisors  
By: County Administrative Officer

RE: Response to 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

---

On behalf of the Board of Supervisors, the County Administrative Officer respectfully submits this response to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report. The headings used in the Board of Supervisors' ("BOS" or "Board") response to the Grand Jury's 2003-2004 Report ("Report") echoes the headings used in the Report, and responds in the same order as the Report. For reading ease, the Grand Jury's findings are re-stated above the Board's responses.

### **Grand Jury Oversight Committee**

#### **Grand Jury's Finding #1:**

*"The current procedure is the Grand Jury issues its report, findings and recommendations on or about June 30<sup>th</sup>. The BOS or the agency involved then has 90 days in which to file a written response. That response is during a new Grand Jury term, when most of the members are not familiar with the findings and recommendations of the prior Grand Jury."*

#### **Board's Response to Finding #1, Grand Jury Oversight Committee:**

Agree.

#### **Grand Jury's Finding #2:**

*"The BOS, on the last two Grand Jury reports for Plumas County, has failed to acknowledge and address all of the findings and recommendations with regard to fire protection issues. On the 2002/2003 report the BOS did file a supplemental response after they (sic) were reminded that they (sic) had not responded to the initial report."*

#### **Board's Response to Finding #2, Grand Jury Oversight Committee:**

Agree in part, and disagree in part. The Board continues to address County fire protection issues: In both the Board's supplemental response to the Grand Jury's 2002-2003 Report, and during the course of its regular Board meetings, in its direction to the Planning Director, in its direction to LAFCo's Executive Director, and in its continuing review of the Plumas County Code. The Board has directed staff, or has itself authorized the following actions in response to the Grand Jury's concerns regarding fire protection issues:

Staff is currently working with the County Fire Warden/Director of the Office of Emergency Services in re-defining this individual's job description.

The Board approved a loan to C-Road Community Services District to assist it in obtaining matching grant funds for fire protection monies.

The Planning Director has met with many Fire District chiefs, representatives of the California Department of Forestry (CDF), and LAFCo's Executive Director regarding the feasibility of creating a countywide and/or a five-zone fire department.

The Board accepted a presentation from LAFCo's Executive Director regarding the feasibility of creating a countywide and/or a five-zone fire department during a regular meeting in August 2004.

The Board has announced that LAFCo holds monthly meetings, open to the public, during which County fire protection issues, as related to special districts, may be addressed at the public's request.

The Planning Director has recommended revision of the County's General Plan to include fire protection issues.

The Planning Director is working with the County Administrative Officer to develop a transition plan for the Planning and Building Department following the Planning Director's anticipated retirement in July 2005. This Transition Plan will address the following matters: Evaluation of Planning Commission creation; Evaluation of zone-by-zone; supervisorial district or some other delineation of zones, districts Evaluation of current function of Planning Director as Zoning Administrator

In the short term, the Board anticipates the Fire Safe Council recommending potential revisions to the Plumas County Code relating to fire suppression and prevention that could be implemented with Board approval.

#### Grand Jury's Finding #3

*"The BOS, on numerous occasions during the past five years, has responded that it agreed with the Grand Jury's findings and/or recommendations and set an action date for implementation, which on many occasions, they (sic) failed to keep. (See examples in Appendix A)."*

#### Board's Response to Finding #3, Grand Jury Oversight Committee:

Agree.

#### Grand Jury's Finding #4:

*"The 1999/2000 Grand Jury made findings and recommendations for annual evaluations of Department Heads. The BOS responded there was an existing performance review procedure. The 2003/2004 Grand Jury found, although the procedure does exist, not all Department Heads are evaluated annually. (See Finding #3, Department of Human Resources section)."*

#### Board's Response to Finding #4, Grand Jury Oversight Committee:

Agree in part, and disagree in part. Since mid-2004, the Board has been evaluating approximately two appointed department heads per month. The Board is committed to bringing all appointed department head evaluations current and maintaining annual evaluations.

