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August 27, 2013

The Honorable Susan Harlan, Presiding Judge
Amador County Grand Jury
500 Argonaut Lane
Jackson, CA 95642

Re: 2012-2013 Grand Jury Report - Response by the Amador County Board of Supervisors

Dear Judge Harlan:

The Amador County Board of Supervisors appreciates the opportunity to respond to the 2012-2013 Grand Jury Report. The report reflects a tremendous amount of effort on behalf of the grand jurors. The Board of Supervisors appreciates the dedication of each member of the grand jury and thanks them for their service.

Listed below you will find agency responses as well as the Board of Supervisors’ response to each finding and recommendation for which the Board of Supervisors was requested to respond to in the 2011-2012 Grand Jury Report.

Amador County Health and Human Services

Finding #1: Amador County has applied for funding under the CSS, PEI and INN programs since 2008-2009. They have applied for funding under the remaining MHSA programs in 2012-2013.

Response to finding #1: Respondent disagrees. Specifically, Amador County has requested, and received, all available MHSA funding including the following: CSS funding for FY 2005/2006 through FY 2013/2014, PEI funding for FY 2007/2008 through FY 2013/2014, INN for FY 2008/2009 through FY 2013/2014, WET for FY 2006/2007 through 2008/2009 (this is all that was available), and CFT 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 (also all that is available).

Response by Board of Supervisors: The Board of Supervisors agrees with the response by the Department Head.
Finding #2: The County accounting system is out of date. It does not allow the tracking of expenses at the level the County Behavioral Health Department requires. Mental Health is a division of Behavioral Health.

Responses to findings # 2: 
Respondent agrees that Mental Health is a division of Behavioral Health. Respondent does not have direct information about the adequacy of the County wide accounting system. Respondent disagrees, Behavioral Health expenses are tracked, in MAXIME, at three levels: 1) department, 2) program and 3) element level. Example: INN, CSS, etc. are tracked within Behavioral Health in MAXIME allowing the tracking of expenditures within each MHSA program element.

Response by Board of Supervisors: The Board of Supervisors agrees with the response by the Department Head.

Finding #3: The MHD reconciles the MAXIME reports to the County expenditure reports monthly.

Response to finding # 3: 
Respondent agrees.

Response by Board of Supervisors: The Board of Supervisors agrees with the response by the Department Head.

Finding #4: MHSA reports are located in 2 separate locations on the County’s website. The reports that are available on the website are out-of-date drafts and are not the final approved reports. This makes it difficult to compare historical data with more recent reports.

Response to finding # 4: 
Respondent agrees. Behavior Health recently funded the new www.amador.networkofcare.org website. There you will find a new section dedicated to the Mental Health Services Act. Currently, Behavioral Health staff are transferring over all previous plans and updates. Once complete the other two websites will be eliminated and the county site will re-direct viewers to the new site.

Response by Board of Supervisors: The Board of Supervisors agrees with the response by the Department Head.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation # 1: The Grand Jury recommends that the County implement the recommendation in the “2011-2012 County of Amador Audit Report” for governmental trust accounts:

“...recommend that the County integrate the activity of these funds into operating funds of the County to better reflect the revenue and expenditure activity throughout the year. In addition, by integrating these funds into operating funds, the County will ensure that all activity is properly budgeted for. If the County wishes to establish separate funds rather than blending the activity into existing funds, it may do so. The benefit of reporting the activity in an operating fund instead of a fiduciary fund is that revenues and expenditures can be associated with a department and a function.”

Response: The Grand Jury recommendation is for MHSA funds to be integrated into operating funds. The quote from the Audit Report is regarding fiduciary / trust funds – which are different than MHSA funds. MHSA funds are already directly deposited into a subaccount within our Behavioral Health operating fund (11700). The subaccount is an asset account called MHSA Prop 63 (101235). When MHSA expenditures are incurred, the monies are transferred into (101170) Behavioral Health Account from which all monies are spent (per design of the auditor's office). By using this process all MHSA monies are carefully tracked.

Recommendation # 2: The MHD needs to increase transparency by providing budget monitoring status in an easy-to-read format and post it on the County’s website. An example would be located at www.sccgov.org/sites/MHD

Response: Fiscal and budgetary planning are currently performed in conjunction with the community and key stakeholders in a public forum via the bi-monthly MHSA / cultural competency steering committee (per statutory regulations). These meetings are open to the public and reflect a fully transparent process. Minutes from these meetings are not yet available upon the county website but are available upon request.

Recommendation # 3: MHD needs to consolidate and update the website to include easier ways to find information about MHSA. They also need to provide a link directly under the “Services” category of the County’s website. This will make it easier to locate the plan, budgets, and expenditures for the average resident.
Response: Respondent agrees with this recommendation. As stated above - in response to management’s concerns around this issue Behavioral Health recently funded the new www.amador.networkofcare.org website. There you will find a new section dedicated to the Mental Health Services Act. Currently, Behavioral Health staff are transferring over all previous plans and updates. Once complete the other two websites will be eliminated and the county site will re-direct viewers to the new site.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

Recommendation #1: The County continue to use budget strategies to maintain a healthy reserve. The BOS should strive to maintain a contingency fund that is 3% of county expenditures as economic times improve.

Response: Agree.

Recommendation #2: The County annual budget documents need to contain a glossary of terms, a narrative on the county’s financial health and a fully graphed and charted summary of the county's financial situation

Response: Agree. The upcoming budget will contain a partial implementation, and this recommendation should be fully implemented in the 14/15 budget documents. Clarifying the budget has been a goal of the CAO for some time now.

Recommendation #3: all budget proposal documents given to the BOS from any department, commission, or agency overseen by the BOS be presented in a standardized format. The BOS should develop a standardized format for budgets submitted to them.

Response: Agree. However, the CAO is unsure as to the nature of this finding, as it is his belief that this already occurs. Identical spreadsheets for each budget are sent out to the Departments by the CAO office, with the same spreadsheet being modified and returned as the official budget request. There are no significant format differences amongst the budgets.

Recommendation #4: The CAO's office should start the budget workshops with a short refresher course to the BOS on governmental accounting.

Response: Agree. This will be implemented in the next budget cycle.

Recommendation #5: All Supervisors have opportunities to take classes on the processes of government, which highlight the differences between private business and government business. This should be required for all incoming Supervisors and could be completed online.
Response: Agree. New Supervisors are already required to attend the new Supervisor Institute that is taught by CSAC. This practice will continue.

Recommendation #6: Concentrated training be developed for all members of the BOS on general governmental accounting and budget development specific to the County. Training should be developed by the Office of the County Administrative Officer (CAO). This training should occur at the beginning of every term of each supervisor.

Response: Agree. A program will be designed and implemented when ready.

Thank you for allowing the Amador County Board of Supervisors the opportunity to respond to the 2012-2013 Grand Jury Report. Hopefully the information contained within this response addresses any questions or concerns the Grand Jury may have regarding the policies, procedures, and functions of services being provided by Amador County. Should there be remaining questions please do not hesitate to contact County Administrative Officer Chuck Iley or me.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Forster
Chairman, Amador County Board of Supervisors

c: Mr. Chuck Iley, County Administrative Officer
    Mr. Greg Gillott, County Counsel
    The Honorable Martin Ryan, Sheriff-Coroner
    Mr. Jim Foley, Health Services Director
    Amador Ledger-Dispatch Newspaper
    Amador Community News
    Hometown Radio
    TSPN
    file
January 14, 2014

Mr. Mark Patrick, Foreman
Amador County Grand Jury
Conductor Boulevard
Jackson, California 95642

RE: Clarification Letter Dated November 18, 2013

Dear Mr. Patrick,

You requested, on behalf of the Grand Jury, some clarifications to the County’s responses to the 2012-2013 Grand Jury Report. I sincerely apologize for the delay in our response. The County’s responses to those questions are below:

Fiscal Integrity #3: All Special Districts will use the same spreadsheets that are used by the rest of the County for the budget presentations. Revenue sheets will be added to demonstrate where the revenues are coming from. This should be in place for the 14/15 budget.

