

# FINAL REPORT

2004-2005

## Del Norte County Grand Jury



### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Foreman's Report	2
Correctional Facilities in Del Norte County	
Alder Camp	2
Bar-O Boys Ranch	3
Del Norte County Jail	3
Del Norte County Juvenile Hall	4
Pelican Bay State Prison	4
Bertsch-Oceanview Community Services District	5
Del Norte County Board of Supervisors / Del Norte County Unified School District	6
Del Norte County Jail	7
Crescent City Police / California Highway Patrol	8
Del Norte County Unified School District	8
Crescent City Harbor District	9
Del Norte County Mental Health Department	9
Del Norte County Drug Task Force	10
Del Norte County Planning Department	10
Secretary's Report	11
Response Instructions for Local Public Agencies	12
Member's Signatures	12

Del Norte County Superior Court  
Honorable Judge Weir

The 2004-2005 Del Norte County Grand Jury respectfully submits its final report. This report has the required concurrence of the Grand Jury.

California law requires a Superior Court Judge in each California County to impanel a civil grand jury. The civil grand jury investigates local government activities, and at the end of the year, publishes a report of what they have found.

Grand jurors are bound by secrecy and confidentiality in grand jury service. Each member of the grand jury, under Penal Code section 911, swears an oath of office not to disclose any evidence brought before the grand jury, nor any discussions or deliberations that occur during a grand jury investigation. This oath ensures protection for those who come before the grand jury and maintains the independence and validity of the grand jury.

This year a trainer from the American Grand Jury Foundation came to Del Norte County to train the 2004-2005 Grand Jury. The training set a solid foundation for this year's grand jury.

It has been a great honor to serve with the members of this year's Del Norte County Grand Jury. The diversity of its members has taught me a great deal. My goal was to facilitate our meetings and ensure every member's voice was heard. Thank you for this opportunity to serve our community.

Grand Jury reports and responses to the Grand Jury reports are on file at the Del Norte County Clerk's Office, 981 H Street, Suite 160, Crescent City, California.

Respectfully,  
Dee Mattz, Foreperson  
2004-2005 Del Norte County Grand Jury

## **Correctional Facilities in Del Norte County**

### **Reason for Inspections:**

Routine annual inspection

### **Alder Conservation Camp**

### **Findings:**

The tour included all work buildings, barracks, recreation and craft buildings, offices, kitchen and dining facilities.

Alder Camp is a fire camp that is run by the California Department of Corrections and is staffed by correctional officers that supervise inmates who, through good conduct at other state prison facilities, may apply to be transferred to the camp to fill job openings as they become available. This is a minimum security work camp. While at Alder Camp each inmate is assigned a job. They have regular work schedules, except when they are involved in firefighting episodes. During the fire season, the shifts can run 24/7. The range of jobs runs the full spectrum of a small community, from food service, maintenance, electrical and mechanical work, labor and all aspects of equipment maintenance for the firefighters.

All buildings, work areas, barracks, recreation buildings and grounds were exceptionally clean and well organized.

**Conclusions:**

This facility appeared to be well administered, organized and clean. The Grand Jury could find no areas of deficiency.

**Recommendations:**

None

**Response Required:**

None

## **Bar-O Boys Ranch**

**Findings:**

The Grand Jury made its annual inspection of Bar-O Boys Ranch. Bar-O Ranch is a camp for male, non-violent, juvenile offenders between the ages of 13 and 18, with a total capacity for 44. The emphasis is on rehabilitation, not incarceration. Counselors and staff appear dedicated. The Ranch program is geared to return the boys to society as confident and productive members.

The boys are required to attend school and can obtain a high school diploma. A point system is used to evaluate the boys' progress. Through this system, the boys can earn special privileges and/or rewards.

The grand jury found the facility to be operating very efficiently. The most notable observation was the cleanliness of the facility and the pride displayed, by both staff and inmates, related to maintaining this cleanliness throughout the buildings and grounds. During inspection of the barracks, it was noted that some of the mattresses appeared to be very old and had holes in them. Jurors were advised that the Ranch has no funding to replace them.

**Conclusions:**

The facility appears to be well run.

**Recommendations:**

Every attempt should be made to secure a funding source for mattress replacement.

