

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.



At Gold Hill fewer than ten gravesites remain for sale. Once these sites are sold the District will continue maintaining the cemetery as needed.

Ophir Cemetery is an unofficial historical site that has no records of interment, but headstones date back to the 1850's. Burial locations are restricted by the few remaining markers. The District limits plot use to cremains only.

Placer County Cemetery District #1

The District was formed in 1925, although its oldest cemetery (Manzanita) dates from 1850. It covers Sheridan, the City of Lincoln, and a large portion of the unincorporated area of western Placer County. The District is currently developing the Santa Clara Memorial Park, scheduled to open in the spring of 2009.

The District performs about seventy burials a year. It has not increased its service charges for the last two years.

The Grand Jury is aware of a recently filed lawsuit that names the District as a defendant. It involves a planned move of a body from the Lincoln Cemetery to a cemetery in Auburn. When the attempt was made to disinter the body, which had been buried in 1947, no body was found. The Grand Jury made no further investigation into this matter because of the pending litigation.

Roseville Public Cemetery District

The Roseville Cemetery includes the largest developed area of any of the public cemeteries in Placer County. The earliest burial in the cemetery occurred in 1861. The District performs about 200 burials each year. It believes that it has sufficient land and other facilities to meet demand for at least the next fifteen to twenty years.

The Union Cemetery originated as a family cemetery. The oldest graves date to the 1860's. The Cemetery was deeded to the District in 1951. It handles six to ten burials a year.

The District covers the City of Roseville, part of Granite Bay, a small area of Rocklin, and a large unincorporated area of western Placer County.

Tahoe City Cemetery District

Tahoe City Cemetery District was established in 1965. The District's Trail's End Cemetery is the smallest cemetery operated by the six Placer County cemetery districts.

The Cemetery averages five to six burials a year and is only open during the summer months. During the winter season, alternate arrangements must be made. The Cemetery is operated and maintained by volunteers and independent contractors.

Findings

1. All of the cemetery districts in Placer County appear to be serving the public well and operating in an acceptable manner.
2. Based on the Jury's review of each district's policies and practices, the Jury was satisfied that unrestricted reserves are being controlled properly.
3. Two districts (Colfax and Tahoe City) are very small with few reserves and small incomes. This makes them vulnerable to future unexpected problems. It also results in customer fees that are the largest in the County.
4. The Colfax District's ownership of the Indian Cemetery exposes the District to potential liability issues.

Recommendation

The Colfax District should investigate its options relative to ownership of the Colfax Indian Cemetery.

Request for Response

- Craig Ballenger, Superintendent - Due by October 1, 2009
Colfax Cemetery District
P.O. Box 231
Colfax, CA 95713

Copies Sent To

- Sue Burkett, District Manager
Auburn Public Cemetery District
P.O. Box 4357
Auburn, CA 95604-4357
- Peter Barmettler, Manager
Placer County Cemetery District #1
P.O. Box 546
Lincoln, CA 95648

- Bill Emerson, Superintendent
Newcastle Rocklin Gold Hill
Cemetery District
850 Taylor Road
Newcastle, CA 95658
- Linda Roberts, Superintendent
Roseville Public Cemetery District
P.O. Box 729
Roseville, CA 95678
- Judy Friedman, Secretary
Tahoe City Cemetery District
P.O. Box 1528
Tahoe City, CA 96145

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO: MITIGATING COSTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Thunder Valley Casino



Photo by Win Gredvig

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO: MITIGATING COSTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Summary

The presence of Thunder Valley Casino in Placer County has resulted in both financial benefits and costs to the County and some of its cities. The municipalities and the Casino have generally worked well together to establish agreements and processes to help mitigate any costs. Based on evaluations from the County and the three cities closest to the Casino (Lincoln, Rocklin and Roseville), the Grand Jury determined that there are currently no known significant adverse financial impacts on these governments and their agencies resulting from the operation of the Casino. Additional analysis should be done to confirm this, however, by Rocklin and Roseville.

Some local government agencies use grant money to partially mitigate their Casino-related costs. Grant availability is not guaranteed for the future, so more permanent funding sources should be found if those costs will be ongoing. In addition, the County committee that awards these grants should improve its procedures to ensure that money is spent as intended.

The Grand Jury did not investigate the complex area of assessing the mitigation of any costs to residents, businesses or non-governmental agencies in these communities that may be caused by the presence of the Casino. This investigation focused only on costs to local governments.