Fiscal Integrity #6 (Timing of New Supervisor Training): Any newly Supervisors will go through a County Orientation, which will explain the intricacies of budgeting, Brown Act, and the other functions of the County. They will also go through the CSAC New Supervisors Institute as they always have. Both of these training sessions will be complete before the New Supervisors are installed in January, 2015.

Mental Health – Finding 4: Behavioral Health Services has uploaded FINAL documents of all MHSA plans that are currently available to the www.amador.networkofcare.org site. In addition to providing updated information, the county site now refers all users to this location. Please note that counties are statutorily required to post draft copies of their plans for 30-day public review and comment only. Beyond that, plans are to be kept on file with the county and with the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (at the State level). Amador plans to post online final signed documents, beginning with fiscal year 2012/13, even though this is not required. You will find this on the www.amador.networkofcare.org site going forward.

Mental Health – Recommendation 2: the name of the committee in question is the Mental Health Services Act / Cultural Competency Steering Committee. This is a departmental committee not required by the Act (MHSA). Since it is not a formal committee created by the Board of Supervisors, and is thus not under the Brown Act, agenda and minutes for this committee are not posted online as this is not statutorily required. The agenda is sent out via email prior to the meeting and minutes can be requested as needed. No plans are in place to post the agenda or minutes online in the future due to capacity issues and
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due to the lack of statutory requirement. The next meeting is scheduled for the 4th Monday of January from 3:30 to 5:00 pm and occurs bimonthly on the 4th Monday of the month thereafter.

If you should have any questions or need any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Chuck Iley
Amador County Administrative Officer
FOLLOW-UP REPORT
County Uses of Mental Health Services Act Funds

Background
The 2012-2013 Grand Jury investigated a complaint that Amador County’s Mental Health Department (Department) was misusing Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) funds. The complaint further stated that Amador County (County) was not applying for, nor reporting on, the use of future years’ funding. The basis for the 2012-2013 Grand Jury Final Report was:
- review of the MHSA itself
- research of the State of California’s website for MHSA
- interviews with current and past County employees
- reviews of other counties’ websites

Discussion
The County has several funding sources to provide services to its consumers and their families, including MHSA funds. The 2012-2013 Grand Jury identified 22 Facts and 4 Findings, and made 3 Recommendations to the County. Pursuant to Penal Code 933(c), a response to the findings and recommendations of the 2012-2013 Final Report was required. The County Board of Supervisors (BOS) and the Department responded on August 27, 2013.

Findings:
In this response, the Department and the BOS agreed with all the findings, with one exception. In the response received for Finding 1, the BOS indicated that it had applied for and received funds since fiscal year 2005-2006. However, the Department’s Program Plans for MHSA were not approved until December 2008. Funds were then requested for the previous years’ MHSA was in place. The Department received their first funding in February 2009 for all prior years.

The BOS agreed with Finding 4, but also stated that the Department staff would be consolidating all previous MHSA Program Plans and updates to a new website, with a link from the County’s website to the new website, Network of Care. No timeline for this consolidation was provided in the BOS response. In early September 2013, the updated plans and the link between the County’s website and the new Network of Care website were not in place.

Recommendations:
The explanation provided by the BOS regarding Recommendation 1 did not adequately address the Grand Jury’s accounting concerns behind the BOS response. While the BOS indicated there was adequate tracking, the Grand Jury disagrees. Comingling funds into one Behavioral Health account precludes adequate tracking of MHSA monies.

Recommendation 2 asks for government transparency by making easy-to-read budget documents available on the County’s website. The BOS response regarding Recommendation 2 did not provide the level of transparency recommended by the Grand Jury.
The BOS response indicated agreement with Recommendation 3.

Clarifications:
A follow-up letter was sent to the BOS on November 18, 2013, asking for clarification to the responses received for Finding 4 and Recommendation 2. A response from County Administration was received on January 14, 2014. In this response, the County stated that the Network of Care website was up and operational, links between the County and the new site were in place, and the MHSA program plans and budgets were available. The 2013-2014 Grand Jury verified that MHSA Annual Program Updates, for fiscal years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014, are available at www.amador.networkofcare.org. Also verified was the link from the County’s website: www.amadorgov.org to www.amador.networkofcare.org.

Clarification regarding Recommendation 2 included information about the steering committee referenced in the MHSA itself. The County Administration indicated that this is a departmental committee and not one created by the BOS. As such, it does not fall under Brown Act requirements, and agendas and minutes do not need to be made available prior to the meetings and posted online. The 2013-2014 Grand Jury confirmed that meetings of this committee occur bimonthly on the 4th Monday of the month, starting in January 2014. Agendas and minutes are available upon request from the Behavioral Health Services Department.

Conclusion
The 2013-2014 Grand Jury accepts the responses from both the BOS and County Administration. No further action is required.
Background
The 2012-2013 Grand Jury investigated County finances, based on complaints received stating the County had “large reserves” while laying off employees. During the investigation, the 2012-2013 Grand Jury decided County finances needed a more in-depth inquiry to understand the facts. Budget strategies and documents were reviewed. County employees, administrators, and department heads were interviewed. The 2012-2013 Grand Jury Final Report (Final Report) identified 20 Facts, 9 Findings, and 6 Recommendations. Pursuant to Penal Code §933(c), the governing body of the public agency shall comment on the findings and recommendations presented.

Discussion
The County Board of Supervisors (BOS) responded to the recommendations in the 2012-2013 Grand Jury Final Report. The BOS agreed with all 6 recommendations. Further information was provided on Recommendations 2, 3, and 6.

The BOS response to Recommendation 2 stated that a partial implementation will be included in the upcoming budget document (2013-2014) with full implementation to be included in the 2014-2015 budget document. The 2013-2014 Grand Jury has verified partial implementation. The details including objectives and funding sources are beneficial. The Glossary of Terms included is clear and concise. (Excerpts included in Appendix A)

In the follow-up response received from County Administration on January 14, 2014, budget preparation spreadsheets submitted by Special Districts for next year (2014-2015) will be the same as those used by the rest of the County departments (Recommendation 3).

Regarding Recommendation 6 highlighting the need for training of Supervisors, this training will occur before the new supervisors are installed in January 2015. A County Orientation to explain the intricacies of budgeting, the Brown Act, and other functions of the County will be provided to future Supervisors.

Conclusion
The 2013-2014 Grand Jury accepts the responses from both the BOS and County Administration. County budgeting and administration is a complex issue. More training and a better understanding promotes transparency between the County, as the governing entity, and the residents it serves. If the County Orientation workshop is open to the public, the 2013-2014 Grand Jury asks that the next Grand Jury attend to gain a better understanding of these functions. No further action is required.
COUNTY OF AMADOR
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ADOPTED BUDGET

For the Fiscal Year
JULY 1, 2013-JUNE 30, 2014

Charles T. Iley  Eugene Joe Lowe
County Administrative Officer  County Auditor-Controller
COUNTY OF AMADOR
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED FINANCIAL SOURCES - CHARTS
FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014

SUMMARIZATION BY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAXES</td>
<td>$20,207,239.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICENSES, PERMITS AND FRANCHISES</td>
<td>$394,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINES, FOREFEITURES &amp; PENALTIES</td>
<td>$1,569,968.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST &amp; RENTALS</td>
<td>$298,354.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE</td>
<td>$33,366,149.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>$5,242,805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUE</td>
<td>$852,797.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERFUND REVENUES</td>
<td>$769,534.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FINANCING SOURCES BY TYPE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,701,246.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARIZATION BY FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEMORIAL HALL #5</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>$33,773,692.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>$9,641,024.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIOR HEALTH</td>
<td>$5,074,849.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>$3,945,998.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD</td>
<td>$6,562,253.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>$77,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH &amp; GAME</td>
<td>$1,310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL REVENUE</td>
<td>$3,600,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FINANCING SOURCES BY FUND</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,701,246.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARIZATION BY FUNCTION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adopted 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>10,079,624.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>29,438,032.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Ways and Facilities</td>
<td>7,937,589.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Sanitation</td>
<td>8,502,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>9,774,705.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>938,861.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Services</td>
<td>212,883.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SPECIFIC FINANCING USES</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,883,734.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARIZATION BY FUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Hall #5</td>
<td>768.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>34,600,768.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>9,640,906.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health</td>
<td>5,074,799.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3,969,595.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>7,937,589.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Development</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Improvement</td>
<td>308,615.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Game</td>
<td>3,851.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Revenue</td>
<td>5,187,043.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FINANCING REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,883,734.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Uses by Function**

