

This document is an extract of a larger publication.

civilgrandjury.org is a project of UnGovr.org, a US-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to government transparency and public accountability.



YOLO HABITAT CONSERVANCY PERSEVERANCE, PRESERVATION AND POSSIBILITIES

SUMMARY

The 2015-2016 Yolo County Grand Jury investigated the Yolo Habitat Conservancy (YHC).¹ The YHC's goal was to develop a County plan to comply with state and federal laws protecting currently listed endangered species and their habitats or those which might be at risk in the future. Several decades of expenditures in excess of the current \$15 million have been spent to develop a long-term plan to address the Endangered Species Act in Yolo County. As no plan was ever filed, the Grand Jury questioned and investigated the Yolo County Habitat Conservancy Joint Powers Agency.²

The results of the 2015-16 investigation found the Yolo Habitat Conservancy (YHC) board to be cooperative even though the report was critical of the time and money expended without results. The Grand Jury also felt that with the overlap of managers and consultants, there existed the possible appearance of impropriety. A Grand Jury Report was issued, several recommendations were made, and responses from the various boards responsible for the YHC yielded mixed results.

Based on responses reported in the media and citizen concerns regarding the functioning of the YHC, the 2016-2017 Grand Jury decided to reopen the investigation to review lingering concerns. These concerns included budgetary documents that were not self-explanatory and appeared to suggest financial improprieties with consultants receiving both direct county salaries and contractual payments.

Development of the Conservancy Plan has historically been slow. Even after the Joint Powers Agency (JPA) was established in 2002, only 20 percent of the work on the plan had been completed. However, with a complete reorganization in 2012 and the hiring of a Contractor to oversee development of the plan, steady progress has been made.

METHODOLOGY

The 2016-2017 Yolo County Grand Jury followed three processes in conducting this new investigation: background research, interviews, and review of pertinent documentation. The committee referenced the report from the 2015-2016 Grand Jury, and noted the responses from the cities covered by the 2015-16 report. While the West Sacramento response was positive, other Yolo County cities' responses were tepid-to-negative and seemed to ignore the problems cited by the 2015-16 Grand Jury.

¹Yolo Habitat Conservancy (YHC) was previously called the Yolo County Conservation Plan/National Community Conservation Plan (Yolo County HCP/NCCP) and Yolo Local Conservation Plan (LCP) that was an iteration of the original Yolo Natural Heritage Program.

²Reference the 2015-2016 Yolo County Grand Jury the *Yolo Habitat Conservancy: A Never-Ending Story*; copies of the report can be found at the local library or at www.yolocounty.org/.../yolo-county-grand-jury-reports

**YOLO HABITAT CONSERVANCY
PERSEVERANCE, PRESERVATION AND POSSIBILITIES**

The Grand Jury conducted interviews to further inquire into the YHC Plan. During the course of interviews, it was opined that "... the program has been an incredible waste of taxpayers' money." However, the interviews and documentation did not reveal illegal activities or malfeasance.

The Grand Jury reviewed various documents including budgets, contracts, and audit reports. Additional documents and websites reviewed by the Grand Jury are as follows:

- Yolo Habitat Conservancy <http://www.yolohabitatconservancy.org>
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife <http://www.wildlife.ca.gov>
- Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Services, Federal Register/Vol. 76, October 21, 2011
- United States Fish and Wildlife Services, Habitat Conservation Plan
- Newspapers including *The Sacramento Bee*, *The Davis Enterprise*, and *The Woodland Daily Democrat*
- East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy <http://co.contra-costa.ca.us/depart/cd/water/hcp>
- Napa County Wildlife Conservation Commission <http://www.countyofnapa.org/Wildlife>
- Independent audits conducted by Vavirinet, Trien, Day and Company, LLC- Certified Accountants and Consultants

DISCUSSION

In a 2013 independent audit, it was determined that the Yolo Habitat Conservation/ Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) had an internal deficit of \$120,915 for the 2012 fiscal year. The Contractor explained that the deficit was due to 2012 accounting shortcomings and not recording or reporting the lag time between expenditures and incoming revenues, primarily from various grants. The YHC borrowed \$120,915 from the Yolo County Treasury to cover the deficit. The loan has been paid down and verified by similar independent audits for years 2014 and 2015 and payments of \$28,482 and \$90,666, respectively. The remaining balance of \$1,767 was scheduled to be paid off in 2016, although no evidence of this repayment was found during this investigation.