#### Grand Jury's Finding #5:

*"California Government Code Section 87300 requires every County to adopt and promulgate a conflict of interest code."*

#### Board's Response to Finding #5, Grand Jury Oversight Committee:

Agree.

Grand Jury's Finding #6:

*"California's Political Reform Act of 1974 (Government Code Section 87100 et seq.) prohibits public officials from making, participate in making, or in any way seeking to influence government decisions in which they have a financial interest."*

Board's Response to Finding #6, Grand Jury Oversight Committee:

Agree.

Grand Jury Finding #7:

*"In conducting interviews of the five members of the BOS, each member had a slightly different view of what constituted a "conflict of interest while serving on the Board."*

Board's Response to Finding #7, Grand Jury Oversight Committee:

Agree.

Grand Jury Finding #8:

*"The former county counsel verbally advised some board members that in order for a conflict to exist it must be shown that the Supervisor in question must receive financial gain."*

Board's Response to Finding #8, Grand Jury Oversight Committee:

Without knowing the precise legal guidance given to the Board by the former county counsel, or the factual context within which the guidance was given, the Board may have interpreted the guidance as written above.

Grand Jury Finding #9:

*"Currently each Board member annually completes a Statement of Economic Interests (California Fair Political Practices Commission form 700), a public document disclosing personal financial interests."*

Board's Response to Finding #9, Grand Jury Oversight Committee:

Agree.

Grand Jury Finding #10:

*"The BOS rejected the Grand Jury's recommendation last year to re-establish the Plumas County Planning Commission."*

Board's Response to Finding #10:

Agree.

Board Response to Recommendations One – Four: Grand Jury Oversight Committee  
(Reference Page Nine of 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report)

1. The Board of Supervisors reviewed and commented on the status of its response to the Grand Jury's 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 Reports at its April 6, 2004 Board meeting. The Board has indicated its willingness to review the status of its responses, and its implementation of accepted Grand Jury recommendations on a regular basis.
2. County Counsel will submit an opinion to the Board of Supervisors regarding what constitutes a "conflict of interest" and will comment on distinctions between the terms "financial interest" and "financial gain" in the context of the Political Reform Act by December 31, 2004.
3. Members of the Board of Supervisors discuss, request legal guidance from the County Counsel, and often recuse themselves from, matters that present a conflict of interest, and, in many cases, even a potential conflict of interest on a regular basis.
4. The Planning Director has offered to assist the Board and any Board-appointed study group in evaluating the feasibility of creating a countywide, or zone-specific Planning Commission, and/or an Advisory Planning Committee that could operate in conjunction with a Zoning Administrator. The Board has directed the County Administrative Officer to report to the Board on the feasibility of either of these potential advisory-planning entities. The Planning Director has recommended that the Board pursue updating Plumas County's General Plan.

### **Plumas County Public Health Agency**

#### **Grand Jury's Finding #1 and #2:**

*"The Personnel Rules of Plumas County (Personnel Rules) define nepotism as: 'The appointment in a department of a member of any employee's family to a permanent, temporary, or extra-help position resulting in the employee having substantial supervisory authority over the family member.' There was no supportable evidence of improper job postings."*

#### **Board's Response to Finding #1 and #2, Public Health Agency:**

Agree. Administrative staff in the Public Health Agency is vigilant regarding adherence to all Personnel Rules. Support staff and the Director of the Public Health Agency have reviewed job recruitment practices, job posting documents, and requests to Human Resources, all of which indicate complete compliance with the County Personnel Rules.

#### **Grand Jury's Finding #3:**

*"The department heads reported that performance evaluations are not consistently completed on an annual basis."*

#### **Board's Response to Finding #3, Public Health Agency:**

The Public Health Agency Director's last performance evaluation was in October 2003, with her next evaluation slated for October 2004. The Public Health Agency's Director has a thorough tracking system for annual employee performance evaluations, including employee developed Work Plans for the upcoming year. This department's director and her support staff reviewed the departmental employee evaluation protocols and found them to be compliant with Plumas County's Personnel Rules.

