

This report was Filed on April 15, 2002

**2001-2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY FINANCE
AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT**

**TRINITY COUNTY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND
RELATED ACCOUNTING MATTERS**

PURPOSE:

California grand juries are charged to act as the public's "watch-dog" by investigating and reporting upon the affairs of local government.

This report contains findings and recommendations resulting from the Grand Jury's follow up on the 2000-2001 Grand Jury's Report on Trinity County Financial Statements and Related Accounting Matters and responses by county officials to the recommendations of the 2000-2001 Grand Jury.

BACKGROUND:

The general-purpose financial statements for Trinity County are the responsibility of the County's management. As required by state law, those statements are audited each year by an independent auditor that has the responsibility to audit and express an opinion on those statements. The Trinity County financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2000, were audited by Bartig, Basler, and Ray, A Professional Corporation, hereinafter referred to as the Independent Auditor.

The 2000-2001 Grand Jury issued a final report on the Trinity County Financial Statements and Related Accounting Matters. The County Administrative Officer and the County Auditor/Controller filed responses. The 2001-2002 Grand Jury felt it would be advisable to follow up the prior Grand Jury's recommendations and the responses, which were turned in within two weeks of the 2000-2001 Grand Jury's year-end.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

The Grand Jury in its inquiry and investigation, read the general-purpose financial statements for Trinity County for the year ended June 30, 2000, and the County's correspondence with the Independent Auditor. The Grand Jury interviewed the County Auditor/Controller, the 2000-2001 Grand Jury chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee, and the partner in charge of the audit of the Trinity County Financial Statements from the Independent Auditor's office. The Grand Jury carefully reviewed the findings and recommendations of the 2000-2001 Grand Jury and the responses from county officials.

FINDING #1:

The Independent Auditor's Report is dated September 13, 2000. That report was not available to the public or the Grand Jury until April 2001. Since audits are normally dated on the last day of field-work done by the independent auditor, the audit was dated September 13, 2000. The delay until April was the time taken to write the report.

Both the Independent Auditor and the County Auditor/Controller have taken steps to expedite the audit for the year ending June 30, 2001. Language was included in the contract requiring a timely delivery of the audit and the Independent Auditor scheduled field work early in the year. A preliminary draft of the June 30, 2001, audit report (except for the cost report from the medical center) was delivered to the County Auditor/Controller on Dec. 4, 2001. The final audit report (which includes the hospital's conservative cost estimates) arrived from the Independent Auditor to the Audi-

tor/Controller's office on January 23, 2002.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

The Grand Jury commends and recommends that the Board of Supervisors commend the County Auditor/Controller for taking steps to expedite the audit.

FINDING #2:

The Independent Auditor's Report for the year ended June 30, 2000 is a qualified report. A qualified report is issued when there are qualifications (exceptions) to the Independent Auditor's opinion that the financial statements fairly present the financial position and results of operations of the County. The report contains the following statement:

"Because of the inadequacy of accounting records for fixed assets, we were unable to form an opinion regarding the amount at which the General Fixed Assets Account Group (stated at \$22,944,534), and fixed assets and accumulated depreciation in proprietary fund types (stated at \$5,944,728 and \$1,938,329, respectively), or the amount of depreciation expense (stated at \$382,363) are recorded in the accompanying financial statements as of and for the year ended June 30, 2000."

The Grand Jury has been informed that obtaining an unqualified independent auditor's report would require an additional auditing cost of \$8,000 per year, plus an undetermined amount of labor to improve the accounting records. While the County Auditor/Controller and the County Administrative Officer's responses indicate that the County's accounting records accurately reflect fixed assets and accumulated depreciation, the Grand Jury has been informed that the accounting records only cover equipment. They do not have detail to back up the financial statements' balances for land, buildings and their locations, cost, use, and dates of acquisition.

The County Auditor/Controller, County Board of Supervisors, and County Administrative Officer have indicated they felt the benefit of an unqualified audit report was not worth the \$8,000 required for including an audit of the fixed assets in the independent auditor's annual audit of the county's general purpose financial statements. The 2000-2001 Grand Jury recommended that the fixed assets be included in the audit performed by the independent auditors. The Grand Jury has been informed that the independent auditors have recommended for several years that the fixed assets be included in the audit.

While the Grand Jury understands that the County does not desire to expend more than needed on the audit, the same argument that the cost outweighs the benefit of the audit could be applied to all other areas of the audit. The balance in the fixed assets account group is material to the overall general-purpose financial statements. Auditing the fixed assets will enable the independent auditors to verify that the fixed assets as presented in the general purpose financial statements of the County, agree with the detailed records of fixed assets; that the fixed assets exist and are owned by the county; that they are not encumbered (or that such encumbrance is reflected in the general purpose financial statements); and that they are being used for the functions for which they were authorized.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

The Grand Jury recommends that the fixed assets be included in the audit for the year ending June 30, 2002, with the goal that there be an unqualified audit opinion from the Independent Auditor.

FINDING #3:

In the County Auditor/Controller's response to the fourth recommendation in the final report of the 2000-2001 Grand Jury, he indi-

cated that the “statements are produced by the Independent Auditor and the County cannot control what is in the notes.” However, the audit report states that the County, not the Independent Auditor, is responsible for the financial statements and their notes.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

The County is responsible for the general-purpose financial statements, and for the accompanying notes. The Grand Jury recommends the County take whatever steps are necessary to ensure the completeness and accuracy of the financial statements and notes. If, in the opinion of the County, there are amounts that need to be corrected or if further disclosure is required in the explanatory notes, we suggest that the County and its representatives discuss the issues with the Independent Auditor until resolved, so that the general purpose financial statements of the County clearly reflect the financial position of the County.

CONCLUSION:

The Grand Jury believes that audits are done for the citizens of Trinity County and that the citizens deserve an unqualified audit, which verifies that the financial statements fairly present the financial position and results of operations of the County.

RESPONSES REQUIRED

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period:

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPOND WITHIN
Trinity Co. Board of Supervisors	#1, #2	#1, #2	90 days
Trinity Co. Admin. Officer	#2	#2	60 days
Trinity Co. Auditor/Controller	#1, 2,3	#1,2,3	60 days

Responses

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: Brian Muir, Auditor-Controller -Performing the duties of County Administrative Officer

SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2001-02 Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee Trinity County Financial Statements and Related Accounting Matters Final Report

DATE: May 28, 2002

The Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee has requested a written response to their final report on the Trinity County Financial Statements and Related Accounting Matters. In my capacity as Auditor-Controller performing the duties of County Administrative Officer, my response is as follows:

Finding #1: 1 agree.

Response: I thank the Grand Jury for their compliment.

Recommendation #1: The recommendation has been implemented.

Finding #2: I disagree in part.

Response: The County’s accounting system and subsidiary records

do have detail to back up the financial statement balances for land and buildings. The current quote for audit of the fixed assets is \$20,000.

Recommendation #2: The recommendation will not be implemented. At their meeting on May 7, 2002, the Board of Supervisors voted not to engage our outside auditors to audit the general fixed asset account group.

Finding #3: 1 agree.

Response: The County is responsible for the notes.

Recommendation #3: The recommendation has been implemented. The County does review the financial statements and notes for completeness and accuracy, and we will resolve any inaccuracies with the outside auditor.

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: J.C. Erikson, Chairman Trinity County Board of Supervisors

DATE: July 16, 2002

SUBJECT: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee Final Report on the Trinity County Financial Statements and Related Accounting Matters

The Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee has requested a written response to their report Trinity County Financial Statements and Related Accounting Matters. The response of the Board of Supervisors is as follows:

Finding #1: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #1.

Recommendation #1: The recommendation is hereby implemented and the Trinity County Board of Supervisors commends the County Auditor/Controller for taking steps to expedite the audit.

Finding #2: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors disagrees with Finding #2. The Board does not believe that an independent appraiser could appraise all of the County’s real property for \$8,000.00.

Recommendation #2: The recommendation will not be implemented. There is no compelling reason for the Board to determine the present market value of county real estate. County property is adequately inventoried and supervised. To spend scarce county dollars having it assessed, or to spend scarce county dollars determining if the undepreciated remainder is accurate is senseless where there is no tax liability.

Finding #3: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #3.

Recommendation #3: The recommendation has been implemented. The County does review the financial statements and notes for completeness and accuracy, and we will resolve any inaccuracies with the outside auditor.

This report was Filed on May 6, 2002

2001-2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT

CITIZEN COMPLAINT REDISTRICTING

PURPOSE:

In its role in handling citizen complaints, the Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee investigated a citizen complaint raising questions and concerns about the process of redistricting of Supervisorial Districts following the 2000 Census.

The investigation is centered on two objectives. One, to see if the process of establishing the revised supervisorial district lines was done in accordance with the California State Election Code. Second is to determine the process for challenging reapportionment decisions so that the citizens of Trinity County will know what these two processes are in advance of the 2010 Census and subsequent reapportionment actions.

BACKGROUND:

Section 21500-21506 of the California State Elections Code covers Reapportionment of Supervisorial Districts. If redistricting must occur, it must be done by November in the year following the census. However, when California changed the date of its Primary Election from June to March, deadlines for completing a redistricting were changed from November to September to accommodate the final date for filing one's candidacy for election in that primary. The new date was September 28, 2001.

Redistricting is governed by the Elections Code. The primary criterion is population. Past challenges to redistricting that have received judgments have not only emphasized population, but have set precedents for very small margins of deviation in population from one district to the next.

Besides a strict adherence to populations, the California State Elections Code allows the County Board of Supervisors (BOS) to redistrict on bases other than the decennial federal census. In such a case, the BOS can cause a census of their own to be taken or they can use population estimates from the State.

The decisions to redistrict and to select the actual boundaries are that of the County Board of Supervisors.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

The Finance and Administration Committee interviewed the Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer and County Counsel. Additionally, the Committee examined relevant sections of the California State Elections Code, video tapes of the meetings of the Trinity County Board of Supervisors (not all tapes were available), and the August through September 2001 issues of the Trinity Journal.

FINDING #1:

This finding describes the process with time lines for enacting a redistricting ordinance and denotes the dates and events that occurred in Trinity County in 2001.

July 3, 2001 Board of Supervisors' Meeting.

The BOS Agenda for their regular meeting of July 3, 2001 included an item for the Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer to inform the BOS about the 2000 census, its impact on current apportionment, and to request the BOS to appoint a citizens committee to assist in a redistricting recommendation. The Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer indicated he had 3 applicants for such a committee and he wanted to have 7 members if possible. All agreed to work on the matter of

establishing a committee.

The Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer said he intended to put the Census Bureau information onto the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) maps. The BOS concurred.

August 7, 2001 Board of Supervisors' Meeting.

The BOS regular meeting agenda of August 7, 2001 introduced the Redistricting Plan. At this time the Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer reported that the County's timelines were much shorter than in past years due to the Primary election month changing from June to March. A memo from the California Secretary of State said that the reapportionment had to be completed 45 days prior to the deadline for filing candidacy for public office in the next election (which is the March 2002 primary). Therefore, the reapportionment ordinance would need to be in place by September 28, 2001. The Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer stated that the data from the Census would not be available until August 8, 2001.

He further outlined that the following schedule must be adhered to:

1. The ordinance must be in effect by September 28, 2001.
2. To be in effect, 30 days must elapse from the time the ordinance is adopted, which means the ordinance must be adopted by August 28, 2001; and the law requires that of such an ordinance must be at a regular (not a special) meeting of the BOS.
3. There must be 5 days between the introduction of the ordinance and its adoption.