- General: 15%
- Public Protection: 44%
- Health and Sanitation: 12%
- Public Assistance: 13%
- Education: 15%
- Cultural Services: 1%

**Uses by Fund**

- General: 52%
- Social Services: 8%
- Behavioral Health: 8%
- Health: 12%
- Road: 14%
- Water Development: 0.46%
- County Improvement: 0.24%
- Fish and Game: 0.01%
- Local Revenue: 0.00%
## BOARD OF SUPERVISORS 1100

**Function:** General  
**Activity:** Legislative & Admin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALARIES AND WAGES</strong></td>
<td>458,034.94</td>
<td>462,979.81</td>
<td>463,930.00</td>
<td>463,930.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREMENT - EMPLOYER'S SHARE</td>
<td>60,081.20</td>
<td>58,162.67</td>
<td>62,270.00</td>
<td>62,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA/MEDICARE - EMPLOYER'S SHARE</td>
<td>34,234.44</td>
<td>34,754.39</td>
<td>35,490.00</td>
<td>35,490.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE GROUP INSURANCE</td>
<td>101,277.20</td>
<td>88,769.34</td>
<td>93,730.00</td>
<td>93,730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKER'S COMPENSATION INSURANCE</td>
<td>1,837.55</td>
<td>2,139.75</td>
<td>2,480.00</td>
<td>2,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SALARIES/EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td>655,465.33</td>
<td>646,805.96</td>
<td>657,900.00</td>
<td>657,900.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SERVICES AND SUPPLIES**                          |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| COMMUNICATIONS                                    | 2,663.52         | 2,785.77         | 2,700.00         | 2,700.00         |
| MAINTENANCE - PROGRAMS                            | 2,969.44         | 2,798.72         | 0.00             | 0.00             |
| MEMBERSHIPS                                       | 19,473.00        | 27,787.00        | 16,000.00        | 16,000.00        |
| OFFICE EXPENSES                                   | 13,447.18        | 4,696.20         | 12,000.00        | 12,000.00        |
| G.S.A. DEPT. COST ALLOCATION                      | 18,760.24        | 15,923.68        | 15,924.00        | 15,924.00        |
| PROFESSIONAL & SPECIALIZED SERVICES                | 104,420.25       | 143,086.17       | 60,000.00        | 60,000.00        |
| COUNTY AUDIT                                      | 58,900.00        | 58,900.00        | 62,000.00        | 62,000.00        |
| PROFESSIONAL & SPEC SERVES - CASINO               | 3,612.50         | 683.78           | 5,000.00         | 5,000.00         |
| SPECIAL PROJECT                                   | 13,515.69        | 1,533.60         | 2,000.00         | 2,000.00         |
| PUBLICATIONS AND LEGAL NOTICES                    | 8,216.00         | 5,578.10         | 6,000.00         | 6,000.00         |
| RENTS, LEASES - EQUIPMENT                         | 4,564.05         | 3,768.65         | 5,500.00         | 5,500.00         |
| MINOR EQUIPMENT                                   | 0.00             | 0.00             | 0.00             | 0.00             |
| STAFF TRAINING                                    | 0.00             | 0.00             | 0.00             | 0.00             |
| OUT OF COUNTY TRAVEL                              | 7,596.95         | 5,404.56         | 5,000.00         | 5,000.00         |
| TOTAL SERVICES AND SUPPLIES                       | 258,138.82       | 272,946.23       | 192,124.00       | 192,124.00       |

| **FIXED ASSETS**                                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| EQUIPMENT                                         | 0.00             | 0.00             | 0.00             | 0.00             |
| TOTAL FIXED ASSETS                                | 0.00             | 0.00             | 0.00             | 0.00             |

| **TOTAL - BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**                  | 913,604.15       | 919,752.19       | 850,024.00       | 850,024.00       |

| A87 - COUNTYWIDE COST ALLOC PLAN                  | 63,021.00        | 480,751.00       | 480,751.00       | 322,057.00       |

| GRAND TOTAL - BOARD OF SUPERVISORS                | 976,625.15       | 1,400,503.19     | 1,330,775.00     | 1,172,081.00     |

---
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**Budget Name/Unit:** BOARD OF SUPERVISORS 1100

**Department**

**Description/Purpose:**
The Board of Supervisors are charged by State Law to “make and enforce rules and regulations necessary for the government of the board, the preservation of order, and the transaction of business.” This budget includes the cost of the Board's activities in this regard, and also includes the costs associated with the Clerk of the Board, which is responsible for meeting minutes, publication of agendas, and responses to public record requests.

**Objective:**

1. Minutes and audio of Board of Supervisor meetings posted within 3 days of approval.

2. Budget balanced and approved within State mandated timelines.

**Budget Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Summary</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td>1,172,081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUE:</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET COUNTY COST:</td>
<td>(1,170,431)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source(s) of Revenue:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal Fee</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>1,170,431.00</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total        | 1,172,081.00 | 100.0% |

---
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**A-87 Charges**—The term "A-87" is used interchangeably with "indirect charges", A-87 is a set of accounting standards used to guide counties as they calculate and assign indirect costs.

**AAA**—Area Agency on Aging

**AB 109**—Assembly Bill 109 realigns custodial and community supervision responsibility for non-serious, non-violent and non-sex offenders, as well as supervision of lower level adult parolees returning from state prison sentences to counties. On June 30, 2011, the Governor signed a series of legislative bills as part of the State budget that provided funding and made necessary technical changes to implement the public safety realignment program outlined in AB 109. The Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) committee recommends to the Board of Supervisors, the allocation of the funding.

**Account**—A record of a type of monetary transaction maintained in the general ledger.

**Activity**—A specific line of work performed to accomplish a function for which a governmental unit is responsible.

**Adopted Final Budget**—The second of a two-part budget process, this budget is required to be submitted to the Board and reflects revisions, reductions or additions to the Proposed Budget.

**Ad Valorem**—In proportion to value, a basis for levy of taxes on property.

**Agency Fund**—Agency funds account for assets held by the County as an agent for individuals, private organizations or other governments.

**Allocate**—To set apart for a particular purpose, assign or allot.

**Allocation**—The share or portion allocated.

**Appropriation**—The authorization granted by the Board of Supervisors to make expenditures.

**Assessed Valuation**—An official government value placed upon real property or personal property as a basis for levying taxes.

**Assessment**—An official valuation of property, used as a basis for levying a tax.

**Audit**—A systematic collection of the sufficient, competent evidential matter needed to attest to the fairness of management's assertions in the financial statements or to evaluate whether management has efficiently and effectively carried out its responsibilities.

**Audit Trail**—Original documents supporting financial transactions.
September 9, 2013

The Honorable Susan Harlan
Judge, Superior Court of California
County of Amador
500 Argonaut Lane
Jackson, CA 95642

Re: 2012-2013 Grand Jury Report Response

Dear Judge Harlan:

This letter serves as the official Amador County Sheriff’s Office response to the 2012/2013 Amador County Grand Jury Report concerning the Amador County Sheriff’s Office Detention Facility (Amador County Jail).

**Finding #1**

The Jail has been operating over capacity for the last several years. The separation required by inmate classification cannot occur due to overcrowding and the lack of sufficient and flexible housing. These conditions impact the safety for officers, inmates and visitors.

**Response to Finding #1**

Respondent agrees with Finding #1.

The Average Daily Population, (ADP), of the Amador County Jail has exceeded the states rated capacity of 76 (65 male, 11 female) beds for several years. For example, the ADP for 2012 was 94. The inmate classification/segregation requirements are difficult to achieve due to the limited amount of bed and/or program space within the current facility. Inmate classification is based upon a risk assessment for each inmate which includes a criminal history or current charge(s), sentenced charge(s), gang history, and/or ethnicity. Due to these limited housing options, there is an increased risk of inmate on inmate assaults, assaults against staff or civilian program volunteers. The Amador County Sheriff’s Office jail staff continually updates assessments and transfers inmates within the available cell blocks in an effort to reduce the potential for conflict.
Finding #2

Using sobriety cells for housing is not compliant with Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) – Title 15/24.