#### **Grand Jury's Finding #4:**

*"In 'Personnel Rules,' the Plumas County Human Resources Department neither defines nor provides procedures for employee pre-disciplinary hearings (Skelly v. State Personnel Board (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194)."*

Board's Response to Finding #4, Public Health Agency:

Disagree. The Personnel Rules, and not the Human Resources Department, both define and describe pre-disciplinary hearing procedures. The Public Health Agency's director comments that "past consensus did not exist between County Counsel, Human Resources and Operating engineers Local Union #3 about the role of a Department Head in the pre-disciplinary hearing process, and encourages the Human Resources director to "review other counties documents on this item for successful models which may" assist Plumas County.

Personnel Rule 16 defines pre-disciplinary hearings. Personnel Rule 16 includes the following sub-sections: Rule 16.01: Notice of Intended Disciplinary Action; and Rule 16.02: Pre-discipline hearing; and Rule 16.03: Administrative Leave; and Rule 16.04: Causes for Disciplinary Action; and Rule 16.05: Letters of Reprimand.

When an employee receives a notice of intended disciplinary action, the notice includes details of the proposed action, the reasons for the action, and it advises the employee of his/her rights to a pre-disciplinary hearing and the right to file a written response. The notice also includes the right to representation by someone of the employee's choosing and the employee is given a copy of Personnel Rule 16. Personnel Rule 16.02 describes the pre-disciplinary hearing procedure.

Grand Jury's Finding #5:

*"The Grand Jury found no evidence of Skelly Hearing violations."*

Board's Response to Finding #5, Public Health Agency:

Agree. The Board appreciates the Grand Jury acknowledging the enthusiasm expressed by Public Health Agency employees for their work, and for acknowledging the "vibrant and enthusiastic agency going about work vital to the well being of the county.

Board's Response to Recommendations One – Three, Public Health Agency  
(Reference Page 10 of 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report)

1. This recommendation has been implemented as described above in the Board's response to Findings #1 and #2.
2. This recommendation has been implemented as described above in the Board's response to Finding #3.
3. This recommendation has been implemented as described above in the Board's response to Finding #4. All employees have, and all new employees receive, a copy of the Plumas County Personnel Rules.

Department of Human Resources

Grand Jury Findings #1 - #5:

*"Human Resources ("HR") came into existence in 1996. The 'Personnel Rules' were originally adopted February 14, 1986 by BOS resolution No. 86-3979. The Personnel Rules revised and adopted February 15, 2000 by BOS resolution No. 00-6363. [Personnel] Rule 15 - Performance Evaluation. 15.01 Policy: 'Each appointing authority shall be responsible for effectively evaluating the performance and conduct of the department's employees. The frequency shall be at least once a year. An effective evaluation provides written documentation, in regular and timely manner, on the quality of performance and employee departmental needs. Such documentation shall provide a basis for future personnel decisions. The performance evaluation shall be completed and presented to the employee prior to the end of the calendar date covered by the evaluation.' (Emphasis added) [Personnel] Rule 6 - Salary. 6.05 Merit Advancement by Salary Step: 'The personnel action shall be based on performance evaluations conducted pursuant to Rule 15.' 6.06 Longevity Advancement: 'Upon satisfactory performance, as evidenced by a performance evaluation, an employee's salary shall be increased (5%) at the following times: upon completion of seven, ten, fourteen, eighteen, and twenty-one years of full-time continuous and compensated service, measured from the date of hire.' "*

Board's Response to Findings #1 - #5, Human Resources Department:

Agree.