The decision was made to continue the August 7, 2001 meeting to August 14, 2001 for introducing the ordinance.

August 14, 2001 Board of Supervisors' Meeting.

When the ordinance was introduced, the Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer provided the BOS and everyone attending the meeting, a display of the existing and proposed maps detailing the supervisorial district boundaries, copies of the legal descriptions of those boundaries, and copies of a written summary, "Trinity County Redistricting Plan."

The written summary, "Trinity County Redistricting Plan" hand-out, and the actual text of the ordinance which consists of the legal descriptions of the boundaries, differed from each other in their description of the boundary locations in the East Weaver Creek area of Weaverville. These differences led to inaccurate reporting in the Trinity Journal and a general misrepresentation of the boundary location in the East Weaver Creek area.

August 21, 2001, Board of Supervisors' Meeting.

The BOS Agenda for their regular meeting on August 21, 2001 listed the Redistricting Ordinance as an Action Item. The minutes of this meeting record the adoption of the ordinance as described by the legal description of boundaries.

The law requires that the BOS can either publish a summary of the ordinance within 15 days of enacting or publish the ordinance in its entirety within 30 days of enactment. The ordinance was published in its entirety within 30 days in the September 5, 2001 issue of the Trinity Journal.

A news article in the August 30, 2001 issue of the Trinity Journal, covering this decision, quoted the "Trinity County Redistricting Plan" rather than the legal description, which comprises the ordinance as adopted.

Not all tapes of the July and August BOS meetings were available to the Committee for viewing. The County Clerk's office did not

know where they were.

RECOMMENDATION #1 a:

The Grand Jury recommends establishing a citizen advisory committee to work with the Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer and the BOS to recommend any redistricting resulting from the 2010 census. The Grand Jury further recommends to the Board of Supervisors and the County Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer that there be instituted a realistic and effective means to remind the BOS of the time frames for this process so that it can start in 2010, rather than the last minute in 2011.

RECOMMENDATION #1b:

The Grand Jury recommends to the Board of Supervisors and the County Clerk that video tapes of the meetings of the BOS be filed and stored in such a way that is secure, allows for borrowing, and maintains their availability to the public for a minimum of 10 years.

RECOMMENDATION #1c:

It appears that the existing "rulings" on the interpretation of the redistricting codes applies to more densely urban areas. Therefore, the Grand Jury recommends to the Board of Supervisors that they join with other rural counties with low populations to work with their legislators and senators to adapt the interpretation of the existing State Elections Code to allow for use of the other four criteria listed in addition to population figures. These considerations are 1) topography; 2) geography; 3) cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory; and 4) community of interests of the districts.

FINDING #2:

This finding describes the process and timelines for public recourse to an enacted ordinance.

Means of recourse are required to be completed within 30 days of the adoption of the ordinance or they are considered invalid. With this redistricting ordinance, the 30-day deadline was September 21, 2001, for either of the following means of recourse:

1. Within 30 days of adoption, a citizen can claim that the new boundaries do not reflect real census and they can go to the Superior Court for action which forces the BOS to revisit the ordinance.
2. Within 30 days of adoption, ten percent (10%) of the voters can sign a referendum to the BOS to challenge their decision. This referendum is filed with the County Elections Department.

RECOMMENDATION #2a:

Since the time frames for recourse by citizens to the current redistricting have passed, the Grand Jury recommends that the BOS, on behalf of the citizens, energetically pursue Recommendation #1 e above, while the issue is still fresh in the minds of legislators.

RECOMMENDATION #2b:

The Grand Jury recommends that the BOS, on behalf of the citizens, educate citizens about the law that allows for recourse through another census or on the basis of population estimates prepared by the State Department of Finance or the county planning department or planning commission (Elections Code § 21503).

RESPONSES REQUIRED:

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period:

ENTITY FINDING RECOMMENDATION RESPOND

			WITHIN
Trinity County Board of Supervisors	1,2	1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b	90 days
County Elections Officer	1,2	1a, 2a, 2b	60 days
County Clerk	1	1b	60 days

Responses

To: John Letton, Judge Trinity County Superior Court
 From: Dero Forslund, Trinity County Clerk
 Date: June 17, 2002

Response Re: Citizens Complaint Redistricting. I am responding as the County Clerk and the County Elections Officer.

Recommendation #1 a: I concur with the recommendation. It was my recommendation to the board that such a committee be established for the 2000 census. I think should a committee would have helped with the 2001 redistricting. Unfortunately when we did advertise for a committee very few expressed an interest in serving. More advertising an a longer recruiting time should help with finding interested citizens to serve on such a committee. One issue that should not be over looked is the fact that the census data was not available until a few days before the County must start the ordinance process. This may not be the case in 2010 as there is much interest right now in moving the Primary election date to sometime later in the year, either back to June or maybe even August.

Recommendation #1b: We have already initiated the recommendation. All meetings are being video taped and stored in digital form. We are currently setting up methods for the public to view any portion of a Board meeting. We will be able to copy a portion of the meeting for interested parties and the library will have the most recent meeting available on video tape to borrowing.

Finding #2: I concur with the Grand Jury's description of the redistricting ordinance process.

Recommendation #2a: I concur with the recommendation. Similar legislation was passed by the California Legislature a few years ago, but it was vetoed by the Governor. There is sufficient interest in such legislation and maybe the timing would be better now.

Recommendation #2b: While I concur with the need of the citizens to know about the recourses available for redistricting, I am not sure of the best way to accomplish this. Perhaps an additional section in the copy of the Grand Jury report that is published and delivered to every household in the County would work.

To: John Letton, Judge Trinity County Superior Court
 From: Trinity County Board of Supervisors
 Date: August 6, 2002

Re: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Finance & Administration Committee Final Report, regarding Citizens Complaint of Redistricting of Supervisorial Districts following the 2000 Census.

The Board of Supervisors response to the Findings and Recommendations of the Grand Jury's report is as follows:

Findings # 1: Time lines for Redistricting

The Board of Supervisors concurs with all 3 of the findings from the committee regarding various time lines, inaccurate reporting by the Trinity Journal, and problems with tape recordings.

Recommendation #1a:

The recommendation will be implemented.

Recommendation #1h:

The recommendation has been implemented.

Recommendation #1c: The recommendation will be implemented.

Findings # 2:

The Board of Supervisors concurs with finding #2.

Recommendation #2a:

The recommendation will be implemented. Some members of the Board have successfully and energetically pursued their peers to Implement Suggestions in Recommendation # 1 c.

Recommendation #2b:

The recommendation will be implemented.

Conclusion:

There is still work to be done now, as well as in the future, with regards to the census. Several system changes have been made and we have adequate opportunity to implement further changes towards the reapportionment challenges and the decisions that effect our region and the citizens of Trinity County.

We would like to thank the Grand Jury and members of the Finance & Administration Committee for the hard work they put forward on this matter. Thank You for the opportunity to provide a response.

This report Filed on May 2, 2002

**2001-2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY
FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT
MARCH 5, 2002 ELECTION SPECIAL
INVESTIGATION**

PURPOSE:

California grand juries are charged to act as the public's "watchdog" by investigating and reporting upon the affairs of local government.

This report contains findings and recommendations resulting from the Grand Jury's investigation of the effects of redistricting on the March 5, 2002 ballots and related election matters.

BACKGROUND:

Members of the 2001-2002 Grand Jury whose district changed with the County's recent redistricting received ballots for their prior district at the March 5, 2002 election. Some spotted the error in time for the correction to be made prior to Election Day; some did not. Because of their experiences with incorrect ballots, the Finance and Administration Committee investigated the issue to determine the extent of the errors and what has been done to mitigate them.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

Members of the Grand Jury asked Mr. Dero Forslund, Trinity County Elections Officer, two main questions: 1) How many voters received ballots for districts to which they are no longer assigned (by district); and 2) how, and by when, will the situation be corrected?

FINDING #1:

Analysis of the voter rolls by the county Elections Officer produced the following information: six voters in the East Weaver Creek Road area received ballots for District 4 when they should have voted in District 1. Supervisors in both districts were up for reelection.

In the Oregon Mountain area, 16 voters received District 4 ballots, even though they are located in District 2. The District 2 supervisor was not up for reelection this year. Of these 16 voters, seven are located on Trinco Road and nine are located on or near Oregon Street.

In the two Weaverville precincts, precincts 1 and 2, ten voters in Precinct I and eight voters in Precinct 2 (a total of 18 voters) had addresses that may in fact not be in those precincts - that is, they are incorrectly located on the precinct rosters.

In the above situations, only a portion of a precinct and district were redistricted to a new precinct and district. In the Salyer, Burnt Ranch, and Buckhom areas, these precincts were moved, in their entirety to new districts, and the ballots were all correct. The Wildwood area was redistricted in the same manner as the East Weaver, Oregon Mountain, and Weaverville I and 2 areas. However, the Wildwood voters were not voting for a supervisor, so the accuracy of their supervisorial district was not required for this election. These have not yet been analyzed.

The County Elections Office is using this relatively slow time (vis a vis elections) to correct each of the identified cases, expecting to complete this work in a month's time. Much of their success in meeting this time line depends on cooperation from the Planning Department, which is the only department that has the names of private streets and roads (and driveways).

Though this investigation began in order to find out how many voters' ballots were incorrectly located in the supervisorial districts

redistricting, it has also uncovered other voters who are not assigned to the correct district in the first place. As a result of these findings, the department is planning changes to the voter registration and re-registration process that will assist the department place voters in the correct precinct. In most places, a person's address is sufficient to place them accurately in their districts. However, Trinity County does not have an address system. Therefore, the information that is vital to accuracy is the Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) where the voter lives. In the case of renters, the owner's name will assist in locating the APN.

The Elections Office workers in the polling places have been a great help in discovering erroneous precinct assignments; and they will continue to be an important link between the Elections Office and registered voters. Errors discovered at the polling places, in conjunction with continued efforts by the Elections Office to accurately locate registered voters, will result in a more accurate reflection of voter distribution in Trinity County.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

The Grand Jury commends the County Elections Office for their continuing efforts to provide the most accurate voter registration rolls possible under less than ideal circumstances. To this end, the Grand Jury recommends to the Board of Supervisors and the County Clerk/Recorder/Elections Officer that this department continue to pursue and gather accurate information on the physical location of all registered voters so that they will receive correct ballots and polling place information for upcoming elections.

RESPONSES REQUIRED:

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period:

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPOND WITHIN
Trinity Co. Board of Supervisors	#1	#1	90 days
Trinity Co. Elections Officer	#1	#1	60 days
County Planning Director	#1	#1	60 days

Responses

To: John Letton, Trinity County Superior Court Judge
From: Dero Forslund, Trinity County Clerk and Ex Officio Registrar of Voters
Date: June 17, 2002

In response to the Grand Jury Investigation on problems with the precincts assigned to voters in Trinity County I offer the following.

Finding # 1. I concur with the finding. While the numbers are small, the fact that anyone may be voting in the wrong precinct is not something that we should be content with. We have noticed over the years that the addresses we are given by registered voters are not consistent and frequently not sufficiently accurate to determine the proper location of the voters' residence. We have worked over the years to help move the Trinity County addressing project forward and believe that we will continue to encounter problems with residence locations until an addressing system is in place.

Recommendation # 1. I concur with the recommendation. The office and I will continue to work with the various County offices involved to help complete the Addressing system. In addition we will review the addresses and locations given to us by the registered voters. In cases where the residence location is not sufficient to locate the precinct the voter resides in we will investigate property ownership records and in some cases contact the voter to better determine the residence location. We will have to continue these efforts until the County addressing system is in place and verified address have been assigned to all residences of the County.