Response to Finding #2

Respondent agrees with Finding #2.

The use of the sobriety cells to house an inmate is only used as a last resort in cases such as inmates who are so disruptive due to a mental illness that they cannot be safely housed with other inmates. These cells are only used for the minimum period of time necessary until an inmate can be safely housed within the general population or placed in a secure mental health facility. If the inmate cannot be housed within the general population, the interior of the sobering cells are the most visible to staff which allows for the closest monitoring of their condition by correctional and medical staff.

Finding #3

Security is compromised due to aging infrastructure and not updating the surveillance technology.

Response to Finding #3

Respondent partially agrees with Finding #3.

The overall security of the jail facility is not compromised due to the aging infrastructure within the jail. However, the aging infrastructure does pose serious budgetary issues such as high maintenance costs to keep the facility operational and maintain the overall efficiency of the jail. The correctional staff continues to physically monitor all inmate movements within the facility.

In 2010, the Amador County General Services Administration (GSA) drafted and released a Request for Proposal (RFP) to prospective vendors for a complete jail surveillance system renovation. In response to the RFP, vendor bids ranged from approximately $200,000 dollars to nearly $500,000. Based upon a comprehensive review of the bids and projected replacement costs, the GSA, working in conjunction with the Amador County Sheriff’s Office, determined that the most critical needs could be accomplished by the county.

The GSA immediately repaired and/or replaced cameras, repaired deficient infrastructure, and began the process to transition the existing analog surveillance system with a digital network.
Finding #4

Video capability is an integral tool to ensure safety of staff and inmates. It is valuable when addressing litigation issues.

Response to Finding #4

Respondent agrees with Finding #4.

Video capability is a critical component for ensuring the safety of staff, inmates, and civilian volunteers. Video recordings are also a valuable tool in protecting the county and staff against unwarranted or frivolous litigation.

For the above reasons, video cameras are located in key areas of the jail such as the sally port, booking floor, recreation yard and library. The staff is also utilizing supplemental video resources to ensure institutional security and safety. For example, the staff is currently using handheld video cameras to supplement fixed cameras to record uses of force involving staff and inmates, cell extractions, or use of the restraint chair.

Finding #5

Rehabilitation opportunities are limited.

Response to Finding #5

Respondent partially agrees with Finding #5.

The Amador County Sheriff’s Office Jail does offer several rehabilitation programs to the inmates. These programs include Drug and Alcohol recovery, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, Positive Parenting classes (which includes Anger Management), and a High School Diploma Assistance Program. The jail is limited on available space to provide other rehabilitation programs. The Amador County Sheriff’s Office Jail is in full compliance with Title 15 in this category.

Finding #6

The library lacks a variety of reading and educational materials.

Response to Finding #6

Respondent disagrees with Finding #6.

Although the library may not contain a vast number of books, there are currently over a hundred books distributed throughout the inmate cell blocks. Due to the inmates constantly destroying books, the jail restocks its reading and educational book supply approximately every six months.
In addition, there are a variety of fiction and non-fiction books that are provided to the inmates along with educational books from Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotic Anonymous.

Inmates can also request educational books in such subjects as History, Math, English, Biology, etc. from the High School Diploma Assistance Program.

**Finding #7**

A needs assessment and design for a new facility was completed in 2006-2007.

**Response to Finding #7**

Respondent agrees with Finding #7.

The needs assessment for a new jail facility was finalized by TRG Consulting on May 26, 2009 as required by the conditions established by Assembly Bill 900. Currently, a new consulting firm, CGL, is beginning a full and complete review of current jail needs, including programing space needs, total jail project costs, jail site evaluations and recommendations, and AB 109 Realignment impacts. This review will provide an accurate report on today’s financial exposure for the county regarding this project as well as identify the most cost effective and viable future jail site.

Sincerely,

MARTIN A. RYAN
Sheriff-Coroner

MAR/es

Cc: Richard M. Forester, Chairman, Amador County Board of Supervisors
October 2, 2013

The Honorable Susan Harlan  
Judge, Superior Court of California  
County of Amador  
500 Argonaut Lane  
Jackson, CA 95642

Re: 2012-2013 Grand Jury Report Response to Recommendations

Dear Judge Harlan,

This letter serves as the official Amador County Sheriff’s Office response to the “Recommendations” found in the 2012-2013 Amador County Grand Jury Report concerning the Amador County Sheriff’s Office Detention Facility.

This response is in addition to the September 9, 2013 letter to you which addressed only the “Findings” found in the above referenced report and completes my response.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

The Grand Jury recommends the Amador County Board of Supervisors prioritize the identification of funds required for the 5% cash match in order to receive the state AB900 funds. These should be set up in a restricted fund for this dedicated use.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #1:

No response by the Amador County Sheriff’s Office is required for this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

The Grand Jury recommends the sobering cells not be used for housing to maintain housing compliance.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #2:

The sobering cells are the only cells within the Amador County Sheriff’s Office Detention Facility that are ADA compliant and as such are the only viable option for temporarily housing
inmates who are awaiting bed space at a secure mental health facility and who are unable to be housed in the general population as a result of their mental illness.

These sobering cells have the most visibility of all cells due to their proximity to the control booth and their large glass windows. This visibility allows for closer observation and monitoring of the inmate by correctional staff and medical staff.

The use of the sobering cells for this limited and temporary purpose is the last resort for these inmates. Since they cannot be housed with the general jail population, and if secure mental health facilities are not available, the only unacceptable option would be to release them back into the community where their safety and that of the public would be jeopardized.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

The Grand Jury recommends the existing Jail be made as compliant with Title 15/24 where possible.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #3:

The last biennial inspection of the Detention Facility conducted by the state Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) for 2008-2010 found the Facility in compliance with Title 15/24 requirements.

The Facility is currently undergoing a state Board of State and Community Corrections (formerly CSA) inspection.

The Facility constantly strives to comply with Title 15/24 even given the existing facilities limitations on space and lack of modernization.

RECOMMENDATION #4:

The Grand Jury recommends the Sheriff's Office research grant opportunities to repair, replace, and upgrade the existing intercom and video surveillance system.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #4:

The Amador County Sheriff's Office Detention Facility staff is currently researching to determine if any state or federal grant opportunities exist for this purpose. If such grants are identified, the Sheriff's Office will explore grant application opportunities to determine if they are viable for our Facility.

RECOMMENDATION #5:

The Grand Jury recommends that the Sheriff's office explore means to involve trusted community organizations in supplying classic reading material for the library and service opportunities in the county.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #5:

In addition to the many books already available to the inmates both in the library and in the individual housing blocks, the Sheriff's Office will continue to look for opportunities to involve community organizations in supplying additional reading materials that are appropriate for an in custody environment.

The Sheriff's Office currently allows various county agencies to supervise and use inmate workers for many different projects in and around county facilities such as weed eating, painting, moving furniture, sand bag assembly during flood threats. In addition, during this Grand Jury’s tenure, Sheriff's Office inmate workers assisted the Interfaith Food Bank, Sober Grad and the Amador City clean-up day. This year, the inmate workers also placed flags on all the veteran’s graves at the Jackson Cemetery.

We continue to look for inmate work opportunities in our community; however, the extent of the use of inmate workers in this county depends upon the criminal histories and potential threats to the community posed by those in our inmate population at any one time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

MARTIN A. RYAN
Sheriff-Coroner

MAR/es

Cc: Richard M. Forster, Chairman, Amador County Board of Supervisors
Background

Civil Grand Juries are mandated to inspect the condition and management of public prisons within Amador County, per Penal Code §919(b). The mission of the Amador County Detention Facility (Jail) is to provide for the basic needs of the inmates, including adequate and appropriate food and health care, and the opportunity for those inmates to make personal improvements.