Grand Jury Finding #6:

*"The CAO [County Administrative Officer] has the responsibility to prepare performance evaluations and provide them to the BOS for the seventeen positions that constitute the department heads, which the CAO supervises. The CAO is to provide the department head with a copy of what is provided to the BOS. The BOS makes the final evaluation after a closed hearing with the department head and the CAO. Official personnel records from HR disclose that thirteen of the department heads performance evaluations are delinquent..." including the Director of Planning and Building Services, the Public Works Director, the Office of Emergency Services Director and the Human Resources Director.*

Board's Response to Finding #6, Human Resources Department:

Agree in part, and disagree in part. Since late Spring 2004, the CAO and the Board of Supervisors have completed performance evaluations for the Director of Planning and Building Services, the Public Works Director, the Office of Emergency Services Director, the Interim County Counsel, the Interim Director of Alcohol and Drug and the Director of Social Services. Performance evaluations for the balance of the County's appointed department heads will be completed by December 31, 2004.

Grand Jury Finding #7:

*"Some performance evaluations for employees whose tenure falls into the time frames when they are not eligible for either a merit or longevity salary increase are delinquent. This occurs during employment years eight, nine, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, nineteen, twenty, or over twenty-one years of service. Within the Assessor, Auditor, County Counsel, District Attorney, Mental Health, Probation and Information Technology departments there are delinquent employee evaluations."*

Board's Response to Finding #7, Human Resources Department:

Assuming Finding #7 is accurate, the Board agrees.

Grand Jury Finding #8 and #9:

*"HR tracks all employees to verify that each employee has received all raises he/she is entitled to and that the evaluations necessary to support the raise has been forwarded to HR. The evaluation is not official until it is on file in HR. The HR computer system does not pick up due dates for evaluations. The HR Department does not have computer software to track personnel, therefore tracking must be performed manually."*

Board's Response to Finding #8 and #9, Human Resources Department:

Agree.

Board's Response to Recommendations One – Four, Human Resources Department:  
(Reference Page 13, 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report)

1. This recommendation has been implemented as described above in the Board's response to Finding #6.
2. This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The current evaluation process, described above, satisfies the Grand Jury's recommendation.
3. This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. This Grand Jury recommendation refers to "various memos, letters of direction and procedures ...that are not reflected in the Personnel Rules." The County Counsel works closely with the Human Resources Director in assuring that the Personnel Rules accurately reflect the current state of the law. The Personnel Rules are amended as necessary, subject to the approval of the union and its bargaining representatives, after a meet and confer process is completed, and subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors. The Memoranda of Understanding between represented bargaining units and the County incorporate some changes to the Personnel Rules. The Memoranda of Understanding supercede the County's Personnel Rules. Each employee is given a copy of his/her bargaining units' Memorandum of Understanding.
4. This recommendation requires further analysis. County staff is completing a cost-benefit analysis of a Payroll/Personnel and Fund Accounting computer software system upgrade now. A demonstration of this software is scheduled for Management Council's consideration this Fall. If Management Council recommends this software purchase to the Board of Supervisors, the Board may consider the recommendation during its mid-year County budget review process in early 2005.

**Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (PCFC)**

Grand Jury Finding #1:

*“Some approved expenditures of the initial installment [of Monterey Settlement Agreement funds] have not been consistent with stated goals of the settlement agreement. Projects not aligned with the goals of the settlement agreement have included \$10,000 for increasing the capacity of a well owned by the Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District, \$115,000 to the PCFC for the 2003-2004 budget expenditures, \$452,000 to repay the general fund for loans to PCFC for expenditures that had accumulated for several years (These expenditures are being reviewed by the Department of Water Resources).”*

Board's Response to Finding #1, PCFC:

Agree in part, and disagree in part. The Monterey Settlement Agreement states, in part that "Plumas may apply the balance of funds received to other district related purposes, as directed by Plumas with due consideration for the needs of the Watershed Forum." The word "may" leaves much discretion to the Board in its use of Monterey Settlement Agreement funds. The \$10,000 was used to enhance the water supply to a contractor of the Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and is directly related to District purposes. The \$452,000 repayment to the general fund was for past expenditures by the Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for District purposes. These loans were created by Board resolution.