Honorable John K. Letton
Superior Court P.O. Box 1258
Weaverville, CA 96093

June 19, 2002

SUBJECT: 2001/2002 Grand Jury Finance & Administration Committee Final Report re: "March 5, 2002 Election Special Investigation".

Dear Judge Letton:

My response to the findings and recommendations of the above referenced Grand Jury Report is as follows:

Finding #1:

The only statement pertaining to the Planning Department in this finding is the following: "Much of their success in meeting this time line depends on cooperation from the Planning Department, which is the only department that has the names of private streets and roads (and driveways)." This is not a correct statement. The mapping information on the county's GIS system is available to all departments through the intranet connection. However, it appears from the examples given that addressing had little if anything to do with the ballot mail-out. The elections office is better qualified to address the other issues raised in the report.

Recommendation #1:

I agree that the elections office performed admirably considering the time constraints between the release of census information, re-districting and the time lines required for mailing out ballots.

Sincerely,

John Alan Jelcich, Planning Director

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: J.C. Erikson, Chairman Trinity County Board of Supervisors

DATE: July 16, 2002

SUBJECT: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee Final Report on March 5, 2002 Election Special Investigation

The Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee has requested a written response to their Final Report on the March 5, 2002 Election Special Investigation. The response of the Board of Supervisors is as follows:

Finding #1: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #1.

Recommendation #1: The recommendation will be implemented and the Board will continue to urge the County Elections Office to

pursue and gather accurate information on the physical location of all registered voters so that they will receive correct ballots and polling place information for upcoming elections.

Conclusion: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors would also join the County Planning Director in praising the Elections Department in their quick adjustment to changes in supervisory district boundaries based on new census information.

This report was Filed on March 1, 2002

2001-2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

CITIZEN COMPLAINT TRINITY COUNTY HOUSING REHABILITATION DEPARTMENT

PURPOSE:

The Trinity County Grand Jury is empowered to investigate all complaints received from citizens of Trinity County.

BACKGROUND:

The Grand Jury received a complaint, with documentation, against Pat Mortensen, Director of the County Housing Rehabilitation department. It stated that the Housing Rehabilitation Program closed one of its loans while legal action was still pending between the contractor and the homeowner.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

The Finance and Administration Committee decided to ascertain the legality of closing a Housing Rehabilitation loan account when a civil action is pending. Members of the committee interviewed Ms. Mortensen, Grants Department Administrator, and David Hammer, County Counsel.

FINDING #1:

County Counsel advised the Committee that a loan may indeed be closed even though a civil action is pending between the homeowner and the contractor. In these housing rehabilitation projects, the County is acting as a bank. Any dispute on defects after the work is completed is a civil matter and separate from the "banking" relationship.

RECOMMENDATION:

None.

CONCLUSION:

It is the Grand Jury's judgment that the Grants Office was acting in accordance with established policy, and that there is value for Trinity County citizens to know the relationship of loan repayment and any civil actions pending on housing rehabilitation projects.

RESPONSES REQUIRED

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period:

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPOND WITHIN
Grants Department Administrator	#1	n/a	60 days
Trinity Co. Board of Supervisors	#1	n/a	90 days

Responses

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: Patricia Mortensen, Grants Administrator

SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2001-2002

Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee, Final Report, Citizen Complaint for Trinity County Housing Rehabilitation Department

DATE: February 27, 2002

The Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee has requested a written response to their final report on the citizen complaint for the Trinity County Housing Rehabilitation Department. In my capacity as Grants Administrator my response is as follows:

Finding #1: I agree.

Recommendation: There is no recommendation by the Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee.

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: J.C. Erikson, Chairman Trinity County Board of Supervisors

DATE: April 8, 2002

The Grand Jury Special Investigation Committee has requested a written response to their Final Report on the Citizen Complaint for the Trinity County Housing Rehabilitation Department. The response of the Board of Supervisors is as follows:

Finding #1: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.

Recommendation: There is no recommendation by the Grand Jury Finance and Administration Committee.

This report Filed on May 6, 2002.

2001-2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT

TRINITY COUNTY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT

PURPOSE:

The Grand Jury investigates, as it deems appropriate, citizen complaints received regarding the operation of Trinity County departments. This investigation began as a result of the Grand Jury's inquiry into numerous citizens' complaints against the Trinity County Behavioral Health Services Department (TCBHS). However, given that these complaints were quite broad in scope, and given that the Grand Jury had not conducted a departmental review of TCBHS in several years, the Grand Jury elected to review and report on the TCBHS Department. Our investigation focused on the mental health elements, administration, quality assurance, and management. The Alcohol and Other Drugs Services (AODS) functions were not included in this review. This report contains extensive background information pertinent to our inquiry, and our findings, recommendations and conclusions concerning this department.

BACKGROUND:

A mental health pilot project was initiated in the late 1960s and has since evolved into a fullfledged, multi-services (mental health, drugs and alcohol) County department today. Initially the County Hospital administrator D. Gerherdson acted as the director, followed by M. Polka, MD ('75), R. Zadra; MD ('76-'79), C. Bethke, RN ('79-'93), and D. Williams, Ph.D. ('93'98). The department was known as the Trinity County Counseling Center (TCCC) and operated with a collegial atmosphere that emphasized long term personalized care for the clients while minimizing paperwork. The staff morale was high and the employee turnover rate was low.

In 1998, Trinity County's Board of Supervisors signed a new contract with the California Department of Mental Health, and renamed the department - Trinity County Behavioral Health Services (TCBHS). The mental health directorship changed hands several times as the County searched for a new full-time licensed director. In July 1999, Trinity County contracted with the Kings View Corporation to provide both an experienced licensed executive director and computerized information management services to the TCBHS Department. This contract clearly states that the County desired this service for reasons of clinical efficacy and cost efficiency, and to be in full compliance with all applicable State regulations.

Under this contract, the Kings View information management services shall include:

1. A computerized management system capable of tracking client appointments, client scheduling, staff time, productivity, and client services;
2. An accounts receivable system capable of billing Medi-Cal, handling UMDAP client accounts, and billing other-third party sources;
3. Accounting reports, including information on cash collections deposited into County accounts;
4. Statistical information needed for cost reporting and CSI and CADDs reporting;
5. An annual cost report, assistance with State and County budgets, the Medi-Cal reconciliation, and calculation of rollover amounts.

Also, during the initial three-month period, Kings View was to provide training for the TCBHS staff on the newly implemented information management system, the current statutory regulations and State requirements, as well as orientation to the Kings View operational style, policies, and procedures.

Concurrently during the late 1990s, the State Medi-Cal program transformed the mental health delivery system into a managed care plan, in which statewide medical necessity criteria are used to determine medical care eligibility. Given that the "small" counties had smaller staffs and budgets with which to adjust to the new State guidelines, the State took an "easygoing" enforcement approach for several transitional years. However, the County mental health department continued to operate as it had in the past, with no proactive plan to achieve compliance with the new State mandates. As stated by previous department directors, the State auditors occasionally "slapped our hands" for infractions, but did not strictly enforce the statutory regulations during that transitional period.

The intent of the Kings View service contract was that cost efficient, updated data management and accounting systems would allow TCBHS to become fully compliant with the formidable State regulations and standards. It was hoped that the increased administrative efficiency of the Kings View system would relieve the staff clinicians from some of their administrative burdens in order to augment their professional service with their respective clients. However, during this transitional phase, the TCBHS personnel had to cope with two major changes simultaneously; convert to a fully compliant managed care system, while implementing a new Kings View management system. With this transformation, the number of processed clients has increased, while the quality of client service has declined. The employee turnover rate has increased as well.

The State requires that the County Board of Supervisors establish a mental health board, and appoint its members. The official title is Trinity County Behavioral Health Services Advisory Board, changed in 1998 to coincide with the change in the County department name. The Advisory Board currently consists of seven members. The members are to have experience and knowledge of the mental health system, and are to be apportioned among:

1. Consumers who are or have received mental health services;
2. Family member of consumers or past consumers (as in #1 above);
3. County citizens at large;
4. One County Board of Supervisors member.

The members serve a three-year appointment, with the terms staggered such that approximately one-third of the terms expire each year. As mandated by the State, the purpose of this board is to:

1. Review and evaluate the County's mental health needs, services, facilities, and any special problems;
2. Review any County agreements involving the mental health system;
3. Review and approve the procedures used to ensure and professional involvement at all stages of the planning process;
4. Review and make recommendations on applicants for the appointment of the mental health director;
5. Review and comment on the County's performance outcome data and communicate its finding to the California Mental Health Planning Council;

6. Submit an annual report to the County Board of Supervisors on the needs and performance of the County's mental health system.

Funding for TCBHS is obtained primarily through a variety of State and Federal programs and grants, with only about \$5,000 derived from matching County funds. According to the County Auditor/Controller, the bulk of these funds (approximately \$500,000 per year) are derived from State "realignment funds"; i.e., funds that originated in the County from such sources as State sales tax, DMV registration fees, etc., and a portion of which the State returns to the County earmarked for specific expenditures. The Federal Medicare program, via MediCal, also provides reimbursements of approximately 50 cents on the dollar expended per Medi-Cal client. This results in roughly \$300,000 annually, depending on the number of clients and permissible expenses. The Kings View contract fee for services is \$142,000 per year, including the salary for the Executive Director.

With the exception of the Executive Director, who is a Kings View employee, the TCBHS staff consists of County employees. By State law, the County must provide a Mental Health Director to represent the Board of Supervisors. The Mental Health Director represents Trinity County to the State, oversees the long-range operation of the Department, including the Kings View component, and insures that County personnel policies are followed. The Executive Director fulfills the State medical licensing requirements, provides technical guidance, oversees the day to day operation of the Department, and provides the liaison with the Kings View Corporation. The TCBHS Department employs between 35 and 40 people, and is organized into four sections: Family/Youth Services (mental health), Adult Services (mental health), Alcohol and Other Drugs (ADDs), and Administration/Quality Improvement. There is also on staff a psychologist, psychiatrist, and Children's System Care Coordinator. TCBHS serves approximately 200 clients per month. The average client load per clinician is about 20, whereas the average across the State is roughly 40. Also, nearly eighty percent of these clients are covered under Medi-Cal.

Currently, the Mental Health Director for the County is also the County Auditor and the interim County Administrative Officer (CAO). The County Auditor and CAO salaries are paid out of the County's general fund, but the Mental Health Director's position is wholly funded by State funds. Currently, the number of personnel within each respective department that he oversees determines the proportionate share of the salary split. Because of the size of TCBHS, he derives over 50 percent of his salary from the Mental Health Director position, while only about 30 percent of his time is devoted to that Department's duties.

Kings View has provided three directors in less than three years, though the first was an interim director that initially filled the position while Kings View recruited a permanent replacement. In the summer of 2001, the Executive Director was on leave for a period of time for surgery and rehabilitation. Since Kings View was unable at that time to provide a substitute, the County created a deputy director post to assume the leadership position while the Executive Director was absent. The Administration/Quality Improvement (QI) team leader was promoted to Deputy Director, while still retaining her previous titles and duties.

As noted earlier, the California Department of Mental Health monitors the operation of the County's mental health program for compliance with provisions of the State/County contract, and applicable Federal and State laws and regulations. In recent years, several State inspections have found TCBHS out of compliance with statutory requirements, and have requested corrective action be taken. In the most recent audit by the State Medi-Cal Oversight Review Team (January 2002), the results were so deficient that the

Deputy Director/Administration/QI team leader was terminated. The draft finding from the State's review showed a total of 64 "not in compliance" notations against a total of nearly 220 items and sub-items. A large number of these deficiencies were under the category of "Quality Improvement Program Activities." The review also noted that TCBHS is operating without an approved Implementation Plan, without an approved Cultural Competence Plan, without an approved Medi-Cal managed care plan, and without a current annual quality improvement work plan.