The YHC is a member of the Yolo County Treasurer's Pool (County Pool), which is an external and legal investment pool, not registered with the Securities Exchange Commission. The cash and investments from the Habitat JPA are held in this pool. The Yolo County Treasury Oversight Committee oversees this pool, and the cash deposit from the YHC is stated at fair market value.

**YOLO HABITAT CONSERVANCY
PERSEVERANCE, PRESERVATION AND POSSIBILITIES**

Based on the independent audits of 2014, 2015 and 2016, the accounting processes and procedures that caused some of the deficits have been corrected. Quoting from the 2016 independent audit:

“...the Habitat JPA adopted new accounting guidance, Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 72, Fair Value Measurement and Application, effective July 1, 2015.”

The initial Grand Jury investigation suspected some accounting irregularities and was inclined to question if illegal payments were being made and whether the entire project had turned into a boondoggle. A September 18, 2016, article in *The Sacramento Bee* suggested that similar conclusions were warranted. However, over the course of the investigation and after reviewing the current development of the long-term conservancy plan, all concerns of the 2016-17 Grand Jury were resolved.

In reviewing three years of budgets (2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17), explanations of specific budgetary items were adequately clarified by the Contractor and county personnel. Once detailed information was provided, it was clear the Contractor was not a simultaneous county employee. The invoice approval process was explained and appeared to be satisfactory, and for the time the Contractor has had the contract, much progress has been made in the effort of plan completion. At the recommendation of the Grand Jury, terminology changes to the 2016-17 final budget to clarify staffing and consulting budgeting were made and are in line with expected costs to finish the development plan by the end of 2017.

As a result of the 2015-16 Grand Jury investigations, the Yolo Habitat Conservancy HCP/NCCP has implemented a Performance Measurement Matrix for 2016-17. This matrix shows Adopted Organizational Goals, Sub goals, Performance Measure, Outcome, Performance Measure Met and Pending Actions. The Contractor’s organization is under contract and is expected to terminate said contract at the end of 2017, when the plan is ready for implementation. Yolo Habitat Conservancy HCP/NCCP is using best practices found and/or implemented by other Conservancies within California to establish common practices and save on development costs.

Landowners’ and/or farmers’ purchase of permits from the Yolo Habitat Conservancy is a one-time expense. Once the plan is fully implemented, it will provide a one-stop shop for landowners/farmers to meet environmental and conservation requirements established by various local, state and federal agencies. Landowners can also sell conservation easements or establish mitigation receiving sites on their property to help fulfill the goals of the Yolo Habitat Conservancy Plan (YHCP).

Conservancy plans for various other counties have taken considerable time to formulate. Guidelines change, and federal and state authorities have often created unnecessary roadblocks to successful conclusion.

It appears that the current iteration of the plan is closing in on an end of year 2017 delivery date. Delays resulting from outside agencies and governmental departments are being monitored and questioned by the YHC to try to meet the expected completion date. Many of the administrative

**YOLO HABITAT CONSERVANCY
PERSEVERANCE, PRESERVATION AND POSSIBILITIES**

problems have been dealt with and appropriate solutions implemented, including adopting the recommendations set forth in the 2015-16 Grand Jury report.

It is important to note that as the 2016-17 Grand Jury report was readied for publication, the Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan Draft was announced in the Federal Register³ and released for public comment. Public comment will be open from June 1 through August 31, 2017. Several public meetings are scheduled. Details and schedule of public meetings can be found on the Yolo Habitat Conservancy website. Written comments may also be submitted, but must be received by August 30, 2017, to be considered.

³ Federal Register/ Vol 82, No. 104/ Thursday, June 1, 2017/ Notices

FINDINGS

- F1. Generally, the YHCP has adopted and uses acceptable accounting practices as cited in the audit.
- F2. The loan to the YHC from the Yolo County Treasury has an outstanding balance of \$1,767.00.
- F3. At the printing of this report, the Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan has been released for public comment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1. By September 1, 2017, the remaining balance of the loan from the Yolo County Treasury is to be repaid to Yolo County.