These goals must be accomplished while maintaining the standards set for jail operations in the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation regulations: Minimum Standards for Local Detention Facilities, Title 15 Crime Prevention and Corrections. The 2012-2013 Grand Jury inspected the Jail on April 16, 2013. Pursuant to Penal Code §933 (c), a response to the 2012-2013 Grand Jury Final Report (Final Report) Jail Inspection findings and recommendations was required.

Discussion

The Jail has a State-rated capacity for 76 inmates - 65 Males and 11 Females. At the time of inspection, the population was 94 total inmates. The Final Report included 47 Facts, 7 Findings, and 5 Recommendations. The Amador County Sheriff-Coroner (Sheriff) responded on September 9, 2013 to the findings only. The 2013-2014 Grand Jury made an additional request for a response to the recommendations presented in the Final Report. A response dated October 2, 2013 was received to address these recommendations.

Findings:
The Sheriff agreed with Findings 1, 2, 4, and 7. The Sheriff partially agreed with Findings 3 and 5, and disagreed with Finding 6.

In reference to Finding 3, the Sheriff stated that the “overall security” of the facility is not compromised due to aging infrastructure. The Sheriff indicated that work on equipment and infrastructure was done in 2010. However, the 2012-2013 Grand Jury assessed the aging infrastructure in April 2013. The Bureau of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) Facility Inspection Report, dated June 14, 2012, stated that the “facility requires ongoing maintenance to locks, plumbing, lighting, etc.” This report confirms the 2012-2013 Grand Jury’s Finding 3.

Regarding Finding 5, the Sheriff stated that rehabilitation programs are offered to inmates and he provided a list of some of these programs. The Grand Jury accepts the response received for Finding 5.

Finding 6 addressed a lack of a variety of reading and educational materials in the Jail Library. The Sheriff stated that over 100 books were distributed throughout the inmates’ cellblocks at any given time and that inmates can request educational materials anytime. The Grand Jury accepts the response received for Finding 6.
**Recommendations:**
The Sheriff provided no response to Recommendation 1 as it was directly addressed to the Board of Supervisors and involved budgetary concerns. No response from the Board of Supervisors has been received to address this recommendation. On July 9, 2013, the Board of Supervisors authorized the Director of General Services to negotiate a contract with a firm to verify the Jail needs assessment report previously completed and to provide an evaluation of jail site options and updated construction costs (Agenda item 7F).

Regarding Recommendation 2, the 2013-2014 Grand Jury does not accept the response from the Sheriff. The one area of Non-Compliance referenced in the BSCC Facility Inspection Report dated June 14, 2012 was use of the Sobering Cells for temporary and special housing. The BSCC report confirms the Final Report Recommendation 2 that the “sobering cells not be used for housing…” The Sheriff’s response to this recommendation was that these cells are the only ADA compliant cells in the facility. Use as temporary housing for certain types of inmates will continue. The Grand Jury will defer to BSCC to monitor this situation in their biennial inspections.


**Conclusion**

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury commends the Sheriff on expanding the work program throughout the County. We want to encourage the Sheriff to research grant opportunities, both Federal and State, to upgrade necessary intercom and video equipment, and any other equipment required to enhance the safety of the Corrections Officers and the inmates within the existing Jail. No further action on this report is necessary.
July 17, 2013

Marianne Bourgeois
Foreperson
2012-2013 Grand Jury

RE: Mule Creek State Prison - Response to the 2012/2013 Amador County Grand Jury Report

Findings in the Grand Jury Report 2012/2013 for Mule Creek State Prison:
Jury Members observed maintenance needs at the facility. The hot water system needs to be replaced and the roofs where the pipes leaked must be repaired.

The Grand Jury's Recommendation for Mule Creek State Prison:
Problems with the water system should be addressed as soon as possible on Facility C to reduce leaking and to avoid potential safety issues.

Mule Creek State Prison's Response:

1. The replacement of the hot water loop is a current Special Repair Project. MCSP is currently on phase 2 of the project which is anticipated to be completed within 4 phases. MCSP is replacing the complete hot water loop line with natural gas piping and independent boilers.
2. A work order was generated for the water leak at C Facility Work Change area. It was repaired upon notification.

Findings in the Grand Jury Report 2012/2013 for Mule Creek State Prison:
The PIA Digital Mapping program was closed due to budget shortfalls. There is now a vacant classroom space.

The Grand Jury's Recommendation for Mule Creek State Prison:
Prison Industry Authority (PIA) should explore using a currently vacant room for expansion of current programs or to plan for a new occupational skills program.
Mule Creek State Prison's Response:

Located on Facility A, the room that was utilized by PIA Digital Mapping has been incorporated into the Health Care Facility Improvement Project. This space is planned and designed to retrofit office space for the Medical Administration at the institution.

Please feel free to contact me at (209) 274-5000 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

WILLIAM KNIPP
Warden
Mule Creek State Prison
September 16, 2013

Mark Patrick
Foreman
2013-2014 Grand Jury


Findings in the Grand Jury Report 2012/2013 for Mule Creek State Prison:

Jury Members observed maintenance needs at the facility. The hot water system needs to be replaced and the roofs where the pipes leaked must be repaired.

The Grand Jury’s Recommendation for Mule Creek State Prison:

Problems with the water system should be addressed as soon as possible on Facility C to reduce leaking and to avoid potential safety issues.

Mule Creek State Prison’s Initial Response to the 2012/2013 Grand Jury:

1. The replacement of the hot water loop is a current Special Repair Project. MCSP is currently on phase 2 of the project which is anticipated to be completed within 4 phases. MCSP is replacing the complete hot water loop line with natural gas piping and independent boilers.

2. A work order was generated for the water leak at C Facility Work Change area. It was repaired upon notification.

Mule Creek State Prison’s Response to the 2013/2014 Grand Jury letter dated September 9, 2013 request for additional information:

1. Special Repair is a function of our Capital Outlay process. An allotment is awarded to CDCR annually from the state budget for Special Repair funding. The CDCR Facilities Management Division (FMD) is responsible to distribute the Special Repair funding annually. Due to the severity of the failed hot water loop at MCSP, we have received Special Repair funding for the first two phases of the Hot Water Loop Replacement Project. Phase one was to install a new poly gas line around the facility. This phase is complete. The second phase is to establish local hot water boilers at each housing unit on C facility and the Administration Building.
This phase is approximately 30% complete and is the current Inmate/Ward Labor project. When this is complete, we will isolate that portion of the hot water loop to reduce leaks. The third phase is B Facility and the fourth is A Facility. Funding is not provided until the Phase has begun. We have assurances from the FMD that the future phases will be funded. Each phase is approximately one year in duration. However, spending restrictions and availability of parts and inmate workers make it difficult to anticipate exact dates.

2. Minor leak repairs on roofs are handled in house by our Carpenter staff. The water leak in the roof of Facility C Work Change area noted in the 2012/2013 Grand Jury Report was repaired by our plant operations carpenter staff. Roof replacements are handled through the Special Repair process listed in the previous paragraph. All roofs at MCSP are on the Special Repair request list. In the past 8 years we have received funding and have replaced the roofs on the following buildings: Dorm 1 and Dorm 2 at the Minimum Support Facility, Administration Building, and PBX building. Inmate Housing unit 12 is approved and funded for replacement. The material is on order. Replacement will begin in the spring of 2014.

The 1584 bed Level II Infill Project is now in the process of setting up a Design-Builder job walk of the proposed job site. The walk through will take place in September 2013. This is the first opportunity for the Design Builders to see the location of the site and get the general layout of the Request for Proposal. They will be shown where their work scope is going to be located. There will be a period of time for the bidding process to take place upon completion of the walk through period. It is anticipated that ground breaking will begin in the spring of 2014 and be completed in late 2016.

Please feel free to contact me at (209) 274-5000 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM KNIPP
Warden
Mule Creek State Prison
FOLLOW-UP REPORT
Mule Creek State Prison Inspection

Background
Mule Creek State Prison (MCSP) is located in the City of Ione and covers 866 acres. MCSP opened in June 1987 and is considered a minimum, medium, and maximum security prison. MCSP currently houses 2,800 inmates. Penal Code 919(b) requires that a grand jury shall inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the county. The 2012-2013 Grand Jury inspected MCSP on February 5, 2013, and released the Final Report on June 24, 2013. Pursuant to Penal Code 933, a response to the findings and recommendations is required.