Concurrent with the writing and publishing of this report, the California Department of Mental Health is overseeing corrective actions within TCBHS to resolve these compliance and quality improvement concerns.

METHODS OF INVESTIGATION:

The Grand Jury in its inquiry and investigation interviewed the complainants, a member of the TCBHS Advisory Board, the County Mental Health Director, the TCBHS Executive Director and interim QI Coordinator, and a number of TCBHS clinicians, mental health specialists, and administrative staff members.

GENERAL FINDING:

The following findings are derived from line staff interviews, and are sufficiently general in nature and applicability to several recommendations and conclusions that they have been set aside in this section, rather than repeated throughout this report. These findings are the threads that are woven throughout the fabric of this report.

The staff employees have provided the Grand Jury with a litany of quality assurance and compliance issues. They state that they had previously brought these issues to the attention of TCBHS management, but most of the issues have yet to be corrected or reconciled. This list includes, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Non-compliant client medical charts can and have caused reimbursements to be disallowed by the State.
2. Non-compliant service code changes to client charts have occurred that could lead to double billing (to both Medi-Cal and CalWORKs).
3. Billings not submitted on schedule, either because of malfunctioning computer systems or administrative negligence, have resulted in lost reimbursements to the County involving tens of thousands of dollars.
4. An unreliable email system, which was not operational for many months, has interfered with effective communication and coordination.
5. Only minimal training has been provided in the implementation of the mandated managed care system, of Kings View operations, and current procedures and policies to implement the training. All have contributed to the compliance difficulties.
6. Extremely long client waiting periods have materialized in recent years. Many clients wait for service over 30 days, some exceeding 60 days. During our second meeting with the Executive Director (February 2002), he stated he was working diligently to eliminate any waiting over 30 days, and had already reduced the total number on the waiting list.
7. The employees complained of the very low morale and unhappiness that exists within the Department.

FINDING #1:

There is a serious morale problem in the TCBHS Department. Neither of the two directors seems to recognize the degree to which morale has sunk, nor its deleterious effect on the Department, while both directors seem confused as to the underlying causes when asked about it.

Interviews with a number of staff members singled out the Deputy Director as a major contributor to low morale. While most acknowledged her technical abilities and competence, there was almost uniform criticism of her derisive and autocratic management style and arrogant treatment of employees. She was recently terminated because of the large number of quality assurance deficiencies associated with the January audit.

The TCBHS progression from a smaller, less bureaucratic department to a larger, managedcare department has been both difficult and trying for the employees. The transition to the Kings View information management system, compounded by system downtime and inadequate training, has also contributed to the frustration level.

Long term clinicians have found themselves, both morally and professionally, and in varying degrees, in conflict with the "managed care" medical delivery system. This has contributed to their personal turmoil and a sense of hopelessness and frustration. "Old-timer" inertia against change has also added fuel to the general angst.

Repeated director changes (five in the last 4 years), together with a high employee turnover rate within the department, has destroyed continuity within the organization and contributed to an unstable, insecure atmosphere.

A severe rift is developing between management and the line staff. When the staff reports irregularities or discrepancies to management, there normally is no follow-through or resolution. In some instances management has retaliated with intimidation and job re-assignments. So the problems continue to escalate, the staff frustration increases, and the turnover rate grows. There is also a sense within the line staff that management ranks are growing while demanding more from the rank and file.

The Grand Jury finds that many TCBHS employees are infected with low morale. As noted above, the causes of this infection may be many, though the effects may vary by degree and with the individual. If these fundamental causes are ignored, the situation will continue to fester and grow. The termination of the Deputy Director has eliminated one major contributor, but the remaining underlying causes of the low morale are still untreated by management.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

A. The Grand Jury recommends that the Mental Health Director require the Executive Director to develop an action plan setting forth the steps he intends to take to create a work environment where communication between management and rank and file is open and candid. He should also require the Executive Director to create an action plan for improving the leadership and team building skills of the management staff. Each action plan should be specific and include action steps and appropriate time lines for completion. Methods to be used for measuring and evaluating the success of the action plans should be clearly identified.

B. The Grand Jury recommends that the Deputy Director's position be eliminated to encourage direct communication between the directors and staff employees. The Department is not so large as to require extraneous layers of management.

C. The Grand Jury recommends that the Quality Improvement Coordinator position be filled, with an emphasis on achieving compliance with State regulations and providing quality medical service to the community.

FINDING #2:

Under the initial contract, the County paid Kings View an additional \$12,000 for training and setup services. Kings View training of County employees has been at best inadequate. At 21/2 years into the contract's 3-year initial term, no training manuals have been made available. The Grand Jury finds that inadequate training, and the lack of implementation of that training through applicable policies and procedures, is an underlying cause of the numerous compliance issues.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

A. The Grand Jury recommends that the Mental Health Director require the Executive Director to develop a training plan setting forth the steps he intends to take to ensure that each employee is thoroughly knowledgeable of current statutory requirements as they pertain to their individual duties, as well as a comprehensive orientation of the Kings View information management system. He should also require the Executive Director to create an action plan for implementing the training. This action plan should be specific and include steps and appropriate time lines for completion. Methods to be used for measuring and evaluating the success of the action plans should be clearly identified. Providing training manuals should be a part of the action plan.

B. The Grand Jury recommends that the County Mental Health Director review the original contractual obligations with regards to Kings View training performance.

FINDING #3:

The TCBHS staff occupies office space at several locations around Weaverville. The former General Services building at the edge of the airport was recently renovated and accommodates the TCBHS ADDS functions and Adult Services clinicians, along with other County entities. However the walls at this facility are not sufficiently soundproofed to provide the necessary audio suppression during confidential client sessions. The same problem also exists at the Hayfork clinic, as was noted in a State On-Site Review in July 2001.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

The Grand Jury believes that client confidentiality must remain a high priority within TCBHS, and recommends that the County Mental Health Director provide appropriate facilities. Either the airport facility needs to be upgraded to meet the soundproofing standards, or the TCBHS staff should be relocated to a facility that is in accordance with established standards. The same holds true at all remote facilities or clinics.

The Grand Jury is aware of the recent Airport Road facility modifications by the General Services Department to correct the deficiency, and though improved, the soundproofing is still inadequate. The situation at the Hayfork clinic will require active leadership, coordination, and cooperation among several County departments, as well as several Hayfork entities, to reconcile the interrelated issues necessary to correct this compliance problem. Since this is a TCBHS problem, the Grand Jury recommends that the County Mental Health Director take the active lead role in initiating the process, insuring the process is proceeding in a timely manner, and that the results rectify the problem.

FINDING #4:

As noted in item 3 of the General Finding section, the computerized information management/accounting system has frequently failed. These malfunctions can, and have caused tardy or incomplete billing, resulting in reduced State reimbursements. Also, the lack of a reliable email system has hindered communications within

the department, as well as with external organizations (other County organizations, Kings View, State, etc.)

RECOMMENDATION #4:

A. The Grand Jury recommends that the Mental Health Director require the Executive Director insure that the computerized system Kings View implemented meets or exceeds industry standards for downtime. In addition, the Mental Health Director should require the Executive Director to develop a backup procedure or system to insure that billing information and data are transferred within the State-mandated schedules to avoid any further loss of revenue to the County.

B. The Mental Health Director should communicate with other counties that have service contracts with Kings View to ascertain their experience regarding system failures and if their system failures correlate with those at TCBHS. When persistent problems such as these occur, and in order to provide proper oversight, the Mental Health Director should seek substantiation as to the underlying cause and corrective actions taken.

FINDING #5:

The Grand Jury received allegations that the Kings View information system failed for a period of four to six months. We also received allegations that numerous Medi-Cal billings were never submitted, and that the total Medi-Cal reimbursement losses may have exceeded \$100,000. Both the Mental Health Director and the Executive Director indicated during interviews that some funds may have been lost due to errors or late billing, but the amounts were insignificant in their eyes, and certainly not of this magnitude.

Given what the Kings View information management service is to provide contractually (refer to the Background section), and in an attempt to shed some light on these allegations, the Grand Jury initiated a test of the current information system. We requested financial information for fiscal year (FY) 2000-01 and FY 2001-02 to date, broken down by month, and including total revenue, Medi-Cal billings, and Medi-Cal reimbursements. We also requested, over the same time periods, and by month, the total numbers of clients, and the Medi-Cal client subset. During the same visit, the Grand Jury also requested copies of all State reviews, inspections, and audits involving TCBHS, from January 2001 to date. We also requested copies of the current State/County mental health provider contract, including any memoranda of understanding (MOU), addenda, or any other documents that modify the initial contract.

The Grand Jury did not obtain this information the day it was requested, nor on the following workday when Grand Jury members returned. It was two weeks later before we obtained the bulk of the material requested. The Grand Jury notes that industry standards normally require audit information be made available by the end of the workday on which it is requested.

The Grand Jury did eventually receive the monthly Medi-Cal billings and reimbursements for FY 1999-00, 2000-01, and 2001-02 through December. Given the Medicare/Medi-Cal reimbursement rate of 51.25 percent and the amounts billed and received, one can determine the potential “fully compliant” reimbursements, assuming no disallowance by the State, and consequently the revenue forfeited by the County for a lack of compliance. The following table illustrates these results, in which the numbers on the top two rows were provided by TCBHS, while those figures on the lower three rows were derived by the Grand Jury.

	FY 1999-2000	FY 2000-2001	FY 2001- Dec.
Amount Billed	\$600,700.	\$805,856.	\$430,620.

Amount Received	\$215,503.	\$307,384.	\$184,958.
Fully Compliant Reimbursement	\$307,859.	\$413,001.	\$220,693.
Forfeited Revenue Reimbursement	\$92,356.	\$105,617.	\$35,735.
	70%	74%	84%

Achievement Rate

Keep in mind that the “forfeited revenue” figures are the difference between the “fully compliant reimbursement” (assuming full compliance with Federal and State requirements, resulting in no Medicare/Medi-Cal disallowance) and the actual “amount received” by the County. The “reimbursement achievement rate” is simply the ratio of actual reimbursements “amounts received”) to the “fully compliant reimbursements”, and illustrates management’s effectiveness. While the Grand Jury realizes that, as a practical matter, achieving 100 percent compliance is highly unlikely, we believe management’s goal should be reimbursement achievement rates of over 95 percent. Although the recent trend is in the right direction, management still has much to rectify.

While the loss of potential revenue is staggering and adds credence to the original allegations, it does not constitute proof as to the remaining allegations. For example, it does not address the assertion that a significant number of billings were not submitted that would add significantly to reimbursement to the County. Because the Grand Jury could not either validate or dismiss all of the allegations, and because the Grand Jury lacks the resources necessary to conduct thorough financial and management audits, the Grand Jury finds that such audits should be performed to identify and correct any related problems.