REQUIRED RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05, the Grand Jury requests responses as follows:
From the following governing bodies:

- Yolo County Habitat Conservancy Joint Powers Agency Board – F-1, F-2, F-3 and R-1
- Yolo County Board of Supervisors – F-1, F-2, F-3 and R-1

From the following individuals

- Yolo County Chief Financial Officer – F-2 and R-1
- YHC-NCCP Executive Director – F-1, F-2, F-3 and R-1

**YOLO HABITAT CONSERVANCY
PERSEVERANCE, PRESERVATION AND POSSIBILITIES**

This report is issued by the 2016-17 Yolo County Grand Jury with the exception of one juror, who was recused. This grand juror did not participate in any part of the investigation, which included interviews, deliberations, and the making and acceptance of this report.

The governing bodies indicated above should be aware that the comment or response of the governing body must be conducted subject to notice, agenda, and open meeting requirements of the Brown Act.

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

YOLO COUNTY ADULT AND YOUTH DETENTION FACILITY INSPECTION

SUMMARY

The 2016-17 Yolo County Grand Jury (YCGJ) conducted a review of the Yolo County Sheriff's Office (YCSO) detention facilities and operations at the Monroe Detention Center (Monroe) and Walter J. Leinberger Memorial Center (Leinberger) and the Yolo County Probation Department's Juvenile Detention Facility (YCPD).

Monroe is a medium/maximum security facility rated to house adult inmates with all security classifications. During the visit of the facility, the Grand Jury members observed that the facility was aged, but orderly, and was in good repair. The facility had addressed the 2015-16 Grand Jury Report regarding maintenance of "Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) units," medical files, and cleanliness of medical facilities. At the time of the visit all exits were accessible and free from obstruction, which was not the case during the 2015-16 YCGJ tours.

Leinberger houses minimum-security inmates in dormitory facilities. The Leinberger facility, though currently operational, is scheduled for demolition as part of the AB109 \$36M demolition and construction/expansion project. At the time of the inspection, the facility was found to be operational and in good repair.

The YCGJ members also inspected the Juvenile Detention Facility. The facility is modern, clean, and appears to be in good operating order. The members did not make any negative observations or findings during the inspection of the facility.

BACKGROUND

Penal Code Section 919(b) states: "the Grand Jury shall inquire into the condition and management of the public prisons within the county." To fulfill the statutory obligation, the Grand Jury chose to visit the Monroe Detention and Leinberger Memorial Centers, the principal adult detention facilities in Yolo County as well as the Yolo County Juvenile Detention Facility.

METHODOLOGY

The YCGJ members toured the Juvenile Detention Facility on September 21, 2016. Due to legal and privacy constraints, the members were unable to interview the inmates who are minors. They did inspect the facility including a housing unit, recreational yard, classrooms, booking, visiting and medical areas. The Grand Jury Members conducted interviews with the Superintendent and facility staff about various programs, funding sources, and the current construction project.

The YCGJ members inspected the Monroe Detention Center and the Leinberger Memorial Center in Woodland, California, on January 13, 2017, and conducted a revisit to examine documents on February 3, 2017.

YOLO COUNTY ADULT AND YOUTH DETENTION FACILITY INSPECTION

Throughout each of these tours, members of the YCGJ members were escorted by the YCSO command staff. During those visits, the Grand Jury inspected the facilities and conducted interviews with staff and randomly selected inmates on various topics including housing, treatment, and programing opportunities.

Prior to the inspections, the YCGJ members reviewed the 2015-16 Yolo County Grand Jury Final Report.