Discussion
The 2012-2013 Grand Jury inspection resulted in a report with 7 Findings leading to 2 Recommendations for the facility. The recommendations highlighted:

• the condition of the hot water system in Facility C
• the potential use of the vacant classroom space within Facility A for occupational skills programs

A response from the MCSP was received on August 1, 2013.

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury requested further clarification concerning the actual repairs made and the use of the vacant space. On September 16, 2013, MCSP responded that the repairs to the hot water leak outside of Facility C were completed. MCSP also provided a phased plan for additional repairs to the hot water and steam pipe infrastructure and the future redesign of the boiler system within all MCSP facilities. MCSP further explained that the vacant space in Facility A has been incorporated into the Health Care Facility Improvement Program.

Conclusion
The 2013-2014 Grand Jury accepts the responses from MCSP with the additional information received. No further action is required.
August 1, 2013

The Honorable Susan Harlan Presiding Judge
Amador County Grand Jury
500 Argonaut Lane
PO Box 249
Jackson, Ca 95642


Pursuant to Penal Code 933.05 I am required to respond to this Grand Jury report. The Amador County Grand Jury inspected Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp on November 14th 2012. During the inspection they took an extensive tour of the facility and interviewed me as well as other PGYCC Staff. In their report they made two Recommendations:

1. Recommended training for our wards who are interested in working on our on-site waste water facility.

   Cal-Fire is looking into this to see if this is possible as they are the ones who are responsible for maintaining the facility.

2. Recommended implementation of a cell phone scrambler to alleviate the use of unauthorized cell phones.

   CDCR has already started the installation of these scramblers and plan on having them installed at all prison and correctional camps.

   If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me (209) 296-7581.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mike Roots
Superintendent
Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp
FOLLOW-UP REPORT
Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp

Background
The 2012-2013 Grand Jury inspected the conditions and management of Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp (PGYCC) per Penal Code 919(b). PGYCC was built in the 1930’s. The mission of the PGYCC is to rehabilitate young men and conserve California’s natural resources. The PGYCC is a privilege based program. The California Youth Authority assumed stewardship of the facility in 1946 in conjunction with the California Department of Forestry. The PGYCC is now operated jointly by the California Department of Forestry and Fire (Cal-Fire) and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice (CDCR).

Discussion
The 2012-2013 Grand Jury inspected the PGYCC on November 14, 2012. This Grand Jury found 33 Facts, made 4 Findings, and made 2 Recommendations. This Grand Jury used the following methods to make these findings and recommendations:
- Tour given by Superintendent
- Presentation of an overview and history of the camp
- References from the CDCR website
- Other internet sources
- Interviews with PGYCC employees

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury received the response to these findings and recommendations on October 28, 2013. PGYCC agreed with both recommendations and is working to implement them. Cal-Fire is looking at the possibility of training wards on water treatment. We commend the CDCR for installing the scramblers at all prisons and correctional camps.

Conclusion
The 2013-2014 Grand Jury accepts and applauds the actions taken by PGYCC on the 2 recommendations. No further action is necessary.
To: The Amador County Grand Jury

From: Dick Glock, Superintendent
Amador County Unified School District

Re: 2012-2013 Amador County Civil Grand Jury’s Final Report and Recommendations 1-3.

Findings and Recommendations

R-1.

ACUSD should include lockdown and civil unrest procedures in the Board Policy (Findings 4, 5).

Response:

The district is overlaid by four (4) different policing jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction has its own unique set of procedures. The sites in each respective jurisdiction have plans reflecting their law enforcement oversight.

We do not wish to have a District policy that conflicts with any law enforcement direction/request.

R2.

Argonaut High School and ACUSD should develop a plan for lighting the main parking lot to include a funding and implementation schedule (Finding 8).

Response:

ACUSD takes this recommendation under advisement for examination and review.

R-3.

ACUSD should explore ways to provide photo identification for all staff and update school policy (Finding 12).

Response:

ACUSD will explore ways to provide photo identification for all staff.

Richard F. Glock, Superintendent
Amador County Unified School District
Amador County Office of Education

Date 9.5.13
Recommendation 1:

Please provide the Grand Jury with copies of the lockdown procedures of the 4 police jurisdictions and copies of the school site plans for these jurisdictions.

Response:

We do not have copies of police lockdown procedures. We know that differences exist due to joint trainings district personnel and police agencies have participated in. Each jurisdictional agency has a copy of relevant lockdown procedures and is conferred with annually.

Each site’s Comprehensive School Safety Plan contains 4 pages (attached) of administrative procedures. I am confused as to how the Grand Jury observes “the District is not concerned with administrative procedures.”

The Grand Jury has examples of complete site school safety plans as exemplars for an elementary, junior high school and high school (mailed to the Grand Jury on March 12, 2013). These plans are approximately 160 pages long. Is the Grand Jury certain it wants a 160 page report for each school? Could a representative(s) come here to inspect the various plans?

The administrative procedures are being provided for each site as that seems to be the focus?

Existing law requires each school district and county office of education within the State of California to be responsible for the overall development of a comprehensive school safety plan for each of their constituent schools. Existing law requires the comprehensive school safety plan to identify appropriate strategies to maintain a high level of school safety. A requirement of comprehensive school safety plans is specific procedures for lockdown situations. Currently, both the Amador County Unified School District and the Amador County Office of Education use the standard California State Department of Education Comprehensive School Safety Plan template and thus meet legal requirements. Likewise, all public school sites within Amador County conduct the required safety and lockdown drills – as is evidenced by the school safety logs provided annually to the Grand Jury. School safety is of the utmost concern to everyone within our organization and we take the appropriate steps and beyond to ensure our plans and practices not only meet the requirements of the law, but are in the best interest of student safety and are designed to keep students and staff out of harms way.

Additionally, we do indeed have Board Policy outlining the legal authority for school plans and a component of these plans are lockdown procedures – Board Policy 0450, attached. It is not the intent of the Board Policy to outline the procedure for a lockdown as that is a function of the plan itself.
There are no state requirements for parent notification in case of a lockdown situation as parent notification is specific to each situation and dependent on student safety. Parents will be notified at the earliest it is safe to do so and given incident specific information. These decisions are usually made by law enforcement officials on site following the conclusion of an incident.

To summarize, the District utilizes the State suggested School Site Safety Plan template which includes administrative procedures. The sites receive feedback/input from their respective law enforcement jurisdiction. The site plans are approved by each school’s Site Council. Finally the plans are annually approved by the Governing Board.

Recommendation 2:

Please provide a timeline for the examination and review of the parking lot lighting at Argonaut High School.

Response:

We will conduct this review by July 1, 2014.

Recommendation 3:

Photo identification are provided to students every year. Please provide a timeline and a copy of the updated school board policy for staff photo identifications.

Response:

The original letter asked that we explore ways to provide photo identification for all staff. In my original response we agreed to explore this possibility. Photo identifications are not provided to students each year. Student I.D.’s are purchased with ASB cards or as part of a fall picture package.

Our budget is set for this year. We are willing to explore this possibility, but we already have a “Check-In” procedure at each site that involves a “Visitor” badge. Please remember we are small campuses. If someone appears who does not seem “to belong” adults/students point the individual out. Adults are taught to approach any adult without a “Visitor Badge”.

We have had no significant call internally for employee badges. One of our Cabinet members has worked in a smaller district which used employee photo I.D’s and found the biggest problem became getting the badges back and subsequent misuse following the conclusion of the individual’s employment (a number of which are seasonal/periodic).

If these responses do not significantly reduce the Grand Jury’s uncertainty I suggest a meeting so that I can more completely understand what information might still be needed.