Background

Thunder Valley Casino, owned by the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC, or “the Tribe”), has been operating on Tribal lands within unincorporated Placer County since 2003. While the presence of the Casino has provided local jobs to the economy, it has also created additional costs to local government. These areas of actual or potential costs include law enforcement, fire protection, emergency medical services, water, sewer, roads and bridges, traffic, pollution, addiction management and other human services.

Now that the Casino has been in operation for several years, the Grand Jury decided to look at the extent to which those additional costs were being identified and mitigated, and what processes were in place to deal with those costs as they changed over time. The Jury felt that Placer County taxpayers should understand how the presence of the Casino is affecting their local governments financially.

The Casino's presence in the County results in many complex economic and social impacts. Some jobs and businesses are created or helped while others are damaged as a result of the Casino's operation. Some people are strongly opposed to gambling of any type and object to its presence in the County. Others welcome the increased entertainment and dining opportunities it provides. Some individuals and families are hurt by problem gambling or by crimes that have some association with the Casino. Other people – some members of the tribe as well as others – benefit financially as a direct or indirect result of the Casino's presence. Attempting to identify these and other effects accurately is extremely difficult and often subjective. Quantifying the financial impacts on individuals and on society as a whole is even more problematic.

Complicating the societal effects still further is the current political reality of Indian gaming in general, and the UAIC specifically. Federal legislation authorized the operation of tribal casinos and has given tribes sovereign nation status. For Placer County, this has resulted in the existence of a very large business operation in the County that operates without much transparency. The UAIC is also attempting to exercise an increasingly large amount of political influence to advance and protect its interests. While understandable from a business perspective, this has caused some people to wonder if the UAIC always acts like a good neighbor.

The Casino is a fact of County life and appears to be here for the foreseeable future. Identifying its impacts on society with any reasonable amount of accuracy and completeness is a complex task probably best suited to academics and other professionals. Accordingly, the Grand Jury limited the focus of this review to considering whether or not Casino-related costs to local governments were being properly identified and compensated.

Investigation Methods

The Grand Jury sent letters to the County Executive Officer and the City Managers of the cities of Lincoln, Rocklin and Roseville asking for a wide range of information and documentation relating to their costs from the Casino and the mitigation of those costs.

Responses were received from all parties and all the material provided was reviewed in detail. The City Managers for Rocklin and Roseville testified to the Jury to expand on several portions of their responses.

The County participates with the Tribe and others in two gaming-related committees: the Tribal County Advisory Committee and the Placer County Indian Gaming Local Community Benefit Committee. Letters were sent to the offices of the County Executive and the Board of Supervisors asking for meeting minutes, copies of relevant reports, and other pertinent information about the operations of those committees. The designated County contacts for these committees provided testimony to the Jury about specific pieces of this information.

California Government Code Sections 12710–12718 deal with the establishment and operations of a Local Community Benefit Committee in each county in which Indian gaming is conducted, including procedures for distributing grants to local government agencies impacted by gaming. The Jury reviewed those Government Code Sections and the manner in which they have been implemented in Placer County. Jurors also reviewed the California State Auditor’s report, published in July 2007, on the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund that was set up by this Government Code. This was a statewide audit with Placer being one of six counties selected to receive a more detailed review. The Jury used this report both for general knowledge about the grant creation process and the results of the audit as it pertained to grants awarded in Placer County.

The Jury reviewed archived newspaper articles to better understand the history of Thunder Valley Casino and related issues in Placer County. We obtained information about the amount paid by the Tribe to the County from the offices of the Auditor-Controller and the County Executive Officer.

The Jury made no independent attempt to identify or quantify any specific costs to governments resulting from the Casino. We relied on officials from the County and its cities to provide any cost estimates and to give their evaluations of the degree to which those costs have been mitigated. The Jury also did not attempt to determine any costs or benefits to individuals, businesses or non-government agencies that may result from the presence of the Casino in the County.

Facts

A Brief History of the Casino

In 1991, the United Auburn Indian Community was organized by remnants of two Native American bands, the Maidu and Miwok, which had been living on land near Auburn provided to them by the federal government in 1917. Federal recognition was restored to the Tribe in 1994 through legislation, along with the right to procure other land for a reservation in Placer County.