The Grand Jury visited informational websites, including the following:

- Yolo County Sheriff's Office
- Yolo County
- California Legislative Information
- *Woodland Daily Democrat*
- Board of State and Community Corrections
- *San Diego Tribune*

DISCUSSION

The Juvenile Detention Facility:

Local Youthful Offender Rehabilitative Facilities (SB 81 2007-2008) legislation awarded the Yolo County Probation Department \$4,784,536 for expansion of its Juvenile Hall facility. In May 2016, the county broke ground for construction of a multipurpose center that includes a gymnasium for the juvenile detainees, a family reunion area, a contact visiting area, and separate rooms for therapy and counseling. The current facility does not have space available for contact visits with family. The scheduled completion date for the project is September 2017.

The Adult Jail Facilities:

Of six inmates interviewed, five had no issues and praised the programs and treatment by facility staff. One inmate complained of water damage in his cell. Upon inspection of the complaining inmate's cell and all other cells in that housing unit, there was no obvious plumbing problem or any visible standing water. The water damage appeared to be caused by another inmate housed above the complaining inmate. The Grand Jury members believe that the facility staff responded appropriately to the inmate's complaint, and the cell did not appear compromised or to present any further concerns.

The Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) and inmate grievances forms discussed in the 2015-16 Yolo County Grand Jury Report appeared to be complete and did not present any issues at the time of the review.

YOLO COUNTY ADULT AND YOUTH DETENTION FACILITY INSPECTION

The YCGJ members did express concern over the handling of the inspection reports for medical services. Since medical services are contracted by the County's Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the Sheriff's Office is not directly responsible for contract management of these services. However, the YCGJ members found that although the Sheriff's Office is provided with copies of inspection reports, they do not routinely follow up with the DHHS to ensure that corrections to any violations are made.

The Yolo County Jail is currently participating in a six-month pilot Inmate Computer Tablet Program funded by a grant in the amount of \$68,000 from the California Community Partnership. Upon expiration of the pilot program in June 2017, Yolo County Community Corrections Partnership will review program results and options for extension.

The tablet program offers orientation, education, life skills and employment curriculum to the inmates by means of an interactive individualized internet based software platform. Both the software and network have a secure design with an effective reporting system that provides an audit trail that is routinely monitored by the facility staff and technical experts. The program's goals are to increase daily activity programming opportunities and inmate participation in programming, as well as to reduce recidivism and incentivize learning. Once the inmates are released from custody, they have access to software via an internet program and may continue their learning experience. The jail staff reported that inmates have positively modified their behavior in order to maintain participation in the tablet program. On December 20, 2016, the *Woodland Daily Democrat* newspaper featured a story that included inmates' statements attesting to their increased knowledge and desire to learn as a direct result of the tablet program. Information reviewed by the YCGJ members indicates the pilot program is successful.

FINDINGS

- F1. The Yolo County Sheriff's Office is ultimately responsible for the health and safety of all inmates in its custody; but does not follow up with the medical provider's contract manager at the Yolo County Department of Health and Human Services to ensure corrections to documented violations in the jail's medical facility and services are made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1. By January 1, 2018, the Sheriff's Office will put policies and procedures in place and in practice to ensure accountability for the remediation of violations as noticed in any letters or inspection reports pertaining to all contractors providing services within the Yolo County jail facilities, including those contractors managed by other departments within the county. The YCGJ recommends that (1) the Sheriff's Office follow up, in writing, with external departments that administer contracts executed for Sheriff's Office facilities when these departments are notified of existing violations pertaining to the operations and administration of services, and (2) keep a copy of all communications with the report/notice on file. This will demonstrate a good faith effort to ensure accountability for all issues concerning inmate health and safety

YOLO COUNTY ADULT AND YOUTH DETENTION FACILITY INSPECTION

REQUIRED RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05, the Grand Jury requests responses as follows:

From the following elected official:

- Yolo County Sheriff – F-1, R-1

From the following governing body:

- Yolo County Board of Supervisors – F-1, R-1

From the following individuals:

- Detention Commander, Monroe Detention and Leinberger Memorial Centers – F-1, R-1
- Director, Health and Human Services Community Health Branch – F-1, R-1
- Chief, Yolo County Probation Department – F-1, R-1