**Response Required:**

None

## **Del Norte County Jail**

**Findings:**

The Grand Jury made an unannounced visit to the Del Norte County Jail. At the time of the tour, the jail appeared to be operating at greater than capacity. The officers on duty were knowledgeable and able to answer the questions that were asked of them. The Jury viewed the sally port, where inmates are brought into the facility, and the booking area, where new prisoners are processed. The kitchen, infirmary, control booth, laundry room and housing units were also made available to the Jury. Inmate meals are prepared on site. Standing water was observed in the floor drains in the kitchen area, and rodent droppings were observed in the bowl of a mixer. There were also boxes of fresh fruit stored on the floor.

**Conclusions:**

Overall condition, policies and procedures appeared to be generally commendable.

**Recommendations:**

Review food storage policy and adhere to state and federal health regulations regarding food preparation facilities.

**Response Required:**

Grand jury requests current report from a health inspection of food preparation facilities, required under Title 15, as soon as a report is available from the next inspection.

## **Del Norte County Juvenile Hall**

**Findings:**

The Grand Jury made an unannounced site visit to Del Norte County Juvenile Hall and was greeted by the on-duty supervisor, who conducted the tour.

Juvenile Hall is a place of detention for juvenile offenders taken into custody within the provisions of the Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 602 of the Juvenile Court Law. These young people are detained for their protection or the protection of the community, pending and/or serving final disposition of their cases. The Juvenile Hall is also used by the Juvenile Court as a commitment facility for minors who require a period of incarceration as part of their final disposition. While in Juvenile Hall, minors are provided with a healthy, safe environment that keeps them securely detained. The Juvenile Hall has comprehensive programming, which includes education, recreation, counseling, health and religious activities.

When touring the kitchen, although the Grand Jury was told that all knives are locked up, it was observed that there were knives missing from the shadow board in the lock box. The lock box is located in the kitchen staff office which is also locked. The Grand Jury inquired about the missing knives and the on-duty supervisor explained that he could not provide the information because he did not have access to the area.

The Jury observed the control room, which was operated by one individual who managed opening and re-locking of doors while also keeping track of various activities in many areas.

**Conclusions:**

Grand Jury had a concern about the safe keeping of knives in the kitchen. Otherwise the relatively new facility is clean, well maintained and orderly.

**Recommendations:**

Review and, if needed, improve tracking of knives and other sharp utensils in the kitchen (perhaps a tag in the missing spot, if knife is broken, and not yet replaced).

**Response Required:**

The Grand Jury requests the Juvenile Hall Director respond to the Grand Jury with a copy of current policy for sharp kitchen utensil storage and any changes made to that policy.

## **Pelican Bay State Prison**

**Findings:**

The Grand Jury visited Pelican Bay State Prison. Prior to touring the facility, the Grand Jury was provided an overview of the prison, its operations, and annual budget by the Public Information Officer. A tour of the

facility included the Secure Housing Unit (SHU), the Psychiatric Services Unit (PSU), general population B Facility, control rooms, some support areas and the exercise yard.

**Conclusions:**

It appears that the prison has adequate policies and procedures in place to provide for the care and safety of the inmates and staff.

**Recommendations:**

None

**Response Required:**

None

## **Bertsch-Oceanview Community Services District**

**Reason for Investigation:**

A complaint was received by the 2003-2004 Grand Jury, alleging the Bertsch-Oceanview Community Services District (BOCSD) board had, in their meeting of May 20, 2004, violated the Brown Act by holding a closed vote on proposed rate increases of water and sewer services. The 2003-2004 Grand Jury forwarded the sealed complaint to the 2004-2005 Grand Jury for consideration.

**Findings:**

The Brown Act (California Government Code Section 54950-54962) requires public access to meetings and requires the elected officials to let the public speak. Section 54953 (c) states that "No legislative body shall take action by secret ballot, whether preliminary or final."

The Grand Jury discovered a number of inconsistencies.

The initial complaint alleged that citizens were asked to leave the meeting before the board voted on rate changes. In the course of the investigation, reports varied among citizens at the meeting. Some people reported fellow citizens told them the part of the meeting involving rate changes was over and that they were supposed to leave. Others said fellow citizens/neighbors just told them they were supposed to leave. Two individuals claimed that the board members told them they were going into closed session.

The Grand Jury was provided two sets of minutes for that meeting—one set of notes by the regular secretary and one by the board's attorney. Notes taken by the regular secretary were never submitted to the board for approval. The board's attorney's minutes were approved.