When the Grand Jury reviewed the State/County contract, we noted under Exhibit B - Payments Provisions, section 4 - Amounts Payable, that the State was to pay TCBHS an allocation amount of \$126,096 for FY 2001-02. We had not received any documentation that modified this allotment, nor assigned it to another source. Since we had not been provided this figure during our interviews with the directors, we asked the Executive Director to explain this omission. Initially, he was unable to explain it, and wanted a copy (in effect, a copy of a copy originally obtained from TCBHS). Several days later the Executive Director stated he believed this funding was a portion of the realignment funds listed in the County budget associated with Medi-Cal managed care reconciliation. The Grand Jury queried the State contract representative from the Department of Mental Health, and he informed us the allocation was direct funding for the contract. Consequently the Grand Jury is still uncertain as to the real funding source and any restrictions associated with this revenue, and just where it resides in the funding explanations provided to us for the Background section. Examples such as these tend to erode the Grand Jury’s confidence in the Department’s management.

In summary, the Grand Jury finds that the Kings View information management system, as implemented at TCBHS, does not measure up to industry accounting standards. The Grand Jury believes that the type of fiscal information we requested should already have been available as printed monthly reports, but at the very least, should have been readily available from the computerized information system. The Grand Jury also finds that any prudent department manager should have had accounting reports provided monthly (as noted above) in order to verify and oversee the client information and costs being reported to the State, and for comparison with the reimbursements returned from the State. Any disallowance should have been a flag to management indicating a problem that required inquiry and solution, in order to maximize revenue return. A management information system can be a superb tool for manag-

ers to properly execute their managerial duties and responsibilities, but only if properly utilized.

As stated in the opening paragraph of this Finding #5, both the Mental Health Director and the Executive Director indicated during interviews that some funds might have been lost due to errors or late billing, but the amounts were insignificant in their eyes. This Grand Jury finds that the funds lost due to management negligence are not insignificant in our eyes, and believes that further investigations are warranted.

RECOMMENDATION #5:

The Grand Jury strongly recommends that the Board of Supervisors initiate independent fiscal and management audits of the TCBHS for FY 2000-01 and 2001-02. Given that the County Auditor is also the Mental Health Director, and to avoid any appearance of impropriety, the prudent course of action would be for an outside entity such as the State or a professional auditing firm to conduct these audits.

FINDING #6:

Given the numerous problems that have arisen in the Department during the transition to contract services with Kings View, and managed care medical delivery service in general, including the compliance issues identified during the State audits, the Grand Jury finds that the leadership and oversight has not been commensurate with the task. We recognize that the Mental Health Director is also the County Auditor and the interim CAO, in addition to other duties that he has been assigned. Overall, he can only devote about 30 percent of his time overseeing the TCBHS Department operations.

RECOMMENDATION #6:

The Grand Jury strongly recommends that a full-time, fully accredited Mental Health Director be hired to provide the vital leadership and oversight this Department requires.

FINDING #7:

Throughout most of its history, a single director has headed the County mental health organization. Now, under the Kings View contract, the organization's management includes a Mental Health Director, an Executive Director, and a Deputy Director, in addition to the section/team leaders. As indicated in the background section and reported findings, both the Mental Health Director and Deputy Director hold other managerial appointments with separate respective duties. The Executive Director, a Kings View employee, resides outside of Trinity County. In addition, the team leaders (essentially first-line supervision) have reduced some of their clinical duties, thus either impacting client services, or adding to the burden of the remaining clinical staff.

The Grand Jury has found that the duties and responsibilities of the Mental Health Director and Executive Director are not well delineated and are inexorably intertwined. At times they overlap, at times they seem not to cover fully all the Department's requirements, and, above all, are confusing to both departmental employees and outside observers.

The Grand Jury finds that Kings View has not achieved the original contractual goal of clinical efficacy, cost efficiency, nor full compliance with State requirements. The Grand Jury finds that the post of Executive Director is extraneous, provided the Board of Supervisors accepts the previous recommendation for a full-time County Mental Health Director.

RECOMMENDATION #7:

A. The Grand Jury strongly recommends that the Board of Supervisors terminate the service contract with the Kings View Corpora-

tion at the earliest contractual opportunity.

B. The Grand Jury has also found a bureaucracy growing within the department, while concurrently, the quality of clinical services are deteriorating. Quality medical service to our community must remain a top priority. Consequently, the Grand Jury recommends that the TCBHS organizational structure be streamlined to maximize client services.

FINDING #8:

The number of compliance issues cited during the State Oversight Review in January dumbfounded the TCBHS Advisory Board. Though they meet monthly (some times more frequently) with the Executive Director, they were perplexed by the large number of deficiencies. The Mental Health Director is present at some of these meetings as well.

When the Grand Jury interviewed the TCBHS directors (separately), each downplayed any problem or issues we introduced, be they from citizens complaints, or issues we had uncovered during our investigation. The Advisory Board has apparently been satisfied by similar assurances.

The contract with Kings View states that the selection of the Executive Director shall be subject to the approval of the County. The Grand Jury assumes that the "approval of the County" involves review and advice from the Advisory Board. Yet the Advisory Board was simply informed about Kings View Executive Director appointments after the fact, and was not part of the process.

RECOMMENDATION #8:

A. The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors enact policies and procedures to ensure that the TCBHS Advisory Board can investigate and evaluate problems or issues within the TCBHS, in order to fulfill the Advisory Board's obligations to report and advise.

B. State statutes and regulations not only require that the County Board of Supervisors establish a mental health board, but consult with it on any County agreements involving mental health services, including service or consulting contracts, and director appointments. The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors and County Mental Health Director abide by these requirements in the future. The Grand Jury also recommends that out of courtesy the County consult with the TCBHS Advisory Board about any professional appointments within the TCBHS Department.

C. The Grand Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors give equal if not more credence to the TCBHS Advisory Board's advice than that of the Mental Health Director. The Advisory Board represents the community's opinion, and the members are serving unselfishly to obtain the best mental health care for the benefit of the County's citizenry.

D. The Grand Jury recommends that the County Mental Health Director attend all of the TCBHS Advisory Board meetings.

CONCLUSIONS:

After review of documents and assimilation of numerous interviews, it is the Grand Jury's conclusion that the TCBHS Department is experiencing significant morale problems, especially between management and rank and file employees. It is clear from the interviews with both management and rank and file employees that the transition from a smaller, less bureaucratic department to a larger, more bureaucratic managed care organization has been rocky and difficult for most of the employees. An atmosphere of distrust and fear has replaced the family atmosphere that existed before the transition, resulting in communication breakdowns and very low mo-

rale.

It is also the conclusion of the Grand Jury that the lack of leadership from management has exacerbated the situation, is totally unacceptable, and in the end, is manifestly detrimental to the entire Department. This has resulted in further erosion of trust and teamwork, and has made the transition to a managed care institution even more difficult and stressful than otherwise would have been the case. Part of the problem can be attributed to not having a full time director physically in and interacting daily with the department. Such a person is necessary to rapidly address developing issues, as well as employee concerns, smooth the transition, and furnish the leadership required during times of stressful change.

The Grand Jury concludes that management deficiencies have also contributed to many other unresolved problems; excessively long client waiting periods, compromised confidentiality during client sessions, continuing compliance issues, inadequate staff training, ineffective computer-based information systems, high disallowance rates of the Medi-Cal billings resulting in reduced reimbursements, to name just a few. The Grand Jury concludes that a comprehensive audit is required to fully identify and correct the management and fiscal problems within the TCBHS Department.

The Grand Jury concludes that the Board of Supervisors should hire a full-time, fully accredited Mental Health Director. With an accredited Mental Health Director, the Executive Director's position becomes unnecessary and should be eliminated. Also, given the numerous compliance issues, and the demonstrated ineffectiveness of the currently implemented information management system, the Grand Jury sees no benefit in continuing the Kings View service contract, and the contract should be terminated forthwith.

The Grand Jury also concludes that the TCBHS Advisory Board should involve themselves more actively in exploring complaints and operations within the department, rather than relying primarily on the information provided by the Department director. That also includes any services provided by the Kings View Corporation, should they be retained. In regards to mental health services, this Advisory Board should be the real watchdog for the community. And as the watchdog, the Board of Supervisors should ensure that the TCBHS Advisory Board has sufficient "teeth" to fully accomplish their obligations to the State and the County Board of Supervisors.

RESPONSES REQUIRED:

Under Penal Code 933 the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period:

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPOND WITHIN
Trinity County Board of Supervisors	1,3,5,6,7,8	IB,3,5,6,7A-B,8A-C	90 days
TCBHS Advisory Board	1,5,6,7,8	1B,5,6,7A-B,8A-D	90 days
County Mental Health Director	1,2,3,4,5 6,7,8	1A-C,2A-B,3,4A-B 5,6,7A-B,8A-D	60 days
TCBHS Executive Director	1,2,3,4,5 7,8	1A-C,2A,3,4A,5 7A-B,8A	60 days

Responses

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of

the Superior Court

FROM: Brian Muir, Director, Behavioral Health Services

SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2001-02 Grand Jury Health & Human Services Committee Trinity County Behavioral Health Services Department Final Report

DATE: June 12, 2002

The Grand Jury Health & Human Services Committee has requested a written response to their final report on the Trinity County Behavioral Health Services Department. In my capacity as Director of Behavioral Health Services, my response is as follows:

Finding #1: I disagree in part.

Response: Although there is low morale among a portion of the staff at Behavioral Health Services, the problem is much less severe than indicated in the finding. Rapid growth and the shift to managed care predictably created stress within the organization. Although management does not always do what the staff requests, I find that there is follow-through on reports of discrepancies or irregularities. I can find no instance where management has retaliated with intimidation or job reassignments. It would have been helpful had the Grand Jury interviewed the Department's middle management, the team leaders.

Recommendation #1A: The recommendation will be partially implemented. The Department will continue to promote open communication and team building. However, no formal plan is necessary other than the plan approved by the State.

Recommendation #1B: The recommendation has been implemented.

Recommendation #1C: The recommendation has been implemented. Since the County was unsuccessful in hiring a person to fill this specialized role, the Kings View contract was amended four months ago, and the contractor has provided a highly skilled professional to work with our clinical staff to meet the State mandates for records and quality improvement.

Finding #2: I disagree in part.

Response: Under the terms of the contract, during the first three months, Kings View provided training, set up, data conversion, and consulting services for a fee of \$12,000. Since that time Kings View has provided training on a regular basis. Training manuals for the management information system have been provided.

Recommendation #2A: The recommendation will be partially implemented. The Executive Director will plan for appropriate training on the Kings View MIS system as well as statutory requirements.

Recommendation #2B: The recommendation has been implemented, and I find that Kings View fully met its contractual obligations regarding training.

Finding #3: I agree

Response: The soundproofing at both the Airport Road and Hayfork facilities was inadequate, and we have been working to find a cost effective solution to the problem.

Recommendation #3: The recommendation has been implemented. A carpet type soundproofing material has been installed on the walls of the airport road facility, and the General Services Department has a contract in place to install similar material in Hayfork.

Finding #4: I agree that there were some problems with the management information and email systems.

Response: The problems were corrected by cooperative efforts of Kings View and County personnel over a year ago.

Recommendation #4A: This recommendation has been implemented. The Kings View management information system meets or exceeds industry standards for downtime and a backup system to access client and accounting information already exists.

Recommendation #4B: This recommendation has been implemented. Other Kings View counties have not experienced an abnormally high system failure rate. The Mental Health Director will continue to evaluate causes and corrective actions regarding persistent system problems.

Finding #5: I disagree.

Response: There are no facts to support the allegations that the Kings View system failed for four to six months. It would be helpful if the Grand Jury investigated allegations to determine if they are accurate prior to publishing them.

The reimbursement information computed by the Grand Jury is incorrect. For example, it indicates a denial rate of 16% for the first six months of fiscal year 2001/2002. In fact, State Department of Mental Health information for the period from July 1, 2001, through January 31, 2002, shows that Trinity County had \$523,003.81 in approved claims and \$47,155.89 in denied claims resulting in an 8.3% denial rate. During the same period the average denial rate for all California counties was 9.8%.

