



2017



2018

**County of Plumas
Civil Grand Jury
Report**

2017–2018 PLUMAS COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Table of Contents

2017 – 2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury Members	2
Judge Introduction Letter	2
Final Report Distribution List	2
Introduction to the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury	3
CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REPORT	4
Summary	4
Background	4
Methodology	4
Discussion	5
Findings	5
Recommendations	5
Request for Responses	6
Invited Responses	6
PLUMAS COUNTY ANIMAL SERVICES REPORT	6
Summary	6
Background	5
Methodology	7
Discussion	7
Findings	9
Recommendations	9
Request For Responses	10
Invited Responses	10
JAIL REPORT	11
Summary	11
Background	11
Methodology	11
Discussion	12
Findings	13
Recommendations	14
Request for Responses	14
Invited responses	14
APPENDIX	14
Note to Respondents	14
How to Report Action in Response to Recommendations	15
Respondents should note:	15
Requirement to Respond	15
CITIZEN COMPLAINT FORM	16

Final Report Distribution List

The Honorable Judge Janet Hilde
 The Honorable Judge Douglas M. Prouty
 Plumas County Board of Supervisors
 Plumas County Auditor/Controller
 Plumas County Treasurer/Tax Collector
 Plumas County Clerk/Recorder
 Plumas County Counsel
 Plumas County District Attorney
 Plumas County Court Executive Officer
 Plumas County Jail Commander
 Plumas County Libraries
 Plumas County Sheriff
 Plumas County Special Districts Association
 Plumas County Superintendent of Schools
 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury (2017–2018)
 California Grand Jurors Association
 California State Archivist
 Smith & Newell CPA's
 Plumas County Department of Social Services

*Dedicated to the people of Plumas County,
whom we have been privileged to serve.*



2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury June 6, 2018

The Honorable Janet Hilde
 Presiding Judge of the Grand Jury
 Plumas County Superior Court
 Quincy, CA 95971

Dear Judge Hilde

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury is pleased to present three reports representing the mandated jail inspection report, a citizen's complaint and an investigation into Plumas County Animal Services. These three reports comprise the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury's Final Report.

July 1, 2017 the Plumas County Civil Grand Jury members were sworn in giving a total of nineteen assembled jurors to start the year. As the year progressed, four jurors had resigned for various reasons, at the closing of the Grand Jury term ending June 30, 2018 there were fifteen jurors on the grand jury.

The members of the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury has spent considerable time and effort conducting research, attending meetings, interviews, hearings, and site visit investigations to address the issues presented in our final report. We believe the recommendations will improve the operational efficiency of the respective agencies.

It is understood by the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury that the recommendations presented be fiscally achievable. However, this is beyond the scope of the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury and it is up to the Board of Supervisors to direct policy and secure funding. We look forward to the Board of Supervisors implementing as many recommendations as fiscally possible.

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury would like to thank our legal advisors; R. Craig Settemire, County Counsel and David Hollister, District Attorney for their legal advice and support throughout the year.

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury is also grateful to Honorable Janet A. Hilde, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court for her advice and continuing support throughout the year and thank you for the opportunity and privilege to have served our community.

It has been both a privilege and honor to have served on the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury with a jury makeup of dedicated individuals who volunteered countless hours to generate the required information necessary for these reports. I thank each and every one of them for their hard work and dedication in making this a successful 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury.

Sincerely,

Ronald D. Green

Ronald D. Green, Foreperson
 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury

2017–2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury Members

Mary Arthur	Portola	District 1
Reb Benner	Greenville	District 2
Marjorie Joseph	Taylorville	District 2
Marshall Brautigam	Chester	District 3
Sherrie Bridgman	Chester	District 3
Holly Coons	Lake Almanor	District 3
Bertha Ingels	Chester	District 3
Katherine Newton	Lake Almanor	District 3
Ronald D. Green	Quincy	District 4
Sharla Satterfield	Quincy	District 4
David Truax	Quincy	District 4
Phil Curtis	Portola	District 5
Jackson Harris	Graeagle	District 5
Dale Hebel	Clio	District 5
David Werner	Clio	District 5

Introduction to the 2017–2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury

The Plumas County Civil Grand Jury is composed of 19 individuals summoned at random from a much larger citizens pool. These individuals volunteer to commit a calendar year of their time to determine if county/elected officials are utilizing county and taxpayer's funds efficiently and to draw attention to county government operations that need improvement and to address selected citizen complaints within the boundaries of Plumas County and incorporated cities. Civil Grand Jury duties, powers, responsibilities, qualifications, and selection process are set forth in the California Penal Code section §888 (see appendix).