The board's attorney claimed that the BOCSD board has never held a closed session and did not do so that night. Rather, he said, he was surprised when the citizens began to leave. He did not question this, nor did he encourage them to stay. The attorney also reported that someone on the board did say to the citizens that the public hearing on the rate changes was now closed, or words to that effect. He stated that this meant simply that the time for public input was over. The attorney did say that someone asked when they would find out what the board decided and at that point someone on the board suggested they write their names and phone numbers on a piece of paper to be called with the outcome of the vote. He added that one citizen was specifically told he could stay but that citizen chose to leave.

The attorney told the Grand Jury that the BOCSD board has generally met without any public in attendance and is not familiar with proper protocol; in fact, he reported that, of the boards he counsels, this board is probably

the least familiar with issues like the Brown Act. The attorney also reported that he does not generally intervene unless a very clear violation occurs.

**Conclusions:**

It appears that the citizens were confused by the way the end of the public hearing was announced. It also appears that the board did not actually violate the Brown Act, as there is no conclusive evidence to show that they stated that the portion of the meeting following the public hearing was to be closed.

**Recommendations:**

The Grand Jury would strongly recommend that the Bertsch-Oceanview Community Services District board familiarize itself with all aspects of the Brown Act and Robert's Rules of Order. The Grand Jury would further recommend that, since the attorney for the board acknowledges an awareness that this board is not adequately familiar with such laws, he meet his responsibilities in advising this board, whenever it appears pertinent. This may encourage citizens whose water rates and water services are impacted by decisions made by the Bertsch-Oceanview Community Services District board to attend board meetings.

**Response Required:**

None

**Del Norte County Board of Supervisors / Del Norte County Unified School District**

**Reason for Investigation:**

A complaint was received alleging a conflict of interest regarding actions following the confiscation of contraband from students at McCarthy Alternative Education Center (MAEC). A teacher, who is a member of the Del Norte County Board of Supervisors, allegedly rebuffed a probation officer for not charging a student with a crime. Instead, that officer had suggested suspension from school would be sufficient. The teacher, dissatisfied with this decision, sought recourse with the Probation Officer's superiors. The complaint noted that, because the teacher holds a public office, it appeared to the complainant that the teacher wielded undue influence with the officer's superiors.

**Findings:**

The Grand Jury interviewed the Del Norte County Unified School District Superintendent, Del Norte County Chief Probation Officer, and the Department of Mental Health Director, among others. The Grand Jury also visited the school site.

In the course of investigation, the Grand Jury found that two key issues affecting this case were:

1. Three independent agencies have important roles at the school, yet there are no formal controls or coordination among them. Two administrators stated they were not aware of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the agencies that would clearly delineate roles of each when conflicts arise. The third stated that "The MOU for services between Mental Health Alcohol and Drug Programs and Probation (for services to Juvenile Hall) is currently being reviewed by Probation for accuracy of content."

2. Line management authority was not properly employed to resolve the conflict regarding appropriate punishment of the student. Initial communication regarding this incident was between agencies and bypassed the formal 'chain-of-command' but, it appeared that the teacher's general assertiveness was the issue and not abuse of position.

**Conclusions:**

Although there appear to be personality conflicts, the Grand Jury found there are no grounds for conflict of interest or abuse of power in this case.

**Recommendations:**

There should be a written MOU specifying the roles of each agency and formal procedures for resolving conflicts among these agencies.

Publicly financed agencies, which dominate the local economy, need to have procedures in place so that managers, as well as employees, act responsibly and consistently. It is valuable that most inter-agency conflicts can be resolved without recourse to formal procedures. This better serves a small community.

**Response Required:**

The Grand Jury requires a response from the Del Norte County Unified School District, Del Norte County Probation Department, and the Del Norte County Department of Mental Health regarding an MOU for MAEC.

## **Del Norte County Jail**

**Reason for Investigation:**

The Grand Jury received a complaint alleging unsafe conditions in the jail. The complaint stated that an inmate was allegedly assaulted by another inmate while incarcerated in the jail. Allegations included delayed medical attention, and lack of security due to an unlocked cell door. The investigation was made to determine whether the man had been treated for the injuries within a timely manner and whether a cell door had been, in fact, unlocked, allowing the perpetrator to escape and attack the inmate. Further allegations included a statement that the victim was charged with a crime based on the attack.

**Findings:**

The Grand Jury requested, from the Sheriff's office, the incident report and all related medical reports. These included medical records from the hospital. Additionally, the Grand Jury checked with the District Attorney to see if the victim, rather than the man who injured him, was charged with assault.