As has been done many times elsewhere in the country, the Tribe decided to build a casino to provide revenue for its members. They chose Station Casinos Inc., a Nevada-based casino management company, to select the land for the Tribe, help develop plans for the Casino and operate the casino during the first seven years after opening. An agreement with the State was signed in 1999 that allowed the Tribe to operate the planned Casino.

After first exploring a site near Penryn for the Casino and being met with strong local opposition, the Tribe settled on a site in the Sunset Industrial Park on County land near Lincoln. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was negotiated between the Tribe and Placer County and signed in January 2000. Through this MOU, three parcels were placed in trust for the Tribe, including a large parcel to be used for the Casino and gaming-related activities. The MOU also describes commitments made by the Tribe for payments and other actions to mitigate a variety of costs that the operation of the Casino would create for the County and local communities.

The cities of Rocklin and Roseville, along with a group called Citizens for Safer Communities, filed a lawsuit in April 2002 seeking to stop the casino. Their primary claim was that the federal government did not fully take into account any adverse effects of the casino on the surrounding communities. In September 2002, a federal court dismissed the case. The cities appealed, but the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld the dismissal in a ruling November 14, 2003.

The Tribe had earlier made several offers to the cities of Rocklin and Roseville to contribute to the cities and community organizations as a way to mitigate any adverse impacts from the casino if the cities would drop the suit. But the cities refused to accept the offers. After the final ruling on the appeal upheld the dismissal of the suit, the Tribe's

attorney was quoted as saying that the Tribe was not likely to repeat those offers to the cities that had challenged the casino in court.

Thunder Valley Casino opened for business in June 2003 as one of the largest casinos in the State. In June 2007, the Tribe announced plans for a \$1 billion expansion that includes a 23-floor hotel, a performing arts theater and a convention center. Construction was well underway when the Tribe halted work in November 2008 to reevaluate the project in light of uncertainties surrounding the difficult economic conditions at the time. In February 2009, the Tribe announced that the expansion would restart in April, but would be scaled back in several areas, including reducing the hotel from 23 floors to 15.

Placer County

The MOU between the County and the Tribe has been amended once, in July 2003, primarily to expand the level of fire and emergency services to the Casino property. The current agreement as amended includes the following:

- defraying all of the costs of adding five deputy positions and a patrol vehicle in the Sheriff's department
- building a fire station on the Casino's land and paying the County an amount to compensate for three-person staffing of the station 24 hours per day
- constructing or improving certain roads impacted by the Casino
- improving infrastructure for water and sewer services to be obtained from the City of Lincoln
- contributing to organizations dealing with problem gambling
- contributing to the newly-established Placer Legacy, a program created to protect open space in Placer County
- reimbursing the County and local districts for any revenue lost from the removal of the trust lands from tax rolls, including in lieu payments for property tax, sales tax and transient occupancy tax (commonly called the "hotel tax")
- making a commitment to adhere to the use of Uniform Building Codes for any structure constructed on the trust lands and to comply with County general and community plans.



Photo by Win Gredvig

The MOU allows for future amendments, provides for an annual inflation-based adjustment on many of the specified amounts, and allows for adjustment of compensation for actual costs incurred by the County.

During the fiscal year of July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, the Tribe paid the County approximately \$12 million as a direct result of the MOU. Over \$5.5 million was for ongoing services. This should approximate the amount that will be paid in the current fiscal year. Payments in future years can be expected to be higher still due to the in lieu hotel taxes that will be paid once the new hotel at the Casino begins operation. Here are the MOU-related payments made by the UAIC to the County in the 2007–2008 year:

<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Sheriff's Services	\$1,194,568
Fire/Emergency Services	1,348,080
Sales Tax In Lieu	400,448
Property Tax In Lieu	2,454,798
Placer Legacy Program (received 7/2/08)	<u>125,000</u>
Subtotal	\$5,522,894
Public Works Department (expansion project)	<u>6,527,935</u>
Total	\$12,050,829

In his written response to the Grand Jury, the County Executive Officer, Thomas Miller, said that in his judgment the costs to the County resulting from the Casino are being adequately mitigated. Mr. Miller stated the “financial impact of the Casino [on the County] has been mostly revenue neutral, with some areas trending positive. The Tribe pays for identified cost impacts per the MOU. The Tribe has also made various voluntary contributions to charitable causes in the County.” He also cited the positive impact that Casino customers have on local businesses. While the Casino’s expansion project could present some issues in the future, he said the County will monitor that project and adjust as needed.