Recommendation #5: Implementation of the recommendation is up to the Board of Supervisors. The Department has had two audits by the State Department of Mental Health within the last six months.

Finding #6: I disagree.

Response: With the assistance of the Kings View Corporation, the executive directors have brought the Department through a difficult period of growth and change. The leadership and oversight has been adequate for the task.

Recommendation #6: Implementation of the recommendation is up to the Board of Supervisors, but I recommend against hiring a Mental Health Director.

Finding #7: I disagree.

Response: Over the term of the contract, Kings View has worked with the County to improve services, including services in County schools, improved services at the jail and juvenile hall and implementation of a children's system of care. Without Kings View's assistance the County will have a difficult time meeting the State's mandates and the new HIPPA rules.

Recommendation #7A: Implementation of the recommendation is up to the Board of Supervisors, but I recommend renewing the Kings View contract.

Recommendation #7B: The recommendation will be implemented. A plan to streamline the organizational structure has been put forth and recommended by the recent classification and compensation study.

Finding #8: I disagree in part.

Response: The Chairman of the Advisory Board has been involved in every interview panel established to review potential executive directors proposed by Kings View.

Recommendation #8A: There is no need to implement this recommendation. The Advisory Board can access any record not involving Confidential patient information, and they have the ability to

interview any member of the Department's staff.

Recommendation #8B: The recommendation has been partially implemented. The County will continue to involve the Advisory Board Chairman in director appointments. The Grand Jury's statement that State regulations require that the Advisory Board be consulted on any agreements involving mental health services is incorrect. Welfare and Institutions Code Section 5604.2(a)(2) provides that the Advisory Board reviews only the annual performance contract with the State Department of Mental Health. Although the Advisory Board will not be involved in the contracting process for other contracts, all completed contracts are available for their review.

Recommendation #8C: Implementation of the recommendation is up to the Board of Supervisors.

Recommendation #8D: The recommendation will not be implemented. I agree that it is important for the Director of Behavioral Health Services to attend Advisory Board meetings. However, in a small county, where we all wear many hats, other important County business, which conflicts with scheduled Advisory Board meetings, is a common occurrence.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY REPORT

Dated April 30, 2002

By Ted Klemm, Executive Director
Trinity County Behavioral Health

Finding #1 r.e. Morale

I agree with the Grand Jury's report that there have been morale problems being experienced by a number of staff. The Grand Jury has accurately described some of the history and the conflict that some of the clinicians have had (for years) with a "managed care" medical delivery system. Managed care requires a focused, often briefer model of treatment. It also requires more frequent, detailed documentation by clinical staff.

Approximately eight years ago, Trinity County - like every county in the State - was given the "right of first refusal" to become the "Managed Mental Health Care Plan" for Medi Cal recipients for the County. Had the County chosen to exercise that right, the State would have been responsible for running the program or contracting it to the private sector. The Trinity County Board of Supervisors chose to accept responsibility for providing managed mental health care services for the Medi Cal population (as did all other Counties). Over the next three or four years counties and the state and other constituency groups worked together to define what that system should look like and how it should operate. In Trinity County there was little done during those early years to prepare staff and the community for managed care.

Three years ago the State reviewed the program and "gently" told the clinicians that they must make the "shift" to managed care. A year ago, the State came back and more forcefully made their point again. During the past year, management has been trying to work with staff to implement the significant changes necessary to come into compliance. The State also provided training to staff. Additionally, the Department offered various training opportunities. This past review by the Department of Mental Health has clearly stated that the Department must make the changes necessary. This pressure from the State Department of Mental Health has forced the Department into needing to make dramatic changes over a short period of time. Over the past five months the Department has developed a Plan of Correction. That Plan of Correction has been approved by the Department of Mental Health.

Clinical staff have indicated their frustration with and resistance to dramatically changing the way they do business given the need

to implement the managed care regulations. This resistance impacted morale negatively for those most affected. It is important to note that not all staff are experiencing morale problems. The Department has taken many steps to improve morale. These have included bringing in outside consultants with specialized training to meet with staff both individually and as a group. On four separate occasions, all day "Team Building" workshops were held. Weekly meetings are held within the various units in the Department, and once per month there is an "All Staff" meeting. More recently, all staff receive minutes from all management team meetings and a clinician and a case manager have been added to the management team.

With respect to the issue of "...no follow through..." and "...retaliation and job reassignments..." I do not concur with the Grand Jury findings. Job reassignments (basically, one job reassignment occurred) have been made for the purposes of improved service delivery, not retaliation. Similarly, Department management works diligently to "follow through" on the priorities of the Department. To thoroughly evaluate these items would require citing specific examples so that there is an understanding as to what follow up actually occurred, or what the reasoning was for any specific reassignment.

RECOMMENDATION 1

A. I concur. It is good business practice to have an action plan. The Department has an extensive action plan that has been approved by the State. It is monitored by the State on a weekly basis.

B. I concur in part. The Deputy Director for Quality Improvement/Administration has been eliminated from the proposed budget. However, the roles and functions of Quality Assurance/Improvement in a Managed Care system are extensive and require a great deal of technical expertise and training. The roles and functions require more than one person to adequately maintain compliance with complex Medi Cal regulations. Over the past five years the Department has attempted to add Quality Improvement as an additional assignment to an already overloaded staff person. In so doing, we have "burned out" three different people because the task was too large and complex.

C. I concur. Over the past five years the county has been unable to fill this position for any length of time due to the highly specialized nature of the position and its role in assuring compliance with Medi Cal Managed Care regulations. The inability to fill that county position has - to a large degree - contributed to the number of items that the Department was out of compliance at the last state review. Beginning in February, 2001, this position was included as a contract amendment in the Kings View contract. Since that time, Kings View has supplied the County with a highly qualified person who has successfully developed and implemented a Plan of Correction that has been approved by the State. She has also implemented a training program for clinicians to improve their record keeping skills in accordance with state requirements. Given that the County has been unable to fill this critical need in the past five years, and the current relationship with Kings View is accomplishing what needs to be done, it is to the county's best interest to continue this position as part of the Kings View contract. This position takes on increased importance in light of the new Federal privacy and security rules (HIPAA). If anything, the Department needs to increase its commitment of resources to "...achieve compliance with State regulations and provide quality medical service to the community."

FINDING #2 r.e. training manuals

The terms of the contract were specific to providing training during the three month startup phase of the contract. Training manuals for Kings View's information system were provided to necessary staff in September of 1999. These manuals are used by

staff for reference during End of Month billing and other accounting processes. In addition, Kings View has sent staff to Trinity on a regular basis to provide on going training. Conversely, the Department has sent staff to other Kings View counties for training and support.

RECOMMENDATION #2

A. I concur. The training plan for clinical and alcohol and drug staff has already been implemented. The first phase of the training has focused on developing treatment plans in accordance with state standards. Trainings take place every Tuesday for two hours. Additionally, once per month an all day staff training takes place. With respect to training of support staff, a training plan will be developed with their help.

B. Not applicable

FINDING #3 r.e. facility soundproofing

Work orders to correct the Airport Road facility were submitted to General Services in January. It was agreed that we would work with one office to determine what level of renovation would be necessary to accomplish the soundproofing. The first phase was to replace the acoustical tile in the ceiling. Phase II was insulation around the doors. Phase III was "carpeting" the walls. It was determined that all three would need to be done to address the problem. General Services has been working to complete the work based upon their priorities given the other demands countywide. All of the Airport Road work is complete, the State has reviewed the site and found it to be in compliance.

RECOMMENDATION #3

The Airport Road facility is complete. As the Grand Jury points out, the Hayfork facility is more complex involving a variety of players. The Department has completed all tasks that it can to assure that this task is completed. General Services has ordered the soundproofing equipment and only needs the "go ahead" to do the work.

FINDING #4 r.e. computerized information management/accounting system

While there was a brief period in the beginning phase of the Kings View contract when the management/accounting system experienced some down time, there have been no problems with the system in the past year. Similarly, most of the email problems were related to the county email system. In the past year, all of Behavioral Health personnel were given a Kings View email account in addition to their current county email account and there have been virtually no problems with the Kings View email system. What problems that do occur are quickly resolved by a Kings View staff person that makes weekly visits to the County to assist county IT staff.

RECOMMENDATION #4

A. Kings View's management information systems exceed industry standards for downtime. Backup procedures exist for access via an encrypted internet connection using Trinity County's internet when the data line is not functioning. This connection is slower yet ensures access to client and accounting information. B. N/A

FINDING #5 r.e. information system

The allegation that the Kings View information system failed for a period of four to six months is not supported by the facts. Due to an external provider failure the Kings View data circuit was not available through the standard access mechanisms for a period of eight weeks, however due to King View's backup capacity it was still available via secured internet connection. Staff were able to

complete work via this connection within 24 hours of the external provider failure.

While we are not able to confirm the data the Grand Jury used in their report from our records, we do have data we would like to submit to document the progress that has been made in maximizing M/C revenue to benefit Trinity county residents. Increased utilization of this revenue source benefits not only the client consumers, it also reduces the demand on limited county funding sources.

98-99

Total Units	105,035	289,643	23,782	12,009	430,469
Paid Units	54,532	213,822	15,470	10,089	293,913
Rate/Unit - Published	1.03	1.71	3.18	2.57	
Paid M/C Revenue \$	56,168	365,636	49,195	25,929	496,927

99-00 (kv)

Total Units	82,767	452,985	19,741	11,646	567,139
Paid Units	64,075	258,170	11,625	8,921	342,791
Rate/Unit - Published	1.33	1.71	3.18	2.57	
Paid M/C Revenue \$	85,220	441,471	36,968	22,927	586,585
					18.04%

00-01 (kv)

Total Units	49,168	532,284	25,425	22,070	628,947
Paid Units	44,145	320,381	11,012	15,305	390,843
Rate/Unit - Published	1.33	1.71	3.18	2.57	
Paid M/C Revenue \$	58,713	547,852	35,018	39,334	680,916
					37.03%

RECOMMENDATION #5

No opinion. The state periodically audits the Department now. An independent audit may be redundant.

FINDING #6

NA

RECOMMENDATION #6

NA

FINDING #7 r.e. Director

The original Kings View contract called for an Executive Director and a management information system. Both Kings View and the County entered into that agreement in good faith. What has been learned over that three year contract is that there are three specific skill sets that are necessary to adequately run a small county managed care mental health and alcohol and drug program:

1. Program and political expertise The ability to work with a diverse group of staff from front office support staff to psychologists and psychiatrists in a variety of settings. The ability to work collaboratively with other agencies towards common goals such as children's system of care and CalWORKS. The ability to work with a local county government structure and be responsive to the Board of Supervisors, Advisory Boards, and a variety of local agencies (both public and private) and special interest groups and interface with other counties, the state and federal government. The ability to make and communicate decisions as to who can be served and who can't based upon available resources, man-

dates and regulations.

2. Fiscal Administration The ability to manage a budget composed of multiple funding sources, legislative mandates, cost reporting systems and fiscal oversight bodies including complex systems such as the Medicaid system.