The inmate who was the alleged victim was arrested for a parole violation and was held in the county jail without bail, pending hearing.

On the evening the inmate was injured, an officer on duty reported there was a radio call about a fight in "J" tank. Two officers responded. One inmate was seen running to a cell and closing the door; the other inmate was lying on the floor. The officer reports noting the injured man had a bloody nose and cuts on his lips. He was taken to the booking area for immediate first aid and observation, and was then transported to the hospital within the hour for evaluation and treatment, which included sutures. He was returned to the jail several hours later.

According to the officer filing the incident report, the inmate who allegedly caused the injury was on lockdown and managed to escape because of a faulty locking mechanism. A work order showed a new door lock was installed the next day.

As a result of this incident, the assailant had the charge of assault added to his already pending charges. The injured inmate was not charged.

**Conclusions:**

It appears that there was a dangerous situation in the jail, with the broken lock on the lock-down cell. This lock did not appear broken to the officers on duty. When it was called to their attention by this incident, however, it was immediately repaired by jail maintenance.

The injured inmate was taken to the emergency room, treated and returned to the jail.

**Recommendations:**

None

**Response Required:**

None

## Crescent City Police / California Highway Patrol

**Reason for Investigation:**

The investigation was made to determine who is responsible for roadway cleanup, following an accident.

**Findings:**

The Grand Jury subpoenaed a lieutenant from the California Highway Patrol and also interviewed Crescent City Police Chief. The CHP contracts with several local towing companies on a rotation basis. These towing companies handle all accidents on Highway 199 and Highway 101, except the stretch that runs within the city limits of Crescent City. Tow trucks are required to carry brooms and buckets and are responsible for removing all glass and debris from the roadway. Debris that scatters off the road should be removed also. If a citizen sees debris on the roadway in areas controlled by the CHP, the lieutenant recommended that the citizen call the CHP office and the debris should be removed. He said that debris considered dangerous or toxic will be removed immediately, but that glass or debris to the side of the road are not considered a safety risk, and therefore are not as high a priority.

Within the boundaries of Crescent City, the Police Chief similarly reported that the tow truck drivers are responsible for debris from an accident from which they tow a vehicle. For accidents where no tow truck was required, city maintenance is responsible for cleanup. Concerned citizens seeing glass and/or other debris in the roadway are advised to notify the city road department.

**Conclusions:**

Tow truck drivers are responsible for cleanup at the scene of an accident. However, the CHP is willing to be responsive to citizen complaints and will see to it that highways within their jurisdiction are cleaned up if they are alerted. City maintenance crews will clean up city streets littered with glass and/or other debris from collisions upon notification by concerned citizens.

**Recommendations:**

The Grand Jury commends both agencies for their willingness to respond to citizen complaints and recommends that the two agencies track patterns of neglect by tow truck drivers/companies. If there are signs of significant irresponsibility discontinue contracts. The Grand Jury further recommends that glass remaining on the street at the site of an accident be included as an indication of irresponsibility.

**Response Required:**

None

**Reason for Investigation:**

The 2004-2005 Grand Jury requested information from the Del Norte County Unified School District regarding absenteeism and truancy at Del Norte High School. The Grand Jury had a concern that there are more absences and actual truancy than recorded.

The Grand Jury interviewed the Del Norte County Unified School District Administrator in charge of the Student Attendance Review Board (SARB), as well as the Principal at Del Norte High School. The purpose was to gain knowledge about the policies and procedures in place dealing with absenteeism and truancy at Del Norte High School. The Grand Jury made an unannounced visit to the campus of Del Norte High School to observe policies and procedures for daily attendance.

**Findings:**

The SARB committee is made up of representatives from the School District, District Attorney's office, Department of Social Services, Mental Health, Rural Human Services, Healthy Start, Substance Abuse Prevention, and the County Probation Department. The purpose of a SARB hearing is to explore ways of increasing a student's school attendance.

Due to low staffing in the district Attorney's office, currently the SARB process does not lead to prosecution. Prosecution tended to be punitive towards people receiving assistance or benefits by a reduction of their financial aid. Thus, each school site works on its own system for improving attendance—some schools award prizes for good attendance.

Del Norte High School has an automated recording system that alerts parents by telephone that their child has missed one or more periods in a given day. The daily attendance is reportedly also taken each period for each student. The Average Daily Attendance (ADA) is based on the attendance taken at the beginning of first period each day. Thus, if a student leaves after that, this is not part of the tally that is reported to the state for school funding.