Tribal County Advisory Committee

The County MOU calls for the establishment of a permanent nine-person Tribal County Advisory Committee. It is comprised of two representatives from the County Board of Supervisors, one from the Sheriff’s department, one from a community organization addressing the local impacts of gambling, and five representatives from the Tribe. The

Advisory Committee is designed to deal with questions related to implementation of the MOU and concerns about any matter within the scope of the agreement.

The Grand Jury determined that this committee meets only twice a year rather than quarterly as is called for by the MOU and appears to be casually managed with few significant issues discussed. This initially concerned the Jury. However, in practice, questions or issues dealing with subjects relating to the MOU have been dealt with routinely outside of this committee. Issues have not been saved for future meetings. This committee has served largely as a means of periodic formal communication between the Tribe and County about projects of mutual interest. Normally, no significant actions have been taken during committee meetings.

City of Lincoln

In July 2008, the City of Lincoln and the Tribe signed an agreement designed to mitigate costs to the City resulting from operations of the Casino, including specifically the expected costs resulting from the planned Casino expansion. Among other elements, the MOU calls for:

- improvements to water and sewer service for the Casino
- \$2 million as a contribution by the Tribe toward the cost of the Ferrari Ranch Road and Highway 65 interchange
- a contribution toward the cost of widening the Twelve Bridges interchange and bridge over Highway 65
- a contribution to the cost of widening Fiddymont Road
- annual payments for fire protection and law enforcement services
- annual contributions to City-sponsored youth recreational activities
- a contribution to the Western Placer Education Foundation Outdoor Learning Environmental Project for the education of youth regarding Native American culture
- annual contributions to the Lincoln library for the development and expansion of a Native American book collection
- an annual contribution to the City of Lincoln for economic development in the City.

The City of Lincoln has tracked certain law enforcement costs to the City linked to the Casino. Police incidents over a nearly two year period were documented along with the staff time required to investigate them, write reports, testify, etc. The City Manager of Lincoln, Jim Estep, acknowledges that not all costs have been identified or quantified. Still, he believes that the current MOU “provides for sufficient funding to the City to

cover all financial impacts on the community as a result of the Casino.” When the Casino expansion is completed and is put into use, the expansion may have a possible impact on local fire services. Other than that, the Lincoln City Manager anticipates no further issues relating to the Casino.

City of Roseville

The City of Roseville has no formal agreement with the Tribe. While the City has documented some Casino-related incidents handled by the police department and looked at statistical and anecdotal information, it has not quantified actual costs of the Casino to the City. The City Manager, Craig Robinson, believes that those costs exist. On the other hand, he said that the City has received three grants from the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund (see next page) that were intended to help mitigate costs to the police department. Mr. Robinson stated that the Casino has made two “generous” contributions to community agencies unrelated to any mitigation of Casino cost impacts. Mr. Robinson additionally testified that on balance, there has been no significant net impact to Roseville as a result of the Casino.

Discussions have begun between Roseville fire and police department staffs and Thunder Valley staff to begin the creation of a written agreement dealing with emergency response. These were prompted by the emergence of plans for expansion of the Casino. The intent is to provide for compensation in cases where Roseville personnel respond to an emergency at the Casino. The City Manager feels confident such an agreement can be worked out.

City of Rocklin

The City of Rocklin also has no agreement with the Tribe. The City Manager, Carlos Urrutia, stated, “the City of Rocklin has not tried to quantify the actual or potential service costs resulting from [the Casino]”. However, Mr. Urrutia stated that there has been a net increase in costs. He feels these would be difficult to quantify. Negotiations with the Tribe had been underway several years ago. When Rocklin opposed the Casino and joined in the lawsuit to prevent it, those negotiations ceased and have never been restarted. The City Manager was uncertain what the response would be from the Tribe if Rocklin were to seek a cost-mitigation agreement. However, Mr. Urrutia stated that the City enjoys a “cooperative relationship with the tribe and has not ruled out the possibility that, in the future, some sort of an agreement may be reached.”

Rocklin has received some grants from the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund (see next page) dealing with public safety. The Tribe has also provided money for improvements to public infrastructure that benefit the City, and has contributed money to charitable organizations not related to Casino cost mitigation.