3. Quality Improvement The ability to develop, implement and monitor a medical model quality improvement process that assures the development and oversight of compliance standards and procedures (this is even more important than ever before due to HIPAA requirements), proper documentation, client grievance procedures, treatment authorization procedures, etc

Four years ago, the County was not able to recruit a qualified Mental Health Director. Through Kings View, a Director that meets the qualifications of the State has been hired. During the past five years, the County has not been able to recruit or retain qualified people in the latter two areas described above. Many of the problems described in the Grand Jury report are directly related to the County's inability to recruit and retain qualified Fiscal Administrative personnel and Quality Assurance personnel. It is only in the past 6 months - as a result of an amendment to the Kings View contract that shifted all of the above responsibilities to Kings View - that these issues have begun to be resolved. Currently, via the Kings View contract, a highly qualified fiscal administrator with over 30 years experience (who has already increased revenues by identifying areas that Trinity County has never billed in the past) and a highly qualified Quality Improvement Coordinator with a similar level of experience are fulfilling the responsibilities that are bringing the Department into compliance, increasing revenues and improving the care of the clients of Trinity County.

The fundamental issue is that Trinity County, like every other county in the State agreed to become the managed care provider of mental health services. This decision was made in the mid nineties. While most other counties spent the next four or five years learning how to do managed care (including going through similar struggles as has been experienced over the past two years in Trinity County), Trinity County Behavioral Health resisted that responsibility. The County was unable to recruit or retain not only a Director, but, as mentioned above, a qualified fiscal administrator or a Quality Improvement Coordinator. Had the County been able to hire its own people in these positions, the Department would still have gone through exactly the same issues as it has recently been going through.

RECOMMENDATION #7

A. I strongly disagree for the reasons mentioned above. It would not be in the County, the clients or the State's best interest to terminate the Kings View contract.

B. I agree that quality mental health services to our community must remain a top priority. I also agree that organizational changes will result in improved service delivery. Recommendations have been made to accomplish this and are included in the County Salary Study and in the proposed Kings View contract.

FINDING #8 r.e. Advisory Board

The roles, responsibilities and makeup of the Mental Health Advisory Board are clearly set forth in regulation. Besides attending all Advisory Board meetings, the Department management staff meets with the Advisory Board Executive Committee monthly and makes available to the Advisory Board all management staff at the Advisory Board's request. To the extent that resources are available, all informational requests of the Advisory Board receive a response.

It is important to note that Trinity County's Advisory Board is designated as a "Behavioral Health Board". This expands their responsibilities to include the Alcohol and Drug portion of the Department of Behavioral Health.

RECOMMENDATION #8

A. As above, the roles, responsibilities and makeup of the Advisory Board are found in regulation and state statute with respect to the Mental Health functions of the Behavioral Health Advisory Board. The Advisory Board performs an important function for the County and the Department. The current members should be acknowledged for their dedication and commitment to the clients that we serve. The Department (and I believe the Advisory Board) encourages members of the community concerned about alcohol, drug and mental health issues to consider becoming a member of the Advisory Board. An Advisory Board that represents all the voices in the county is essential.

To: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

Subject: Response to Recommendations of 2002-02 Grand Jury Health and Human Services Committee Final Report

Date: July 30, 2002

The Grand Jury Health and Human Services Committee has requested a written response to their final report on the Trinity County Behavioral Health Services Department. In our capacity as members of the TCBHS Advisory Board we voted, at a special meeting on July 29, 2002 to submit the following responses to the indicated items....

Finding 1: TCBHS Advisory Board agrees moral was low in the department at the time of the investigation.

Recommendation 1B:

The Advisory Board agrees, please see Attachment A, a letter written to the Board of Supervisors on April 10th, recommending that a qualified Director be hired.

The Advisory Board agrees that the layers of management and committee structure are cumbersome and "extraneous" for such a small agency serving 206 clients. Under the current structure it appears that the administration levels are not well defined. Behavioral Health has a Director, an Executive Director and a variety of consultants that do specific activities, i.e. BHS contracts with a retired mental health Director to provide for fiscal oversight.

In response to the firing of the Deputy Director the TCBHS Advisory Board also notes a lack of support from management in organizing a Quality Improvement Committee although she had the most actual mental health experience and client culture knowledge. To assure that the Department is more responsive to the deficiencies and defines who will address issues, the Advisory Board will recommend that a job description addressing individual positions, roles and responsibilities of each of the supervisory positions, the management structure and hierarchal reporting are in a written form that can be used to guide employees and the TCBHS Advisory Board. It appears that the amount of in-house committees and meetings that are closely interrelated and contain the same people with the exception of one or two additional persons appear to be cumbersome and inefficient but seem to consume the weekly schedule. The Executive Director has stated that it is not good practice to have the team managers involved in clinical duties but the Board finds that the hands-on experience of this County could be beneficial to employees from other areas especially in as much as this frontier community finds it difficult to employ licensed clinicians.

Finding #5: The TCBHS Advisory Board agrees that some months were not billed to DMH in a timely matter but the information required is available.

The TCBHS Advisory Board disagrees with the Recommendation to have an independent audit.

This Board believes the computer problems are being addressed which involved the late billings. The cost of such an audit would deter from consumer services and the State has already conducted a focused review and did not find significant problems. Program reviews would better serve the clientele of the Department which will and should be done through the Quality Improvement Committee, community input, contractor professionals, the Advisory Board and the County.

The TCBHSAB will recommend that Behavioral Health Department conduct a full and complete training of staff on an annual basis relating to regulations and requirements that impact billing procedures; we find this has been added to the Kings View Contract which went into effect on July 1, 2002, and is currently being addressed.

Finding #6: The Board agrees that the Director has been assigned numerous other County tasks and cannot commit to TCBHS full time.

The TCBHS Advisory Board agrees with the Recommendation (please see enclosed Attachment A). The Board feels that the current structure has had a negative impact on both the budget and programs of the Department. The cost effectiveness and efficiency levels have declined based on the level of complaints and reports as received from four independent sources, Calif. Dept. of Mental Health, the TCBHS Advisory Boards, the Patient's Rights Advocate, and the Grand Jury.

Finding #7: The TCBHSAB agrees that should a full time Director be employed the Executive Director function would be extraneous.

The TCBHS Advisory Board agrees with the Recommendations (please see enclosed Attachment A).

Finding #8: Yes the TCBHSAB agrees that they were surprised by the number of non-compliance issues in the State Oversight Review.

The TCBHS Advisory Board has not "been satisfied by similar assurances," but rather felt disempowered to pursue these matters. The TCBHS Advisory Board agrees the Executive Director and Director seem to "down play" issues and problems which has had a negative impact on the majority of the Board's ability to accept current information as forthcoming. In addition this has had an impact on decisions made, we continue to express our concern and our confidence has been eroded in the process. The expectation appears to be that because the program is of no cost to the County the Department can absorb the costs of "not" significant problems but funds are taken from other areas and has directly impacted our direct service levels.

The TCBHS Advisory Board agrees with Recommendations A, C, D.

The TCBHS Advisory Board agrees with Recommendation B, but must also state that accessibility of information has increased under the present Executive Director if requested. Prior Kings View Executive Directors supplied no information even after repeated requests.

The TCBHS Advisory Board agrees that there is problem in our ability to do our job effectively due to lack of information and the lack of confidence and trust issues between the agency administration and staff and the Board. As an example this Board has continually requested the draft budget and contract as part of our duties to review, in July the budget was mailed in the Board packet after being signed without any meaningful input. This significantly lim-

its, our role and recommendations/advise as. required by the. regulations.

Conclusion:

Although the Advisory Board is concerned with budget and administration our first priority is client/consumer services to the Severely Mentally Disabled in the Children, Adult and Older Adult populations. Monitoring and evaluation of the programs is to this end.

The, TCBHS Advisory Board agrees with the balance of the Grand Jury Report and appreciates the time and effort required to make the insightful recommendations that it did.

The Advisory Board is developing a Memorandum of Understanding to present to the Board of Supervisors in order to form a more collaborative and effective approach for the programs of the TCBHS Department for the citizens of our County.

Sincerely, Jeanne Simmons, TCBHS Advisory Board Chair

July 26, 2002

TO: Honorable John K. Letton Superior Court
P.O. Box 1258
Weaverville, California 96093

FROM: Trinity County Board of Supervisors

RE: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Health & Human Services Committee's Final Report on the Trinity County Behavioral Health Services Department

The 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury requested a written response from the Trinity County Board of Supervisors regarding the Grand Jury's Health and Human Services Committee report on the Trinity County Behavioral Health Services Department. The Board of Supervisors respectfully offers the following:

Finding #1: The Board agrees that there has been a morale problem, for many of the reasons stated in the report, amongst some employees in the Behavioral Health Services Department, however, efforts to correct the problem are being taken. We do not agree that Behavioral Health managers use retaliation as a management tool, something the Board of Supervisors would never tolerate.

Recommendation #1B: This recommendation has been implemented.

Finding #3: The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

Recommendation #3: The Board of Supervisors understands its responsibility to assure confidentiality and will see that this recommendation is implemented. The County's General Services Department has, we understand, corrected the soundproofing problem at the airport offices and is working with the other players at the Hayfork offices to correct it there also.

Finding #5: The Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. Figures provided us by the Behavioral Health Department Director, Executive Director and State Department of Mental Health would indicate that State reimbursement returns or disallowances to Trinity County have not been out of the ordinary and that the percentage of Medical disallowances has been improving over time.

Recommendation #5: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors will not implement this recommendation. The Trinity County Behavioral Health Department is one of the county departments that are regularly audited by the State of California and any local audit would be expensive and duplicative.

Finding #6: The Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. The Board has organized an effort to examine the different modes of behavioral health care delivery to determine if our existing system is the most user friendly, efficient and cost effective. Until that effort is completed, we believe our existing structure will continue to give us local control and oversight of behavioral health services and our contract with Kings View.

Recommendation #6: The Board of Supervisors will not implement this recommendation at this time. If by virtue of the study mentioned above, a recommendation was made to reconfigure our Behavioral Health Department and hire a full time Director then the Board would consider it at that time.

Finding #7: The Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. Trinity County's historic inability to recruit and fill positions in the Behavioral Health Department has created situations where efficiency has suffered however, Kings View has made an effort to expand services to areas not previously served and the relationship between the Director and Executive Director is not confusing to the Board.

Recommendation #7A: The Board of Supervisors will not implement this recommendation at this time. As previously indicated, the Board of Supervisors has set up a committee to explore various options for behavioral health care delivery in Trinity County including what role Kings View would play. Recommendations from that committee may dictate what relationship Trinity County has with Kings View in the future.

Recommendation #7B: This recommendation will be implemented.

Finding #8: The Board disagrees in part with this finding. We understand that the Chairman of the Behavioral Health Advisory Board has indeed participated in the selection of Behavioral Health Executive Directors and a Member of the Board of Supervisors is in regular attendance at their meetings.

Recommendation # 8A: The Board of Supervisors will not implement this recommendation because it is not necessary. Members of the Behavioral Health Advisory Board already have access to all the workings of Behavioral Health Department except those that would violate patient confidentiality.

Recommendation #8B: The Board of Supervisors will implement this recommendation and abide by all laws requiring consultations with the Behavioral Health Advisory Board and will continue to involve the Advisory Board in professional appointments made in the department they oversee.

Recommendation #8C: The Board of Supervisors cannot implement this recommendation in a definitive way. The Board certainly recognizes the importance of the Behavioral Health Advisory Board and appreciates their work and dedication. The relative merit of advice regarding the Behavioral Health Department would depend on a number of factors and the weight given to input would necessarily depend on the issue being discussed.

ATTACHMENT A

April 10, 2002
Trinity County Board of Supervisors P.O. Box 1613
Weaverville, Ca. 96093

RE: Kings View Contract Dear Honorable Members,

The Trinity County Behavioral Health Services Advisory Board voted at a special meeting on April 8th to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the following:

** Our priority is for the County to employ a Mental Health Director

that meets California Department of Mental Health criteria and standards and that is also cognizant of Alcohol and Other Drug issues at a competitive salary. With a reasonable amount of time to transition from the management part of the Kings View contract the Advisory Board believes that the change in salary level just published for the Director might attract an employee at this time.