Sincerely,

Dick Glock, Superintendent
FOLLOW-UP REPORT
Safety in Amador County Public Schools

Background
The 2012-2013 Amador County Grand Jury investigated a complaint that a previous Grand Jury did not follow up on a report into school safety in Amador County schools. The 2012-2013 Grand Jury interviewed school personnel and district personnel, reviewed School Board policies, and reviewed the California Education Codes pertaining to school safety. Inspections at the 12 Amador County schools also occurred. The Final Report of the 2012-2013 Grand Jury was released to the public last June 2013. Per California Penal Code, a response from the governing body of the public agency investigated is required within 90 days. The Amador County Unified School District (District) responded on September 10, 2013.

Discussion
The 2012-2013 Grand Jury identified 12 Findings that resulted in 3 Recommendations. The District’s response addressed the 3 recommendations only.

• Recommendation 1: The District stated that it did not want its procedures for lockdowns and civil unrest to conflict with the 4 police jurisdictions involved in school incidents. The 2013-2014 Grand Jury (Grand Jury) found the District’s response incomplete because it did not provide any copies of police jurisdiction procedures.

• Recommendations 2 and 3: The District stated they will review lighting changes at Argonaut High School and will explore photo identification for all school staff. The Grand Jury found these responses incomplete because no timelines were included for the review of the parking lot lighting and photo identifications.

A follow-up letter was sent to the District on September 17, 2013. A follow-up response was received on October 4, 2013 regarding Recommendation 1. The District indicated that each school’s Comprehensive School Safety Plan had a section addressing lockdown procedures. A copy of each school’s section addressing lockdown procedures was provided to the Grand Jury with the October 4th response.

According to the District, the State of California provides all schools with a template for the Comprehensive School Safety Plan to ensure compliance with the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and the National Incident Management System (NIMS), SB719 and AB115. A site visit by members of the Grand Jury verified that all schools in Amador County have followed this template in developing their Comprehensive School Safety Plans. Plans include 15 sections involving safety procedures for students and school personnel, evacuation maps, photos of emergency shutoff valves for all utilities, and parent notification procedures. The index of the Comprehensive School Safety Plan template is included in this report. (Appendix A)
All comprehensive School Safety Plans are reviewed by each school’s School Site Council. The Plans are then presented to the School Board, discussed, and reviewed at an open School Board meeting. The 2013-2014 school year plans were approved by the Amador County School Board on September 25, 2013 (item 11.6a and 12.4a).

On Recommendations 2 and 3, the District will conduct the review and evaluation of parking lot lighting at Argonaut High School by July 1, 2014. Regarding photo identification of school personnel, the District stated that students have to purchase their photo identifications cards every year. Each school has a “check-in” procedure that involves visitor badges. The District concludes that the issue of unidentified persons on campus is non-existent considering the small size of our schools’ campuses.

Conclusion
The Grand Jury would like to commend the schools’ personnel and District management for emphasizing the importance of school safety for our children and personnel. The Comprehensive School Safety Plans, with oversight by both the District and the School Site Councils, are thorough and informative. The Grand Jury would like to see Public Safety (Police and Fire) sign off on the plans as a final step to ensure all jurisdictions involved are aware of the procedures developed by each school. The schedule for addressing the parking lot lighting is acceptable to the Grand Jury since it will have a budgetary impact. Photo identification cards for school personnel should still be addressed.

The Grand Jury recommends that a subsequent jury follow up on the 2012-2013 recommendations made regarding the inadequate lighting of the Argonaut parking lot and photo ID cards for school personnel.
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September 19, 2013

Honorable Susan C. Harlan
Presiding Judge
Amador County Grand Jury
P.O. Box 249
Jackson CA 95642


Dear Judge Harlan,

We appreciate the Grand Jury’s efforts to examine the Water Agency and provide Findings and Recommendations regarding elements of interest to the public. The Water Agency concurs with the recommendations from the Grand Jury and many of the items were already in process prior to the Grand Jury report being published.

FINANCIAL ROAD TO RECOVERY

GRAND JURY FINDINGS

F1. The Agency has implemented financial reporting that follows the standard accounting practices in line with the State’s General Accounting Standards Board (GASB) and GAAP.

F2. The Project Analysis determined percentages of all projects based on replacement or improvements/ expansion.

F3. The State does not penalize for not filing GC 66013 reports.

F4. Members of the public are interested in budget status reports for their particular water supply system as well as the Agency overall.

F5. Some members of the public are instrumental in voicing concerns and challenging financial information on behalf of some ratepayers.

F6. When controversial items are added to a Board agenda, the discussion at the meetings can be lengthy. This extends the duration of Board meetings. Lengthy
meetings may change the public’s availability to hear the discussion about their particular item and to address the Board.

F7. Between 2008 and 2012, the length of time spent at Agency Board meetings has increased 123%.

F8. Policies that identify and address the accounting activities used within the Agency were generally unwritten.

Agency response to findings: The Agency agrees with the findings of the Grand Jury as stated above.

Grand Jury Recommendations:

R1. Provide a link on the Agency web homepage showing the budget information in simple, easy to read formats. Use of charts and graphs should be included.
R2. Limit public comment time to 3 minutes, similar to the Amador County Board of Supervisors.
R3. Develop and adopt policies to ensure standard accounting practices are consistent. This will ensure discrepancies and inconsistencies in accounts do not reoccur. Policies can be made available on the Agency’s webpage to aid in public transparency.

Water Agency Responses:

R1. A link on the Agency web homepage has been implemented providing direct access to budget information and monthly financial status reports which simplifies access to financial information. The Water Agency staff has been working on simplifying monthly status reports over the past year which includes charts to aid in better understanding of the financial position of the Water Agency. The Water Agency is in the process of seeking a financial consultant to review all existing financial policies, procedures, software, hardware, reports, and related activities with the goal of improving efficiencies, transparency, consistency, meaningful and user friendly reports, and compliance with federal, state, and local financial related requirements. The Water Agency expects to engage a financial consultant and have a final report with recommendations during the 2013-2014 fiscal year.

R2. The Water Agency adopted Resolution 2013-29 (attached) on July, 25, 2013, which amended Section 2030 of the Administrative Policy Manual entitled “Board Meeting Conduct” to limit public comment to 3 minutes per person.

R3. The Water Agency website contains the Administrative Policy Manual. As discussed in the response to R1, the Water Agency plans to engage the services of a financial consultant to review Agency financial policies, as well as other associated financial related activities and systems, and expects to have specific
recommendations this fiscal year. As policies are adopted, the Administrative Policy Manual will be updated and available on the Agency website.

UPCOUNTRY WATER SOLUTION

GRAND JURY FINDINGS

F1. Some members of the public are instrumental in voicing concerns and challenging any new project and funding source on behalf of some ratepayers.

F2. The lifespan of pipe used for air is unknown when used for water. Although the pipe was pressure tested, inspected, sand blasted, and coated per specifications, it was not used as intended (air vs. water). Water pressures and directional changes may have compromised the integrity inside the pipe.

F3. The existing Pipeline must continue to be fully operational while an alternate water supply is developed, constructed, and implemented.

F4. The existing pump stations pose a danger to employees with the high pressure contained in the pipes and the fast moving parts of the pumps.

F5. There are maintenance issues with the pumps and pump stations.

F6. An alternate water supply to the existing pipeline is needed to eliminate the need for electricity and constant monitoring. This will also reduce the dangerous conditions for both employees and residents.

F7. An alternate water supply would reduce the fiscal concerns of the ratepayers.

F8. Costs from PG&E are unknown if the existing pipeline has to be activated as the GSL's backup. Pumping costs increased by 3.9% this past year.

Agency response to findings:
The Agency agrees with the findings of the Grand Jury as stated above.

Grand Jury Recommendations:

R1. The Grand Jury recommends that some preventative maintenance be performed on the existing pipeline. Preventative maintenance includes wire-brushing of the exposed rust and treating areas with a rust retardant.

R2. The Grand Jury recommends the GSL should be constructed as an alternative to the pipeline.

R3. The Grand Jury recommends that the existing pipeline not be considered or used as a backup to the GSL.
Water Agency Responses:

R1. The Water Agency will increase preventative maintenance activities and will complete the treating of Central Amador Water Project (CAWP) raw water pipe facilities with exposed rust within the next thirty days.