The Civil Grand Jury reviews policies, procedures and mission statements from county government agencies to determine whether they follow and achieve stated objectives. In addition, the role of the Civil Grand Jury is to evaluate the effectiveness and fiscal responsibility of the investigated agency. Other duties may include any aspect of county or city governments, special districts, service districts and joint power agencies that the Civil Grand Jury decides to investigate. The Civil Grand Jury is a watchdog body that oversees the responsible allocations and spending of tax payer dollars and other county funds.

It should be noted that no individual Civil Grand Jury member has the power to act alone, the Civil Grand Jury lawfully functions as one body. The Civil Grand Jury is a secret body. Meetings are not open to the public and all voting and decision making is private and confidential. The Civil Grand Jury is required by law (PC §925 and §933(a)), to produce a final report.

In the following pages we present three reports that comprise the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury Final Report. A citizen's complaint (not all complaints are investigated), Plumas County Animal Services and mandated (PC §919(b)) county jail report. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury understands that the following report recommendations are contingent on fiscal reality. We understand that there are limited fiscal resources available in Plumas County, and that great demands are placed on these resources. We believe our recommendations are fiscally achievable, however, it is up to the Plumas County Board of Supervisors to make the final determination.

As a consequence of our investigations the Civil Grand Jury found a very dedicated county workforce, doing good work with limited resources. Our commendations to all.

So who is the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury? In essence, we are you, concerned citizens. Consider serving, you will find the process a most rewarding experience.

Reports issued by the Grand Jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code section 929 requires that reports of the Grand Jury not contain the name of any person or facts leading to the identity of any person who provides information to the Grand Jury.

2017–2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REPORT

Summary

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury investigated a citizen's complaint involving the immediate removal of a Foster Care Juvenile from a Foster Care Home. The investigation revealed that County's Child Protective Service does not have a policy and/or procedure for the immediate removal of a Foster Care Juvenile from a Foster Care Home. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury findings support the development by the County's Child Protective Service for a workable, written policy and/or procedure for such rare emergency situations.

Background

The County Child Protective Services works with contracted, non-government agencies for the placement of children in Foster Care Homes. The Sheriff's Office does have a written policy and procedures for the removal of children from unsafe environments. But, Child Protective Services does not have a written policy/procedure for the removal of a juvenile from a Foster Care Home when he/she is a danger to him/herself or others in an emergency situation. Currently, the procedure to remove a juvenile from Foster Care requires a seven-day grace period so that all agencies involved can coordinate with each other to find placement.

Methodology

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury approached their investigation by conducting three interviews with personnel from the Child Protective Services. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury also interviewed the Plumas County Sheriff and a non-government agency contracted with the County for Foster Care placement and supervision. An individual involved with the incident in question was also interviewed. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury also searched the Plumas County website for relevant information and requested documentation from the Department of Social Services pertaining to the Child Protective Services, Plumas County Sheriff's Office and a non-government entity contracted by the County for Foster Care placement and supervision.

Discussion

Why is it important for a county government or organization to have clear policies and procedures? Policies and procedures are the operational foundation of any organization by defining an organization's guiding principles, providing detailed actions for specific situations and forms the basic structure of the organization. Clear policies and procedures allow for a coordinated workforce by elucidating organizational guidelines and defining specific actions for specific situations and individuals. Good policies and procedures provide a way to communicate and apply consistent standards and practices within an organization. Policies and procedures are the backbone of any organization.

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury investigated a complaint received from a private citizen involving Child Protective Services and a situation that involved the immediate removal of a juvenile from a Foster Care Home.