The Governing body indicated above should be aware that the comment or response of the governing body must be conducted subject to the notice, agenda, and open meeting requirements of the Brown Act.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Yolo County Sheriff's Office website: www.yolocountysheriff.com
- Yolo County website: www.yolocounty.org
- California Legislative Information website: www.leginfo.ca.gov
- *Woodland Daily Democrat* website: www.dailydemocrat.com
- Board of State and Community Corrections website: www.bccc.ca.gov
- *San Diego Tribune* website: www.sandiegotribune.com

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

BICYCLE SAFETY

SUMMARY

The 2016-17 Yolo County Grand Jury (YCCJ) studied whether adequate consideration is being given to promoting bicycle safety and developing biking-related facilities including bicycle parking, bus compatibility, restrooms, and air for bicycle tires throughout the county. Two biking fatalities and an accident, caused by a driver who purposely ran into a bike lane hitting three bicyclists, took place and prompted the YCGJ's concern for a bicycle safety review.

METHODOLOGY

During the research, the YCGJ studied (1) prior reports of accidents and other bicycle-related incidents; (2) reviewed the *County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan* (March 2013); and (3) interviewed the Yolo County Administrator. The statistics regarding accidents and culpability for those accidents provided evidence that the *Plan* is well thought out with specific design requirements and utilization standards that are consistent with regional governing bodies and future needs of communities.

Documents and websites reviewed and researched by the YCGJ are as follows:

- www.thebikecampaign.com – Woodland Bike Loop Plan 2002 and March 2013
- www.cityofdavis.org/city-hall/public-works/bike-pedestrian-program - 2014
- [www.cityofwinters.org/PDF/January%20213%](http://www.cityofwinters.org/PDF/January%20213%20) - Sections 2, 3, 4, pages 8-33
- www.westsacramento.org/city/depts/pw/traffic - May 2013
- City of Woodland Bicycle Transportation Plan 2002
- www.census.gov/quickfacts/Yolo County, CA
- www.pedbikeinfo.org – statistical usage data
- www.yolocounty.org – *County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan*, March 2013

Additional resources, mainly regarding accidents came from

- THE DAVIS ENTERPRISE, *Cyclist Hit, Killed by Car During Time Trial Near Esparto*, May 7, 2015; *Davis man killed in Road 99 car-bike collision*, September 4, 2016; *Study: More bike ridership collisions along Fifth Street*, September 18, 2016; and *Car-free Davis: Pedal power is alive and well in Davis!* December 28, 2016;
- THE SACRAMENTO BEE, *Coroner identifies Davis Bicyclist killed in collision with SUV*, October 30, 2015;

BICYCLE SAFETY

- CBS 13 News, *Cyclist Hit, Killed by Car During Time Trial Near Esparto*, September 27, 2015;
- MINUTES, from the Yolo County Board of Supervisors' March 18, 2013, meeting (Resolution 13/32), and excerpts from the *County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan* (March 2013) and *Alternative Corridor Feasibility Study 2009*

BACKGROUND

Bicycling has grown nationally from 1.7 billion persons in 2001 to 4 billion in 2009, and workforce bicycle commuting has increased 105 percent from 2000 to 2013 in bicycle friendly communities such as the University of California Davis.² According to the California Office of Traffic Safety, the number of bicyclists killed or injured in Yolo County hovered close to 90 individuals per year. In 2009, there were 92 incidents; in 2012, there were 100 incidents; and the year 2014 had 86 incidents. Considering the growth of Yolo County's population from 200,849 in 2010 to 215,802 in 2016, a particular concern is that during the period of 2001 through 2009, the County experienced 22 bicycle-related accidents with three fatalities. There were three serious incidents occurring in 2016. For the three 2016 occurrences, the incidents involving bicycles were not due to bicycle path designation, road construction, or pathway design, but rather to bicyclist or automobile operator error as reported by the police and local newspaper coverage.

Bicycle routes or pathways are designated into three classifications:

- Class I – is a pathway separated from roads or streets where cyclists can travel in either direction on the route, and vehicles are excluded. The minimum width is eight feet, but ten feet is preferred.
- Class II – is a paved edge of a wide road or street designated by white stripes. Bike lanes come in pairs, one on each side of the road, and the cyclist must travel in the same direction as motor traffic. For purposes of making turns, vehicles and agricultural implements can use bike pathways.
- Class III – is a road or street without bike lanes or paths but is designated by signs to provide continuity to the bikeway system. Cyclists share the route with motorists.³

The Yolo County Transportation Advisory Committee (YCTAC), reporting to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors, is responsible for creating, recommending and monitoring plans to promote transportation safety, ease of use, and future road and traffic development.