Grand Jury Finding #2 and #3, Plumas County Flood Control (PCFC):

*“Plumas County has a building permit moratorium in the Sierra Valley. This moratorium can be lifted only after the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) determines that an adequate Sierra Valley flood plain map has been developed. The PCFC has recommended approximately \$500,000 be allocated to a Sierra Valley flood plain study to develop a flood plain map of the county's portion of the valley.”*

Board's Response to Finding #2 and #3, Plumas County Flood Control:

Agree in part, and disagree in part. There is no building moratorium in Plumas County's portion of the Sierra Valley. The Board has received responses to Requests for Proposals for a flood study of the Sierra Valley, and has directed staff to award a contract for completion of this flood study. The Sierra Valley flood plain study will define the limits of the 100-year flood plain and establish known elevations to make interpretation of both the County's General Plan and various County ordinances easier. The Monterey Agreement Forum has approved the \$500,000 flood plain expenditure.

Grand Jury Finding #4:

*“Some approved expenditures are consistent with the goals of the [Monterey] Settlement Agreement. They include \$75,000 for a vegetative management project contracted through Plumas Corporation and approximately \$28, 000 to develop a strategy document (Feather River Watershed Management Strategy) for using the [Monterey] Settlement Agreement funds.”*

Board's Response to Finding #4, PCFC:

Agree.

Board's Response to Recommendations One – Five, Plumas County Flood Control  
(Reference Page 18, 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report)



1. This recommendation has been implemented. The Board of Directors of PCFC, and its partners, works closely with the Watershed Forum, in applying the Monterey Settlement Agreement and the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy to achieve long term economic and environmental benefits for all of Plumas County.
2. This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The Watershed Forum agreed with PCFC's \$500,000 expenditure for the Sierra Valley flood plain study.
3. This recommendation has been implemented. The Board of Directors of PCFC is currently applying the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy to the first round of nine project applications.
4. This recommendation has been implemented. The Board of Directors of PCFC, and its partners, continues to seek opportunities to leverage Monterey Settlement Agreement funds for the benefit of Plumas County.
5. This recommendation has been implemented, as described in the Board's responses to Recommendations one – four.

### **Plumas County Jail**

At page19, the 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report states: "The following findings and their related recommendations from last year's Grand Jury report [2002-2003] have not been corrected:

1. The Control Room still contains a crowded maze of wires, monitors and cords hanging in a jumbled manner.
2. The drop ceiling in one of the hallways had been removed to repair piping and was not replaced. Utilities carried in the ceiling space are exposed. This also creates a potential security issue.
3. Portions of the security wire in the female exercise yard have not been installed.
4. The area used for fingerprinting is not isolated from the Control Room thus burdening the already limited jail staff and creating a potential security issue."

### **Board's Response to **2002-2003** Grand Jury Jail Maintenance Issues 1 – 4, listed above:**

1. Facility Services obtained a bid of \$126,000 to correct Jail control room wiring issues. Sheriff's staff is evaluating the possibility of correcting the Jail control room wiring issues using a portion of the grant monies received to build the new 911 Dispatch Center. Once funding for this project is assured this work will be completed promptly.
2. The drop ceiling repairs in the central Jail hallway were complete in August 2004. Removable steel panels have been installed in the ceiling providing both security, and, access for future repairs and inspection to maintenance staff.
3. A contractor installed razor (or security) wire around the female exercise yard at the Jail in April 2004.

4. As of September 2004, the fingerprinting area is still near the Jail's control room. There is no security risk to either the public or inmates while being fingerprinted because this area is locked when in use. The Sheriff's department is evaluating the feasibility of purchasing a new "Live Scan" fingerprinting machine from the State of California, and placing it at a location other than the jail. However, current budget constraints may delay this project.