Placer County Indian Gaming Local Community Benefit Committee

California Government Code Sections 12710–12718 calls for the creation of a seven-person Indian Gaming Local Community Benefit Committee (LCBC) in Placer County. It is currently comprised of two members of the Board of Supervisors; one person each from the cities of Lincoln, Rocklin and Roseville, and two representatives from the Tribe. The primary purpose of the LCBC is to establish and implement policies and procedures dealing with grants to be made from the State Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund.

Money in this fund is a percentage of gross revenues certain tribes earn from gaming operations. (These are tribes with which the State had entered into compacts in 1999.) The UAIC is not one of those tribes. Therefore, no money goes into this fund as a result of gaming in Placer County. However, all counties in the State in which Indian gaming is conducted may receive portions of the fund each year. The money allocated to counties from the fund (less an allowed 2% deduction by each county for administrative costs) is to be awarded by the LCBC in grants that will help mitigate the cost impacts of tribal gaming. Actual amounts available for grants vary from year to year.

The amounts of money available to the County through this fund can be significant. The first year Placer County had money available from the Fund to distribute for grants was 2004. Annual amounts beginning then were:

2004 \$332,426.40
2005 \$383,346.76
2006 \$765,127.93
2007 \$326,729.11
2008 Zero



For reasons that are unclear to the Grand Jury, but apparently are linked to chronic shortfalls in a different fund (the Indian Gaming Revenue Sharing Trust Fund) that takes priority over the Special Distribution Fund, no money was allocated for grants to be made in 2008. However, notification has been received that approximately \$290,000 will be available for Placer County in 2009. It is important to understand that the availability

of money for grants is not guaranteed each year. Recipients cannot count on this source as a remedy for Casino-related costs. Also, the state legislation creating the LCBC and the Special Distribution Fund contains a sunset clause (Section 12718) calling for it to expire on January 1, 2010. This could be extended, and has already been done at least once. This feature reinforces the lack of permanence of the grants.

In the fall of each year, the County receives a letter from the State Controller's office providing the amounts to be available for grants the following year. The Placer County LCBC normally receives grant applications in March and makes the final allocations by April or May. Grants are available only to local governmental agencies, not private organizations. Government Code Section 12715(g) defines the priorities for the receipt of grant money. The list begins with law enforcement, fire services, emergency medical services and environmental impacts. All grants must be for a purpose that mitigates in some way the impact of casino gaming. A report must be provided to the State by October 1 of each year giving high-level details of the grants that have been made by each county's committee.

The Jury examined reports of grant decisions made by the committee in 2007. Some examples of grants awarded in 2007 are:

- \$55,000 to the County Health and Human Services Children's System of Care program to help prevent addictive behaviors
- \$35,500 to the County Sheriff for a Stolen Property Tracking System
- \$100,000 to the City of Rocklin Police Department to help with start-up expenses relating to a regional Vehicle Theft Task Force
- \$35,000 to the Placer County District Attorney to help offset criminal prosecution expenses related to crimes from the Casino.

An audit is performed by the State every three years. The most recent audit was published in July 2007. Among other areas of focus, the audit evaluated the use of the grants and the processes in place in six counties for the 2006 grant awards. Placer County was selected to be one of the six. The audit found that "none of the six counties consistently used the grant funds solely for projects that mitigate the impacts of casinos." In Placer County, the audit determined that two grants totaling \$127,885 did not address a casino impact. The Grand Jury did not examine those grants or pursue the validity of those findings. However, in September 2008, the legislature approved AB

158 that added language to the Government Code saying that grants can be used only to mitigate impacts from casinos.

Once the October reports were made to the State, no further action was taken by the LCBC to verify that the money was spent as the committee intended. The LCBC had not set up a procedure to enable it to determine, for example, if an agency had spent only part of the grant money on an approved project and the rest elsewhere, or had not spent the grant on the project at all. The desirability of instituting such verification steps was brought up in at least two LCBC meetings, but no action was taken to put those into effect. The County contact for this committee confirmed that no such procedures exist.

Findings

1. The County and the City of Lincoln have worked proactively with the Tribe to create MOUs that mitigate costs to those governments resulting from the operation of the Casino.
2. While representatives of the cities of Rocklin and Roseville feel the cities are incurring some additional costs resulting from the Casino, they have not taken adequate steps to identify and quantify those costs in order to determine if any formal agreements with the Tribe would be appropriate.
3. The LCBC is serving the basic role called for by statute in awarding grants for Casino cost mitigation. The 2007 grants awarded appeared to be reasonable in type and amount for the purposes described. They all had a logical link to Casino cost mitigation and fit with the priorities described in the statute.
4. The LCBC is not performing a basic fiduciary responsibility in verifying that grant money is spent in the manner that was intended.