As noted in the Background section of this report, the County's Child Protective Services current policy to remove a child from a Foster Care Home requires a seven-day notice from the Foster Care Agency to the Child Protective Services. This removal procedure is a complicated process that takes time to get everything in place as multiple agencies, such as Behavioral Health, the Sheriff's Office, Probation and the Courts may be involved with the removal and placement of a child.

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury investigation showed that the Child Protective Services had no written policies and procedures when a juvenile must be immediately removed from a Foster Care Home.

Findings

F1. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that there is no written Child Protective Services policy and/or procedures when a Foster Care Juvenile must be immediately removed from a Foster Care Home, placing the Foster Care Juvenile and/or the members of the Foster Care Home in a precarious situation.

Recommendations

R1. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends that Board of Supervisors

direct the Child Protective Services to create a workable, written policy and/or procedure when a Foster Care Juvenile needs to be immediately removed from a Foster Care Home.

Request for Responses

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05, the grand jury requests responses as follows:

From the following individuals:

- The Director of Social Services should respond to R1

From the following governing bodies:

- The Board Supervisors should respond to R1.

Invited Responses

- The Presiding Judge may respond to the entire report.

2017–2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury

PLUMAS COUNTY ANIMAL SERVICES REPORT

Summary

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury investigated the Plumas County Animal Services Department. The Civil Grand Jury found deficiencies in security, administration, maintenance and staffing. The Civil Grand Jury also found a very dedicated staff. The Findings of the Civil Grand Jury support the need for the Board of Supervisors and Sheriff's Office to implement current Civil Grand Jury's Recommendations.

Background

The Animal Services Department falls under the control of the Plumas County Sheriff's Office. The Mission Statement of the Plumas County's Animal Services Department is to enforce Animal Control laws and regulations. When appropriate, they work cooperatively with other organizations to increase pet adoptions and reduce unwanted pet populations. They are responsible for humanely housing and disposing of unwanted stray animals, enforcing all laws pertaining to the care, custody, and control of animals within their jurisdiction, and complying with the State of California's Rabies Control Program Regulations.

The County has two paid Animal Control employees: An Animal Control Supervisor and an Animal Control Officer. Per the Sheriff's Office organizational flow chart, both the Animal Control Supervisor and the Animal Control Officer fall under the direction of the Sheriff's Office Special Operations Sergeant. The Animal Control Officers are tasked with enforcing the animal control laws and regulations of Plumas County and the State of California. The investigation on which this report is based is to ensure that the Animal Services Department is meeting these objectives.

Methodology

During this investigation, the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury made both announced and unannounced visits to the County's Animal Shelter in Quincy. On these visits, an inspection of the facility was conducted. Both Animal Control Officers were interviewed separately. The Civil Grand Jury also interviewed the Sheriff's Office Special Operation Sergeant. In addition, the Sheriff's Office Fiscal Officer was interviewed to delineate budget constraints of the Animal Shelter. The Plumas County Sheriff was also interviewed, to provide further information on the administrative and operational requirements of the Animal Shelter. The Civil Grand Jury reviewed the 2015-2016 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury report, and Board of Supervisors response, as well as, the "Amended and Supplemental Response to the 2015-2016 Plumas County Grand Jury Final Report" from the Board of Supervisors. In addition, the Civil Grand Jury reviewed the Humane Society of the United States Guidelines for Animal Shelter Policies found in the Humane Society International Electronic Library at www.hsihsus.org.

Discussion

The Plumas County Animal Shelter is a relatively new facility, built in 2003. The kennels and outdoor exercise areas are adequate and meet the needs of Plumas County. Areas of concern identified by the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury are as follows:

1. The Animal Shelter has several maintenance issues that include:
 - a. An inoperable crematorium, requiring euthanized animals to be taken to a Nevada landfill for disposal at a fee. When the crematorium was operating the County charged Plumas County residents for private cremations.
 - b. The buildings emergency generator is not connected to the building. Without electricity,

during the winter months, animals are left in freezing conditions. Furthermore, an operation manual is not available, and employees are not trained on how to operate the generator.