2003-2004 Grand Jury Finding #1:

*"The jail's heating and ventilating is regulated by an offsite computer-controlled system (the "DELTA" system). The purpose of this system is to realize energy efficiencies. It was noted during the inspections that the jail areas, particularly the maximum-security section, appeared very warm and damp. The jail staff indicated conditions were often too hot or cold."*

Board's Response to Finding #1, Jail:

Facility Services staff has addressed all pending heating and ventilating issues in the jail. As of September 2004, Facility Services has not received any additional complaints from jail staff or inmates regarding heating and ventilating issues in the jail.

2003-2004 Grand Jury Finding #2:

*"It was noted the standby generator for emergency power during power failures was missing. The Grand Jury was informed that the generator had been removed by Facility Services in December 2003 because it had been "red tagged." During a countywide power outage in that month, the jail was without backup power for over twenty-four hours creating a security problem. While a new generator was on order, it had not yet been received (as of May 1, 2004), forcing the jail to rent a temporary trailer-mounted generator at a cost of \$1,800 per month for three months."*

Board's Response to Finding #2, Jail:

A contractor completed installation of a new generator, and repair of the automatic transfer switch on the generator in May 2004. Startup, transfer and shutdown of the generator are completely automatic, requiring no involvement by jail staff. The Facility Service's budget, and not the Jail budget, absorbed the \$5400 rent for the portable generator during the winter of 2003.

2003-2004 Grand Jury Finding #3:

*"The present jail facility presents many security issues because of the way it was constructed in 1976. Examples: there is no automated lock-in control when moving inmates from one cell to another; the physical layout is linear which makes it more labor intensive and places staff in direct contact with prisoners; there are no slots in maximum security cell doors requiring food to have to be served to prisoners by opening the cell door; access to jail facilities for disabled female inmates is inadequate. The Jail Commander estimated a new jail facility might cost in excess of \$12 million."*

#### Board's Response to Finding #3, Jail:

The jail is the only County-owned facility operating 24 hours a day, every day. Facility Services staff gives jail maintenance issues top priority, and provide more maintenance services to the jail than any other County-owned facility. Both Facility Services and jail staff maintain logs to track and prioritize "job orders." Due to both County and State budget constraints; construction of a new jail in the near future may not be feasible. In lieu of constructing a new jail, the Board will direct staff to evaluate the feasibility of remodeling the jail to address potential security issues, explore grant funding, and consider a loss-prevention analysis of the current jail configuration.

#### 2003-2004 Grand Jury Finding #4:

*"There are numerous maintenance problems applicable to the jail. Previously, the jail had its own full-time maintenance employee. Maintenance now has to be requested of the Facility Services Department. Due to that department's understaffing situation, requested maintenance orders are often not completed in a timely manner or not completed at all. Documentation indicated twenty-two open work orders for the jail with only six currently in the process of correction."*

#### Board's Response to Finding #4, Jail:

The County's 2004-2005 budget includes funding for a dedicated jail maintenance person. Jail, Facility Services and Sheriff's department staff have agreed to meet on a regular basis to proactively manage maintenance issues in the jail.

#### 2003-2004 Grand Jury Finding #4:

*"Outside the jail, there are several problems relating to security in the yard areas. These include:*

- a. Two surveillance cameras are not functioning; another camera is needed to cover the east end of the yard.*
- b. Some of the lighting sensors are not functioning properly. One security light was noted as being on at 4:00 P.M. during the inspection.*
- c. The main electrical panel and transformer are without adequate security.*
- d. The outside female exercise area is not adequately wired for security."*

#### Board's Response to Finding #4, Jail:

- a. Both surveillance cameras are now functioning.
- b. Outside security lighting repairs are complete.
- c. A contractor will install a chain link fence with top and locked gate entry around the electrical panel and transformer. Facility Services let this improvement project out for competitive bids, and is awaiting responses as of September 2004.
- d. A contractor installed razor (or security) wire around the female exercise yard at the Jail in April 2004.