Yolo County is a member of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) that aims to coordinate compatible development among the six Sacramento Regional counties. In that capacity, the YCTAC revised the 2009 *Alternative Transportation Feasibility Study* by creating

² League of American Bicyclists, www.bikeleague.org

³ *County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan* (2013-2035), Appendix 1

BICYCLE SAFETY

the *County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan (Plan)* in March 2013. The plan’s life span extends to 2035.

Yolo County contains four incorporated cities, which compete for funding from the county. Each city pursues individual priorities for road development and safety that are based on revenue streams that include tax revenue and State and Federal allocations. The economic collapse in 2008 contributed to a shortage across most revenue sources. Although there are more than 700 miles of road within Yolo County, exclusive of roads within the four incorporated cities, most citizens live within the cities, leaving a population of approximately 20,000 persons outside of those areas. This population imbalance creates a funding shortfall for the unincorporated areas due to fewer tax resources and allocations and may slow or impede the full implementation of the *Plan*.

During the life span of the *Plan* (2013-2035), Yolo County and the incorporated cities are to fund the designated projects identified in the *Plan*. Additional revenue of \$1.4 billion is to be provided through the Metropolitan Transport Plan, which includes state and regional resources. The *Plan* designates five projects as high priority, ten projects with medium priority, and 11 with low priority. These designations are a key factor in determining the funding and timeline of implementation. The five top priority projects are found in the *Plan’s* Appendix 2 and include:

1.	Alternative Transportation Corridor (Davis to Woodland), (J Street and Covell Boulevard in Davis to County Road 27, County Road 101 to Spring Lake Development in Woodland)	Class I
2.	Davis-Woodland Bikeway (Davis to Woodland). Connect west side of State Route 113	Class I & II
3.	County Road 21A, Esparto	Class II
4.	County Road 98, Hutchison Drive to Russell Boulevard in Davis	Class II
5.	County Road 99, County Road 19 to Davis City Limits	Class II

All the community bicycle safety plans are based on the “Bikeway Standards” outlined in Chapter 1000 of the State of California Department of Transportation, CalTrans Highway Design Manual, and the California Streets and Highways Code, Section 890 to 894-2. Additionally, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), for the purpose of coordinating compatible development among the six Sacramento regional counties, reviewed the *County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan*. After the review, the appropriate planning committees of the four incorporated cities, regional bicycle clubs, CalTrans, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, and the Yolo County Transportation District provided additional input. Public responses and comments were also solicited and are included in the *Plan’s* Appendix 5.

BICYCLE SAFETY

The *Plan* addresses how the public uses the various existing bike pathways such as for shopping, recreation, and commuting to and from work and school. Between the four County cities, it is estimated there are 75 work-force commutes alone. The three different route classifications, I, II, and III, developed with the help of CalTrans, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and Yolo County establish specifications to meet those utilization requirements.

In addition to listing current bike routes, the *Plan* proposes other routes between the four incorporated cities and along roads outside of the incorporated areas. Setting high, medium and low priorities to projects, 24 new proposed routes are included. Combined with new routes is the need for sufficient bicycle racks at key locations as well as bicycle racks on public transportation vehicles (currently limited to three bikes per bus) that should be addressed. The *Plan* notes utilization of bicycles as a percent of the population exceeds the national average in most counties. With 33,000 students, University of California Davis contributes a substantial portion to that bicycling community.

The *Plan* further cites the need for bicycle training programs regarding traffic laws, safety tips, and “rules of the road” common courtesy. The League of American Bicyclists Better Education is specifically mentioned as a potential provider of training for all County residents.

The *Plan* sets forth an ambitious number of projects while, at the same time, tries to maintain the rural nature of the County. Funding issues are noted as critical to completion of the *Plan*'s goals.