Recommendations

1. The cities of Rocklin and Roseville should regularly (e.g., annually) identify, document and quantify any adverse financial impacts the Casino has had on their government operations. Where appropriate, overtures should then be made to the Tribe to reach or modify agreements that would mitigate any of these actual costs.
2. Local government agencies that incur costs resulting from Casino operations should seek financial resources other than grants from the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund in order to help mitigate those costs. That fund should not be considered to be permanent or otherwise available each year.

3. The LCBC should immediately develop and implement procedures to ensure that recipients spend grant money only for intended purposes. At a minimum, this should include requiring statements and documentation from grantees at the end of the fiscal year supporting the appropriate use of the grant money. It might also include a requirement that such documentation be received and approved by the LCBC before any grant money is disbursed for each project.

Request for Responses

- Peter Hill, Mayor / #1- Due by September 1, 2009
City of Rocklin
3970 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677
- Gina Garbolino, Mayor/ #1 - Due by September 1, 2009
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678
- Thomas M. Miller, County Executive Officer / #3 - Due by October 1, 2009
County of Placer
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Copies Sent To

- Spencer Short, Mayor
City of Lincoln
600 Sixth Street
Lincoln, CA 95648
- Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

PLACER COUNTY AUBURN ANIMAL SHELTER



Photos by Win Gredvig

PLACER COUNTY AUBURN ANIMAL SHELTER

Summary

The Placer County Grand Jury conducted an inspection in November 2008 of the Placer County Animal Services Facility in Auburn. The facility, although old and somewhat deteriorated on the exterior, appeared to be adequate. The cages and animal enclosure areas were found to be small, but clean and well maintained with fresh water available. Volunteers and regular staff handle dogs on a frequent basis to maintain sociability of the animals.

Jurors concluded that the Placer County Animal Services Division is doing a satisfactory job considering the limitations of the facility.

Placer County is currently working with the cities of Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln with respect to planning, funding, design, construction and operation of a new animal shelter to serve South Placer County.

The demolition and replacement of the Auburn site, according to the current timeline, is scheduled to be completed by August 2013. However, this is contingent on the new South Placer facility being built and operational. The replacement of the Auburn Animal Shelter had been discussed in Grand Jury reports as early as 2001. It is the hope of this Grand Jury that the County and its partners adhere to the current timeline for the projects.

Background

The primary goal of the Animal Services Division, a unit of the County's Health and Human Services Department, is to serve the residents of the County through active animal care and control programs. The Animal Services Division operates the Auburn and Tahoe animal shelters. Having received complaints about the shelter condition and operation in Auburn, the Grand Jury investigated that facility.

Investigation Methods

The Grand Jury inspection of the Placer County Animal Services Facility in Auburn occurred on November 6, 2008. Accompanied by Program Manager Mike Winters, Jurors inspected the buildings and grounds that house the separate areas for dogs, cats, rabbits, and horses. Quarantine areas were also observed. Subsequent information was requested and received from Dr. Richard Burton, Health Officer/Health and Human Services Director, and from facilities management.

Facts

Placer County is currently in negotiations with the cities of Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln with respect to planning, funding, design, construction and operation of a new animal shelter to serve South Placer County. The site, yet to be determined, will be provided by the City of Roseville. The facility is to be constructed under a Memorandum of Understanding among the three cities and the County. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) is slated to operate the shelter.

The Auburn facility, built in 1973, is slated to be demolished and rebuilt at its current site beginning in the summer of 2012 after the South Placer shelter becomes operational. The current timeline for both projects was provided by Placer County and is attached to this report.

As early as 2001, in their response to that Grand Jury's findings, the Board of Supervisors and the County Executive Officer acknowledged the need for replacing the Auburn shelter. Since 2001, several Placer County Grand Juries have expressed concerns with the condition of the Auburn Animal Shelter Facility and have recommended its replacement. To date, little has been accomplished beyond the planning stage. However, a timeline has been created calling for the rebuilt Auburn shelter to be completed by August 2013.

During the inspection of the Auburn Shelter, Jurors observed that the exterior of the facility was in need of repair. Paint was peeling and the siding on the temporary office trailer had separated. Jurors also observed that the animal cage areas inside the facility were small.



Photos by Win Gredvig