#### Board's Response to Recommendations One – Four, Jail (Reference Page 21, 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report)

1. The recommendation requires further analysis. The Sheriff, Undersheriff, Jail Commander, Facility Services Director, members of the Sheriff's Association and the County Administrative Officer have reviewed, and continue to review the current and future adequacy of the jail. The Board has authorized significant maintenance and improvement general fund expenditures on the jail to assure the continued safety and security of both inmates and jail staff.

The Board has researched the availability of both federal and state funding for a new jail facility without success to date. Collaborating with the California Administrative Office of the Courts, in its state wide new court facility construction program, could develop into a potential secure court/jail complex. County staff will continue to pursue grant funding, and other revenue sources to build a fund for jail construction purposes.

2. This recommendation has been implemented. The Sheriff, Undersheriff, Jail Commander, Facility Services Director and the County Administrative Officer have met, and have agreed to meet regularly, to assess and proactively manage the security and maintenance issues raised by the Grand Jury and others. Beginning in March 2004, the individuals listed above created written project lists and schedules for project completion to address jail maintenance and security issues. Each participating individual received copies of project lists and project completion schedules.

3. This recommendation has been implemented. The Board approved funding for a full time dedicated jail maintenance person in its 2004-2005 budget.

4. This recommendation has been implemented. Individual Board members have visited the jail from time to time.

### **Probation Department**

#### **Grand Jury Finding #1:**

*"One probation officer is now assigned to students on probation who are enrolled at Plumas County Community School. This officer follows prescribed procedures by signing the visitation log and notifies teachers if students on probation are to be removed from the classroom. This has improved communications between the Probation Department and the Plumas County Community School."*

#### **Board's Response to Finding #1, Probation:**

Agree. The Probation Department anticipates a positive relationship with the Plumas County Community School in the future, and continued cooperation with the School District.

#### **Grand Jury Finding #2:**

*"The Probation Department does not have a separate juvenile division."*

#### **Board's Response to Finding #2, Probation:**

Disagree. The Plumas County Probation Department has a juvenile division.

#### **Grand Jury Finding #3:**

*"The Probation Department is in need of expanded office space for personnel and equipment. Lack of space has caused overcrowding conditions and lower staff morale. Currently, there is inadequate office space for fourteen employees."*

Board's Response to Finding #3, Probation:

Agree.

Grand Jury Finding #4:

*"Two hundred hours of training are required for newly employed probation officers. The Chief Probation Officer [Thomas Frady] indicated the department experiences high turnover. Many officers leave for higher paying positions in other counties once they reach the two hundred hour mark. The average retention duration for entry-level probation officers is eighteen months. Current annual compensation levels are: entry level - \$29,448; 1 year - \$31,200; 4-5 years - \$34,800."*

Board's Response to Finding #4, Probation:

Agree.

Grand Jury Finding #5:

*"Funding for the Probation Department is provided from the County general fund (55%), six separate grants (22%), State and federal sources (20%) and fees charged to probationers (3%)."*

Board's Response to Finding #5, Probation:

Agree.

Grand Jury Finding #6:

*"At the time of the Grand Jury interview, the Chief Probation Officer [Thomas Frady] had not received a performance evaluation for eleven years."*

Board's Response to Finding #6, Probation:

Agree.

Board's Response to Recommendations One – Three, Probation Department  
(Reference Page 23, 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report)

1. This recommendation has not been implemented in its entirety, but will be fully implemented by approximately winter 2005-2006. Several County departments will be moving out of the courthouse in the fall and winter of 2004-2005 in to the remodeled One-Stop Permit Center. The County's new Health and Human Services Center is currently slated for completion by fall 2005. The Public Health Agency will relocate into the new Health and Human Services Center, leaving vacant a County-owned building in East Quincy adjacent to the Sheriff's Department.

These several departmental relocations will likely result in additional space becoming available for expansion of the Probation Department.

2. This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The Grand Jury's analysis of this matter is accurate, and no additional study is necessary. Staff turnover in many County departments derives from current County pay scales.

3. This recommendation has been implemented.