Different designated areas within the County to be serviced by the *Plan* are:

- Cities: Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland
- Census Designated Places (CDPs): Clarksburg, Dunnigan, Esparto, Guinda, Knights Landing, Madison, Monument Hills, University of California Davis, and Yolo
- Unincorporated Communities: Arcade, Arroz, Beatrice, Brooks, Browns Corner, Cadenasso, Capay, Central, Citrona, Conaway, Coniston, Daisie, Dufour, El Macero, El Rio Villa, Fremont, Green, Greendale, Hershey, Jacobs Corner, Kiesel, King Farms, Lovdal, Lund, Merritt, Morgans Landing, Norton, Peethill, Plainfield, Riverview, Rumsey, Saxon, Sorroca, Sugarfield, Swingle, Tancred, Tyndall Landing, Valdez, Vin, Webster, Willow Point, and Zamora

The community designation (cities, CDPs and unincorporated communities) does not necessarily determine the priority status of individual projects or pathway classifications. There is only one project, State Routes 28/16, classified as a Class III project. The designation of community is more likely to identify revenue obstacles to implementing a specific project.

DISCUSSION

The *Plan* was developed with a great deal of input from a large list of knowledgeable contributors as well as from positive responses from the public. Documentation of the responses can be found in the 2013 *County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan*, Pages 79 through 83.

BICYCLE SAFETY

Despite uneven funding which slowed the implementation of the *Plan*, progress has been made with the cities enjoying more success than the unincorporated portions of the County. The YCGJ finds the *Plan* to be well written and documented. It also provides guidelines for present and future projects to enhance bicycling safety and utilization throughout the County. During an interview with a County official, it was expressed that the lack of regular structured communication between Yolo County's transportation agencies and communities prevents coordinated efforts to overcome similar implementation hurdles, shortfall revenue, coordination of priorities and resources, and possible ballot initiatives or legislation to enhance similar goals and revenue as they relate to the *Plan*.

It should be noted that the very high bicycle accident rate in 2016 may be an anomaly or may indicate increased bicycling activity combine with poor judgment on the part of individual drivers and bicycle riders who choose to ignore their own safety as well as established "Rules of the Road." Neither the accident rate nor the individual behavior detracts from the value of the *Plan*.

FINDINGS

- F1. The 2013 *Yolo County Bicycle Transportation Plan* is well thought out, addresses adequate safety needs, follows statewide standards, and provides a reasonable and systematic approach to upgrading and repairing existing streets and roads.
- F2. Recent bicycle-related accidents do not relate to inconsistent street/road construction/repairs or adherence to stated bicycle safety standards, but rather to individual acts or mistakes in judgment.
- F3. The economic collapse in 2008 contributed to a shortage of revenue across most local, state, and Federal revenue sources. Most citizens live within the four cities, leaving a population of approximately 20,000 persons outside of those areas. This population imbalance creates a funding shortfall for the unincorporated areas due to smaller tax resources and allocations.
- F4. The lack of regular structured communication between the County cities, CDPs, unincorporated areas, transportation agencies and districts has prevented input to pool resources and ideas and assist in a timelier completion of the *Plan*.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A future Yolo County Grand Jury may periodically wish to review and confirm the continued execution and adherence to the *Plan*.

- R1. By January 2018, the Yolo County Transportation Advisory Committee and the Yolo County Transportation District shall host, at least twice yearly, a meeting of organizations and local governments to share implementation hurdles, ideas for funding, coordination of priorities and resources, and possible ballot initiatives or legislation to enhance similar goals and revenue as they relate to the *Plan*.

BICYCLE SAFETY

REQUIRED RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal code section 933.05, the Grand Jury requests responses as follows:
From the following elected officials or elected agency heads:

- None

From the following governing bodies:

- None

From the following individuals:

- Yolo County Transportation Advisory Committee Chairperson – F1 through F3; R2
- Yolo County Transportation District – F1 through F4; R1
- City of Davis Public Works Director – F1 through F4; R1
- City of West Sacramento Public Works Director – F1 through F4; R1
- City of Winters Public Works Director – F1 through F4; R1
- City of Woodland Public Works Director – F1 through F4; R1

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