- c. The security camera systems recording features are unusable due to a lost password preventing access to the system. The systems monitor is operational but located in a storeroom making it unusable to employees for security purposes.
- 2. Record keeping and year-end reports are manually logged in a notebook. While the Animal Shelter has a computer available, it does not have record keeping software for the employees to expedite this cumbersome and time-consuming process.
- 3. There is a lack of supervision of the jail inmates at the Animal Shelter. Inmates are transported to the Animal Shelter daily by a deputy from the jail and returned to the jail in the afternoon. The limited staff at the Animal Shelter prevents adequate inmate supervision. Inmates are often left unsupervised to wander about the Animal Shelter and off grounds.
- 4. The Sheriff's budgeting process for Animal Services does not include the Animal Control Supervisor. The job description for the Animal Control Supervisor states that the Animal Control Supervisor be involved in the budgeting process.
- 5. The Animal Shelter has two paid employees, both are Animal Control Officers who share the Animal Shelter operational duties. During an Animal Control call, one or both officers may be called to handle the incident, requiring the shelter to be closed and the inmate worker returned to the jail. When there is only one employee on duty, the front desk and reception areas are left unattended while the employee is performing duties in other areas. There is a volunteer worker program that could be utilized at the Animal Shelter to help resolve the staff shortage but is not being used.
- 6. Animal Services has an Animal Control Field Manual, developed in 2016, and placed into operation in early 2018. However, an office policy and procedure manual does not exist, leaving employees to presume their duties and responsibilities. Without an office policy or procedure manual in place there are no set guidelines for employees to follow.

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury commends the two Animal Control Officers who are dedicated employees who sincerely care for the animals brought to the Animal Shelter. They make every attempt to find good homes for the animals and to reunite owners with their lost pets.

Findings

F1. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that an inoperable crematorium may be costing the County lost revenues from private cremations and adding to the operational costs of the Animal Shelter. Currently euthanized animals are stored in a freezer until disposed at a Nevada landfill.

F2. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that the emergency power generator for the Animal Shelter is ineffective since it is not connected to the building. Furthermore, an operation manual is not available and employees are not trained on the operation of the generator.

F3. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that the security camera systems recording features are unusable due to a lost password preventing access to the system.

F4. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that the Animal Shelter security camera system is ineffective because the monitor showing the live feed from the six security cameras is located in a storeroom.

F5. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that reports and records required by the State of California are manually recorded into a notebook rather than by computer making for an arduous and time-consuming process for employees.

F6. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that using jail inmates at the Animal Shelter is not practical because inmates cannot be properly supervised.

F7. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that the Animal Control Supervisor is not included in the Sheriff Department budget process.

F8. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that the Animal Shelter's operational efficiency may improve with an office policy and procedure manual.

Recommendations

R1. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors commission a cost analysis study to determine which is the most cost effective, using the crematorium for cremations or disposing of animals at a landfill.

R2. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors to direct the County Facility Services Department to connect the Animal Shelter generator to the building. Test the emergency operation, and develop operating instructions to train Shelter personnel in the use of the generator.

R3. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct the Department of Facility Services to resolve the password issue.

R4. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct the Department of Facility Services to relocate the security camera system monitor to the front desk and relocate cameras for optimum surveillance.

R5. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors authorize funds to purchase an Animal Shelter management computer program.

R6. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends the Sheriff's Office reevaluate the benefits of the use of inmates and hire additional employees and/or enlist volunteers to assist in the operation of the Animal Shelter.

R7. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends the Sheriff's Office include the Animal Control Supervisor in their annual budgeting proceedings.

R8. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends the Sheriff to direct his staff to develop an office policy and procedure manual for the operation of the Animal Shelter.

Request for Responses

Pursuant to Penal Code section §933.05, the Grand Jury requests responses:
From the following:

- The Plumas County Board of Supervisors R1, R2, R3, R4, R5
- Plumas County Sheriff R6, R7, R8

Invited Responses

The Presiding Judge may respond to the entire report.

2017–2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury

JAIL REPORT

Summary

In compliance with Government Code Section §919(b), each Civil Grand Jury in the State of California is mandated to inspect correction facilities within the fiscal year. The members of the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury inspected the Plumas County Jail twice, once on September 5 and a second time on October 17, 2017. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury was specifically concerned about the state of the jail's physical plant, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the jail's state of cleanliness. The findings support the need for a new jail.