During the campus visit at the high school, the Grand Jury observed students in the hallways during class time who were talking amongst themselves and individually on cell phones, studying each other's physical geography, etc. A student in the hall was asked if class was in session. The student said yes, and, in response to a direct question, indicated casually, that students had left class early. It was further observed that many classrooms had empty seats.

**Conclusions:**

Due to time constraints the 2004-2005 Grand Jury was unable to investigate this matter further. At this time our findings remain inconclusive.

The concern is that, although each parent receives a phone report that "your child has been absent or tardy one or more periods" the day before, the general public is likely not aware of the actual number of students who are missing from school each period and/or each day. The Grand Jury recognizes that observations made on one day when students were lounging in the hall during class and when classrooms have empty seats is not clearly indicative of an ongoing problem, but, based on a variety of miscellaneous reports, feels that there is a bigger problem than the ADA figures would show.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the 2005-2006 Grand Jury continue to investigate this matter. Additionally, because it takes a whole village to raise a child, the community—parents, citizens and teachers—work diligently on supporting school attendance.

The Grand Jury further recommends that representatives from the various cultural populations participate on the SARB Board.

**Response Required:**

None

## Crescent City Harbor District

**Reason for Investigation:**

The Grand Jury was concerned about conditions of the public restrooms at the harbor, including but not limited to holes in the wall. The Grand Jury investigated, and photographed, the conditions.

**Findings:**

Restrooms, upon investigation, were clean and freshly painted. The hole in the wall (observed previously by the Grand Jury) had been repaired. New restrooms west of the harbor office were in the process of construction at the time of investigation.

**Conclusions:**

The problem appears to have been resolved.

**Recommendations:**

The Grand Jury recommends the Harbor District maintain the restrooms in the newly repaired condition.

**Response Required:**

None/

## Del Norte County Department of Mental Health

**Reason for Investigation:**

The investigation was conducted in response to concerns regarding the qualifications for Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) counselors.

**Findings:**

Upon interviewing the Director of Mental Health, the Grand Jury found that all seven AOD counselors working within the Department of Mental Health meet all minimum requirements set by law. Currently only one counselor is certified. Effective 4/1/05, the State of California has revised the regulations so that all AOD counselors must register to be certified by 10/1/05; and they must actually have certification within five years of the 4/1/05 revision.

**Conclusion:**

The Department of Mental Health is in compliance with all regulations related to the qualifications for AOD counselors.

**Recommendations:**

The Grand Jury recommends that the Department continue to follow the State regulations and meet the deadline set by the state to certify all AOD counselors.

**Response Required:**

None

## **Del Norte County Drug Task Force**

### **Reason for Investigation:**

The Grand Jury received complaints alleging that a member of the Drug Task Force used undue force during interactions with citizens. Complaints further stated they had received no response to complaints filed directly with the Sheriff's Office.

### **Findings:**

The Grand Jury interviewed the Patrol Commander from the Del Norte County Sheriff's Office regarding protocols for citizen contact and complaint procedures.

The Grand Jury learned that the complaints were already under investigation. The Commander provided criteria for an officer to stop a car and the acceptable procedures for questioning the individual(s) in the car. Given the latter, the behaviors alleged did not fit within these acceptable procedures. The procedure for making complaints regarding any officer of the Task Force follow:

- There is a "Public Complaint" form available through the Sheriff's Office, which contains a cover sheet basically stating the intent of the department to maintain a "relationship of trust and confidence with the public."
- Within "a couple of weeks" of receipt of the completed complaint form, the Sheriff's Office will send the complainant a standard response letter, which acknowledges receipt of the form and that the matter is under investigation.
- If no further communication is received by the complainant for what seems to be a lengthy period of time, the complainant may call the department and ask about the progress of the investigation. The complainant may expect to be told approximately how far along the investigation has progressed at the time of the call (i.e. half way, one third of the way, etc.) and how much longer it is expected to take.
- Upon completion of the investigation, the complainant is sent a letter advising them of the determination.

The Grand Jury also learned that staffing/budget issues may cause some delays in the investigation.

### **Conclusions:**

Because the complaints were already under investigation, they do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Grand Jury.