R2. The Water Agency has approved the Gravity Supply Line (GSL) project as the preferred replacement for the existing raw water pump and pipeline for the CAWP system which is at the end of its useful life. The Water Agency opened construction bids for the GSL project in early August 2013, awarded the construction contract at the end of August, and plans to issue a notice to proceed with construction by the end of September 2013.

R3. The Water Agency concurs with findings of the Grand Jury regarding the GSL and existing pumps and pipeline system. The existing system is antiquated, is at the end of its useful life, utilizes dangerously high pressures, and is likely to encounter significant failures within the next five years according to two independent engineering reports. The Water Agency plans to retain the existing system as a backup initially, but will utilize a planned decommissioning schedule that will eliminate storing high pressures in the facilities and minimize risk of potential damages.

CAWP Raw Water Pump Station & Pipeline Decommissioning Schedule

Year 1
During the first year of the GSL’s operation, the existing pump system will continue to be in a ready to use state with active electrical service, automated controls, and water retained in water pipes. During this year, the pump system will be tested once a month.

Year 2
During the second year of the GSL’s operation, the electrical power service from PG&E will be disconnected, automated controls will not be maintained, and water will be drained from the water pipes. A trailer mounted emergency generator capable of powering up one of the 250 HP pumps at the Tiger Creek Pump Station will be purchased. This emergency generator will available for use at other Agency facilities and will not be dedicated solely for the Tiger Creek Pump Station. The Agency currently owns an emergency generator capable of powering up one of the 200 HP pumps at the Silver Lake Pump Station. Each calendar quarter the pump system will be tested utilizing emergency generators at each pump station and in manual operation mode. At the end of each test, water will be drained from the pipe to eliminate high pressure water and potential damages that might occur should there be a failure of the pipeline or facilities in the pump stations.
Year 3
The testing schedule will progress to once per year.

Year 4 and beyond
An evaluation will be performed to determine if the pump system should continue to be tested annually and whether there remains any benefit to continue to retain the pump system as a backup. Included in this evaluation will be an analysis of other possible emergency water supplies, such as an intertie with the Amador Water System in which the two systems become an emergency supply for the other. The evaluation also will include a review of the pump and pipe conditions and any problems encountered during testing cycles. Based on this evaluation, the Agency will either continue annual testing or decommission the facilities.

The Amador Water Agency takes seriously its job of providing safe, reliable water to all of its customers, including local families, fire districts and small businesses; and we will continue to look for ways to control costs, and be fiscally responsible and transparent while serving the community with safe reliable water and wastewater services. The Agency will provide long-term management of water resources through responsible planning and decision making to meet the needs of Amador County. We always appreciate suggestions and questions from the community we serve and invite everyone to learn more about our precious resource and about the Water Agency by visiting our website, www.amadorwater.org, or by attending our public board meetings.

Sincerely,

Paul Molinelli Sr.
President, Board of Directors
Amador Water Agency
Background
The Amador Water Agency (Agency) is a public, not-for-profit special district created in 1959 by
the California Legislature. The purpose of the Agency is to provide water, waste water, and storm
drainage services to Amador County. The 2011-2012 Amador County Grand Jury conducted an
investigation of the Agency based on citizen complaints received regarding the Agency’s
financial health and long-term debt. The 2011-2012 Grand Jury recommended the investigation
into the Agency continue. The Follow-up Committee of the 2012-2013 Grand Jury reviewed the
details of the response received from the Agency on August 31, 2012. Based on the Agency’s
response, improvements were made in several areas. A few issues remained outstanding.

Discussion
The 2012-2013 Grand Jury determined a continuing investigation was in order. The
2012-2013 Grand Jury made 8 Findings and 3 Recommendations relating to the Agency’s
financial health. Pursuant to Penal Code §933(c), a response to the findings and
recommendations was required. The Agency responded on September 20, 2013. The 2013-2014
Grand Jury accepted the Agency’s response with one exception. The exception was to need to
confirm a financial consultant contract to look into the Agency’s financial policies
(Recommendations 1, 3). The 2013-2014 Grand Jury confirmed the following:
• The Agency’s Board of Directors, at their general meeting September 12, 2013 (item 6B),
  unanimously authorized the General Manager to negotiate a contract with a financial
  management firm
• The contract agreement was executed on September 24, 2013

Work has begun and a report is to be provided to the Agency in early spring 2014.

Conclusion
The 2013-2014 Grand Jury commends the Agency’s commitment to sound financial policies and
thoroughness of the financial analyses that occurred on behalf of the ratepayers. The 2013-2014
Grand Jury accepts the response and no further action is necessary.
Background
In the 1970's, there were major water outages in the upcountry areas due to a severe drought. In response to the drought, Amador County (County) entered into a Joint Powers Agreement with the Amador Water Agency (Agency) in 1977. Construction began in 1978 of the "Emergency Pipeline" (Pipeline) from Tiger Creek Afterbay to Buckhorn Water Treatment Plant. Water service agreements were executed in 1978 with each of the 10 districts that would receive water. In 1979, the Agency began operations of the Central Amador Water Project (CAWP) system.

The Gravity Supply Line (GSL) concept was initiated in early 2010 by the Agency's Board of Directors (Board). At that time, there was public concern about the Pipeline's ability to help fight an Upcountry fire. There was also the desire to offer a means of delivering water to customers at a lower cost. No studies were done to ascertain the actual condition of the Pipeline. Numerous objections and citizen complaints were brought to the Board. Some of these complaints related to the cost of a new system. Others voiced that the present system was adequate to serve the existing customer base. The GSL project had to be evaluated on its own merits without political bias.

Discussion
The 2011-2012 Grand Jury investigated the Agency and the Agency responded to that report on August 31, 2012. The 2012-2013 Grand Jury determined, based on the Agency’s response, that a follow-up investigation was necessary. The 2012-2013 Grand Jury listed 43 Facts detailed in three separate headings:

- Existing System Lifespan
- Gravity Supply Line
- Fiscal Concerns

The 2012-2013 Grand Jury published 8 Findings and 3 Recommendations.

Pursuant to Penal Code §993(c), the Agency is obligated to respond to all findings and recommendations. The Board responded on September 20, 2013. The Board concurred with all findings. The Board has initiated actions in agreement with the recommendations:

- **R1 - Preventive Maintenance should be performed**: The Agency has performed preventive maintenance as recommended by the 2012-2013 Grand Jury. Photos of work performed were provided.
• **R2 - Gravity Supply Line should be constructed:** The project is moving forward. The construction contract was awarded on August 28, 2013 and a ground-breaking ceremony was held on October 10, 2013. The estimated date of completion of the project is April, 2015.

• **R3 - The existing pipeline should be retired:** The Agency has provided a Decommissioning Schedule of the existing "Emergency Pipeline" over a period of four years.

**Conclusion**

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury commends the Agency for taking a path in the best interest of the majority of their ratepayers and Amador County as a whole. The 2013-2014 Grand Jury accepts the response and no further action is necessary.
Background

The 2011-2012 Grand Jury investigated the City of Ione (Ione) based on complaints regarding financial mismanagement. Ione responded on September 4, 2012. The 2012-2013 Grand Jury followed up with additional questions to clarify Ione’s response. The additional response was received on March 13, 2013.

Discussion

The 2012-2013 Grand Jury accepted Ione’s responses to all Findings except Finding 7. For Finding 7, Ione indicated it was improving contractor monitoring and payment and cash balance tracking. In the follow-up letter, the 2012-2013 Grand Jury asked if changes were made to the policies and procedures to address these inconsistencies on a permanent basis. Ione responded it has corrected the problems, but changes to the policies and procedures have not been completed.

The 2012-2013 Grand Jury made the following recommendation regarding this issue:

R1. The 2012-2013 Grand Jury recommends a subsequent Grand Jury follow-up with Ione to ensure that changes occur in the policies and procedures for contract monitoring and payment and cash balance tracking.

Conclusion

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury recognizes that Ione is currently working on several complex issues. Since the problems have been addressed by the city Manager and staff, we will allow Ione’s City Council additional time to make the policy changes. The 2013-2014 Grand Jury will defer this recommendation to a future grand jury since a considerable amount of progress has been made by the administration of Ione.