Background

The existing County jail became operational in 1976, incorporating an old linear design. The original jail was built to hold 37 inmates. In the early 1990's the jail expanded to accommodate 67 inmates. The County jail was originally designed to house persons being detained while awaiting trial, those who had been sentenced to a County jail term and those who were awaiting transfer to a California State Prison. In 2011, in a response to the U.S. Supreme Court mandate to reduce the number of state inmates in the California State Prison system, the California State Assembly passed Assembly Bill (AB) 109. AB 109 shifted state prison inmates who were classified as "low-level offenders" to county jails. Additionally, in 2014, California voters passed Proposition 47, a law that changed certain low-level crimes from potential felonies to misdemeanors. AB 109 and Proposition 47 radically changed the demographic dynamics of the Plumas County Jail by adding to the jail population high-risk offenders who are serving long-term (multiple year) jail sentences. Furthermore, the current jail was built before the Americans with Disabilities Act came into effect. The Sheriff's Office has made reasonable accommodations for inmates who have disabilities, but generally the jail is not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Methodology

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury approached their investigation by inspecting the jail twice (September 5 and October 17, 2017). They also interviewed the Plumas County Sheriff

twice (December 8, 2017 and January 11, 2018). The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury also reviewed past Plumas County Civil Grand Jury jail reports, and reviewed the following documents: the Board of State Community Corrections 2016-2018 BIENNIAL INSPECTION – PLUMAS COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE ADULT CORRECTIONAL FACILITY (PENAL CODE SECTION §6031); the Plumas County Environmental Health Inspection Report December 14, 2017; and the Office of the State Fire Marshall FIRE SAFETY CORRECTION NOTICE January 20, 2016.

Discussion

The current Plumas County Jail is 42 years old and shows its age. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds the County jail’s physical plant to be inadequate. The jail is one of the last remaining county jails in California to incorporate, a now, out dated linear design that makes inmate monitoring with the current staff level difficult and ineffective. The current jail also does not adequately provide the infrastructure needed to house inmates serving long-term sentences per AB 109 and Prop 47. This poses a security risk to jail staff, inmates and the public.

Specific areas of concerns identified by the 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury during this investigation include the following:

- 1) Surveillance cameras that are not always working.
- 2) The infirmary is too small and is adjacent to the staff’s office space and computers, creating a security and safety risk.
- 3) The mens low-risk dorm area, which incorporates an early 1990’s renovation of the old Sheriff’s Office, has doors leading to the outside that can only be opened from the inside, that per the Office of the State Fire Marshal must remain unlocked.
- 4) Space where new inmates change clothes is concealed and creates a dangerous situation with a 1 to 1 officer to inmate ratio for clothes change outs.
- 5) Due to AB 109, there’s a problem with the segregation of the inmate population per their offense.
- 6) There is a lack of physical space to help rehabilitate inmates and reduce the rate of recidivism.

7) The improper use of the sobering cell, which is intended to hold inmates under the influence of alcohol or drugs, is being used for the placement of inmates who are suicidal or exhibiting mental illness. This cell is also being used as a holding cell to segregate inmates due to the lack of adequate holding cells in the intake area.

8) The jail's general physical structure is not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. According to the County Sheriff this is the largest source of liability to the county.

Overall the jail is clean as per our inspection and the latest Plumas County Environmental Health Inspection report dated December 14, 2017.

The obvious solution to these concerns is a new jail. Due to the foresight of the Board of Supervisors, and the diligent work of the Sheriff and his staff in consultation with the Carter Goble Lee Companies, on June 8, 2017, the County was awarded a grant for 25 million dollars from the State of California for a new jail. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury commends the Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff's Office for their commitment and dedication in submitting this award-winning grant proposal to the State of California for a new jail. On January 16, 2018, the Board of Supervisors gave final approval for the location site of the new jail, bringing to an end an inter-County Department disagreement over the site location of a new jail. This Board of Supervisors' decision allows the County to clear the last hurdle for the State of California to give its stamp of approval to the County's new jail plan and release the funds of this grant to the County. The County expects to get final approval from the State by the spring of 2018.

Per the plans developed for the new jail, all the issues discussed above would be resolved. The tentative completion date for the new jail, barring any delays, is late November 2020. Let the construction begin!