### **Recommendations:**

None

### **Response Required:**

None

## **Del Norte County Planning Department**

### **Reason for Investigation:**

A complaint was received alleging the County was denying a certificate of occupancy for a newly constructed single-family residence. The individuals felt that certain county officials were denying them a certificate of

occupancy unless they agreed to give a specified amount of their property as an easement to the County without compensation. The complaint also stated that eleven of their trees were cut down by the County, using inmate labor. The property owners stated they were neither consulted nor compensated for their timber. They further alleged that some of their neighbors were offered incentives from the County, i.e. land, trade of land, building permits etc. in trade for easements; and that the County wanted to close the only road that allowed access to all of the properties, in essence leaving the complainants land locked. The individuals felt that they were singled out by the County and if the County wanted their property they should purchase it or claim eminent domain.

The complaint continued with allegations that the County had to close the aforementioned road in order to widen the airport runway. The complainants felt the County should purchase the land so that there was enough land to make runway measurements legal. They further felt that if the County was not willing to purchase the necessary portion of their land, then the airport should be closed.

**Findings:**

The Grand Jury interviewed both the complainants and a County official involved in this situation. Since the initial complaint to the Grand Jury, the County has issued the certificate of occupancy.

The County owns the airport, and Cal Trans Division of Aeronautics requires the County to maintain what is known as an "airport clear zone". During the investigation, the Grand Jury found that the clear zone is much like that of the bleachers in a football stadium, such that the zone begins at ground level and rises to 125 feet. Like stadium bleachers, the clear zone rises up and out. This clear zone is legally defined in the county easement and it is required that there be clear zone set backs.

Approximately six to nine months prior to the complaint, Cal Trans Division of Aeronautics stated that they did not want *any* moving objects in the clear zone. This meant that the County may have to close the road and find other alternatives for the landowners to access their property. The County has asked to have such ruling in writing. As of this writing, the County has not yet received a letter of determination from the Cal Trans Division of Aeronautics.

The Grand Jury learned that sometimes recorded easements may not appear on a deed.

**Conclusions:**

The investigation showed the County was not trying to take the complainant's property. In fact, county officials appeared to be trying to do all they could to ensure safety for all who live near and who use the airport. In addition, county officials were maintaining the "airport clear zone" as defined by Cal Trans Division of Aeronautics.

**Recommendations:**

The Grand Jury recommends that the County continue to seek a written recommendation/ruling from Cal Trans Division of Aeronautics regarding the need to close the current access road. Further, if the road must be closed, the County is encouraged to continue its efforts toward a viable solution to creating access to those properties affected.

**Response Required:**

None

## *Secretary's Report*

On June 23, 2004, the Honorable Robert Weir impaneled the 2004-2005 Grand Jury. Dee Mattz was appointed Foreperson of the nineteen member panel. Five of the nineteen members held over from the previous year in continued service to this community. Eight current members have elected to stay on the Jury for another year.

This Grand Jury met three times a month during the fiscal year 2004-2005 and as a body did on-site inspections of correctional facilities and other public agencies.

The 2003-2004 Grand Jury passed on only one complaint that had been received too late to act upon. In addition, twenty-two written complaints were received by this Jury for investigation, of which one will be passed on as unresolved with a recommendation for continued investigation. Each complaint received a timely response and when necessary, investigations were documented.

It was my personal pleasure to work with these committed people over the past year. I was impressed by the seriousness and determination with which these individuals approached each task. I appreciate the opportunity to serve this community and its citizens.

Berni Rimack  
Secretary, 2004-2005 Grand Jury

### **RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS FOR LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES**

This Grand Jury's report contains findings and recommendations directed to the boards of various local public agencies subject to the "watchdog" functions of the Grand Jury. Pursuant to Penal Code §933, no later than 90 days after the 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 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 elective county officer or agency head for which the grand jury has responsibility shall comment with in 60 days to the presiding judge of the superior court.

Pursuant to Penal Code 933.05 as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:

The respondent agrees with the finding.

The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefore.

As to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:


The recommendation has been implemented with a summary regarding he implemented action.

The re commendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.


The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director

# 2004-2005 Del Norte County Grand Jury Formal Submittal of Report


The undersigned, being duly sworn and acting members of the 2004-2005 Del Norte County Grand Jury, and comprising of at least twelve (12) members thereof, hereby affix their signatures, and submit this Final Report.




Susan M. Andrews



Alison Baxter




Betty Brown




Kurt Cooke



Jeff Dickson




Dorothy Fay



Donna Haynes




Marshall S. Jones



Byron Lundberg




Dee Mattz




Sandra Morrison



Kay Parrott




Rosemary Reed




Berni Rimack



Linda Sanford



Cheryl Scott



Dean Valero, Jr.