The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury also wants to commend the Sheriff's Office men and women who staff the County Jail for doing an outstanding job in serving the citizens of Plumas County with very limited resources.

Findings

F1. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury finds that the current jail is antiquated and inadequate to meet the needs of today's inmate population.

F2. The County has been awarded a grant of 25 million dollars by the State of California to build a new jail.

Recommendations

R1-2. The 2017-2018 Plumas County Civil Grand Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors, the Sheriff's Office and all other County Departments continue to work effectively with the State to ensure the 25 million dollar granting process continues to move forward smoothly for the building of a new jail.

Request for Responses

Pursuant to Penal Code section §933.05, the grand jury requests responses as follows:

From the following individuals:

- The Sheriff should respond to R1.

From the following governing bodies:

- The Board of Supervisors should respond to R1.

Invited Responses

The Presiding Judge may respond to the entire report.

APPENDIX

California Penal Code §888 requires the Grand Jury to:

- Inquire into the condition and management of jails within the county.
- Investigate and report on the operations, accounts, and records of county officers, departments, and function.
- Inquire into the willful or corrupt misconduct in office of public officers.
- Submit a final report of its findings and recommendations to the Supervising Judge of the Superior Court.

Agencies to which these recommendations are directed are required to respond to the Plumas County Grand Jury within 90 days after the final report is released.

Note to Respondents

The legal requirements for individuals and agencies to respond are contained in California Penal Code, Section §933.05 as summarized below:

How to Respond to Findings

The responding person or entity must, within time frames specified in Penal Code Section §933 (c), respond in one of two ways:

How to Report Action in Response to Recommendations

Recommendations by the Civil Grand Jury require action (Penal Code §933.05). The responding person or entity must report action on all recommendations in one of four ways:

- The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary of the implemented action.
- The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.
- The recommendation requires further analysis. If the person or entity reports in this manner, the law requires an explanation of the analysis or studies in a time frame not to exceed six (6) months.
- The recommendations will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation.

Respondents Should Note

1. If a finding or a recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county department headed by an elected officer, both the agency or department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Civil Grand Jury. However, 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.
2. A Civil Grand Jury may request a subject person or entity to come before the Civil Grand Jury for the purpose of reading and discussing the findings of the Civil Grand Jury report that relates to that person or entity in order to verify the accuracy of the findings prior to their release.
3. During the investigation, the Civil 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 foreman of the Civil Grand Jury, determines that such a meeting would be detrimental.
4. A Civil Grand Jury shall provide to the affected agency a copy of the portion of the Civil 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.

Requirement to Respond

No later than ninety (90) days after the Civil Grand Jury submits a final report on the operations of any public agency subject to its reviewing authority, the governing body of the public agency

(includes departments) shall comment to the presiding judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the governing body, and every elected county officer or agency head for which the Civil Grand Jury has responsibility pursuant to Section §914.1 shall comment within sixty (60) days to the presiding judge of the Superior Court, with an information copy sent to the Board of Supervisors, on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of that county officer or agency head and any agency or agencies which that officer or agency head supervises or controls. All of these comments and reports shall forthwith be submitted to the presiding judge of the Superior Court who impaneled the Civil Grand Jury.

PLUMAS COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY
P.O. Box 784, Quincy, California 95971



CITIZEN COMPLAINT FORM

(Please print or type all information)

Person Filing Complaint

Name: _____

Date _____

Address: _____

City _____

State/Zip _____

Phone _____

Agency or person about whom complaint is made

Name: _____

Title _____

Department: _____

1. Describe your complaint (Briefly state action that is (was) dishonest, improper, illegal, inefficient, etc.)

2. Set forth the facts upon which the complaint is based. (Describe in detail, include all names, dates, places, etc.)

3. What other agencies, officials or persons have you contacted about this matter? What was (has been) their response to you?
(Give names, addresses, phone numbers, contact dates and any other information you think is pertinent.)

4. Is the complaint involved in litigation? No Yes

5. Should we contact any other agencies or persons? (Please give names, addresses, phone numbers, etc.)

6. What action do you think the Grand Jury should take?

Signature: _____