Contracting out management has not been a cost savings, it appears to the Board, but rather a reduction in care levels for clients. The County is losing staff faster than new clinicians can be hired, resulting in lack of care and billing reductions. Though we understand this is a state wide problem the visible impact is considerably higher in Trinity.

The above proposal would not relieve Kings View of its duties as the Board would desire the CMHC data reporting system be retained which was an option in the original Kings View proposal.

** That the Advisory Board Chair (or designee) be included in the contract negotiations, especially early in the process.

** That if Kings View is retained as management that a transition clause be inserted in case either party decides to terminate the contract that would guarantee the retention of client data (further, to make sure that Trinity's data is backed up in County before forwarding).

The full report from the Ad Hoc Contracts Committee would be premature at this time as the compliance issues are not fully analyzed. The committee will have a full report at a later date with more recommendations.

Depending on the California Department of Mental Health report relating to the Plan of Correction from the January, 2002 Annual Review, the Special Focused Review Report from the March 25-29 Ca. DMH Compliance Team, the Ad Hoc Contracts Committee final report and the ability of Kings View to bring the county into compliance in a timely manner, this Board has reservations about making any additional recommendations for changes to the contract at this time.

Sincerely, Jeanne Simmons, Chair

This report was Filed on June 20, 2002

**2001-2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY
JUDICIAL COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT
ANIMAL CONTROL**

PURPOSE:

The Trinity County Grand Jury is required to periodically review the management and functions of county departments as deemed necessary. The County Animal Control Division was last reviewed by the 1992-1993 Trinity County Grand Jury. This report contains findings and recommendations based on an updated review of this department.

BACKGROUND:

Operating under the auspices of the Trinity County Sheriffs Department, the Animal Control Officer (ACO) is responsible for all the provisions of the applicable laws pertaining to animal regulation, to include both California State Code and local Trinity County Ordinances.

The primary duties of the ACO are to deal with animals in the county, both privately owned and stray; impound and dispose of unwanted or problem animals; provide and maintain short term care of animals at the County Animal Shelter until an appropriate disposition of the animal is made; maintain accurate records of all actions taken regarding the disposal of animals encountered; operate and maintain responsibility for the animal shelter; and patrol various areas of the county providing appropriate enforcement coverage.

The Animal Control Division consists of one Animal Control Officer (ACO) and one Animal Care Attendant (ACA). The county obtained possession of the current animal shelter located at the end of Mountain View Terrace in Weaverville in December 2001. The building itself is showcase new,

well maintained and operated under the direction of the county ACO, Christine Whitcomb. The shelter has 10 dog runs and can accommodate up to approximately 30 dogs, depending on the size. There are 14 cages for cats that can accommodate approximately 20 cats, again depending on the size of the animals. On March 5, 2002 the Trinity County Board of Supervisors (BOS) repealed Chapter 6.04 of the Trinity County Code dated 11/87 pertaining to animal regulations and enacted a new revised version of Chapter 6.04.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

Members of the Grand Jury interviewed Trinity County Sheriff Paul Schmidt and ACO Christine Whitcomb and toured the new county animal shelter. Grand Jury members were further provided with documentation pertaining to departmental trends, annual rabies control activity, animal shelter processing and Chapter 6.04, Animal Control Regulations (11/87). Grand Jury Judicial Committee members were subsequently provided the newly enacted regulations pertaining to animal regulations passed by the BOS on March 5, 2002 for review.

Ms. Whitcomb also briefed Grand Jury members on the procedures she utilizes in maintaining shelter records, tracking statistical data for annual reports and updating pet licenses within the county.

FINDING #1:

Trinity County Sheriff Schmidt and Animal Control Officer Whitcomb provided the Grand Jury with a good overview of this division and were most responsive to questions and issues raised by the members.

Although the division is extremely small, Ms. Whitcomb in particular appeared to all present to be very dedicated, hardworking and innovative. Ms. Whitcomb is a professional officer, knowledgeable about both state and local animal ordinances, and she assisted the BOS and county Counsel in the development of the newly enacted Trinity County animal regulations. As with many county departments, the Animal Control Division is in need of additional resources but appears to be well served under the management of the Sheriffs Department and Ms. Whitcomb.

The Grand Jury believes the repeal and re-enactment of the outdated county animal regulation codes were warranted.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

The Board of Supervisors, County Counsel and Sheriff's Department are commended for working together to update the animal control regulations for the county.

FINDING #2:

The tracking of pet licensing, dog bits, impounds, adoptions, etc., within Trinity County is currently conducted manually by the Animal Control Division. The 1991-1992 Grand Jury report recommended the purchase of an animal control software program to provide automated tracking of these records. In 1993 the BOS approved the purchase of a software program called PetNet to put in place a tracking program; and the 1992-1993 Grand Jury concluded that revenues between \$6,000 and \$7,000 would be generated/anticipated.

In response to the 1993 Grand Jury report, Sheriff Schmidt wrote that the "...PetNet license renewal program has been ordered and should be here by August 1st." To date, the tracking system is not automated and continues to be done manually.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

The Grand Jury concurs with the decision of both the 1993 BOS and the previous Grand Jury's recommendation that animal control software be obtained to facilitate the licensing of animals within Trinity County, the tracking of officer response, and facility management within the animal Control Division.

FINDING #3:

The new Trinity County Animal Shelter is an excellent facility, clean and well maintained. However, on the day that members of the Grand Jury toured the facility, it was raining and there were large accumulations of water and mud on the ground in the immediate vicinity of the facility. The parking area has numerous potholes that need filling and grading.

Ms. Whitcomb advised members of the Grand Jury that there is a need to fence off both the front and rear entrances to the animal shelter due to vandalism and individuals throwing rocks and trash at the animals in the outdoor runs when department members are away for short periods. The Grand Jury was advised that the General Services Division is aware of the drainage issues at the facility and is working toward a resolution of the problem. The jury further observed that there is currently fencing already purchased and ready to be installed for this project but was advised by General Services that this effort could not be completed until the drainage issues were resolved.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

The Grand Jury concurs that the parking area and fencing at the animal shelter need further work. The jury also recognizes that the General Services Division is aware of the issues, is committed to resolving the problems and needs time to obtain the necessary information and funding to complete the project. The jury recommends

that both divisions continue to work together toward a successful and timely resolution of the fencing and drainage projects.

RESPONSES REQUIRED:

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period.

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	DAYS
Trinity County Sheriff Director, Trinity County General Services Division	1,2,3	2,3	60
Trinity County Board of Supervisors	3	3	60
	1,2,3	2,3	90

Responses

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: Trinity County Board of Supervisors J.C. Erikson, Chairman

DATE: September 12, 2002

SUBJECT: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Judicial Committee Report of the Animal Control Division

The Grand Jury Judicial Committee has requested a written response to their Trinity County Animal Control Division Report. The response of the Board of Supervisors is as follows:

Finding #1: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #1.

Finding #2: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #2.

Recommendation #2: The recommendation is in the process of being implemented, and the Board of Supervisors commends the Animal Control Officer, Christine Edwards for her dedication and excellent work in accomplishing the tasks.

Finding #3: The Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #3.

Recommendation #3: The funding for recommendation #3 has been provided, the issues have been addressed the Trinity County Building Department is monitoring the completion of paving and fencing as we speak. The project should be completed by the end of September 2002.

Responses

June 5, 2002

TO: Honorable John K. Letton
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: John Whitaker, General Services Director

SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2001-02 Grand Jury JUDICIAL COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT - ANIMAL CONTROL DIVISION

Finding #3:

The new Trinity County Animal Shelter is an excellent facility, clean and well maintained. However, on the day the members of the Grand Jury toured the facility, it was raining and there were large accumu-

lations of water and mud on the ground in the immediate vicinity of the facility. The parking area has numerous potholes that need filling and grading.

Ms. Whitcomb advised members of the Grand Jury that there is a need to fence off both the front and rear entrances to the animal shelter due to vandalism and individuals throwing rocks and trash at the animals in the outdoor runs when department members are away for short periods. The Grand Jury was advised that the General Services Division is aware of the drainage issues at the facility and is working toward a resolution of the problem. The jury further observed that there is currently fencing already purchased and ready to be installed for this project but was advised by General Services that this effort could not be completed until the drainage issues were resolved.

We concur with this finding.

Recommendation #3:

The Grand Jury concurs that the parking area and fencing at the animal shelter need further work. The jury also recognizes that the General Services Division is aware of the issues, is committed to resolving the problems and needs time to obtain the necessary information and funding to complete the project. The jury recommends that both divisions continue to work together toward a successful and timely resolution of the fencing and drainage projects.

Response:

We concur with this recommendation and it will be implemented when the 2002-2003 budget is approved.

June 27, 2002

TO: Trinity County Grand Jury Hon. John Letton, Superior Court Judge 'Trinity County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Paul Schmidt, Sheriff

SUBJECT: Response to 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Report Animal Control Division

I would like to convey my thanks to the Grand Jury for their care in preparing this report.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

The Sheriffs Department and Animal Control officer appreciate the Grand Jury's recognition of our efforts to update animal control regulations for the county.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

I concur with the recommendation to automate animal control records and licensing functions. The software program obtained in 1993 never came on-line due to problems acquiring adequate hardware to support it. The Sheriffs Department now has sufficient computer capacity to run such a program, though it appears that the original PetNet program is now obsolete. We have identified some other software options that maybe obtainable for little or no cost and are working towards automating the Animal Control Division.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

I concur with this recommendation.

This report was Filed on March 1, 2002

2001 - 2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY JUDICIAL COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT

TRINITY COUNTY DETENTION FACILITY AND TRINITY COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY

PURPOSE:

Penal Code Section 919(b) mandates that the Grand Jury will annually inquire into the conditions and management of all public prisons within the county. In June of 2001, construction of a new 24 bed Trinity County Juvenile Detention Facility was completed and has been added in conjunction with the annual review of the Trinity County Detention Facility by the Grand Jury.

BACKGROUND:

The California State Board of Corrections classifies the Trinity County Detention Facility (Jail) as a Type 11 facility. This facility is used to detain persons who are awaiting or undergoing trial proceedings, convicted persons sentenced to serve time up to one year, and minimum-security state parolees back in custody due to parole violations.

The Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF) is operated under the direction of the Trinity County Probation Department and provides in-county secure custody to house a growing number of juvenile offenders who are finding their way into Trinity County's juvenile justice system. Co-located with the offices of the County Probation Department, the JDF replaces the Trinity County Juvenile Assessment Center (JAC), which was a non-secure, 10-bed facility, able to hold minors for no more than 72-96 hours.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

Members of the Judicial Committee toured the Jail with the officer in charge and interviewed the Sheriff and Under-Sheriff on two separate occasions. In addition, members of the Judicial Committee reviewed sections of the California Board of Corrections Inspection report dated June 5th, 2001, pertaining to the Trinity County Jail.

On September 14th, 2001, interested members of the Grand Jury as a whole were briefed by Mr. Terry Lee, Chief Probation Officer for Trinity County and toured the JDF. In addition, Judicial Committee members reviewed sections of the California Board of Corrections pre-opening evaluation of the JDF dated June 26th, 2001, and a Trinity County Juvenile Justice Commission inspection report of the JDF dated August 23rd, 2001.

FINDING #1:

Trinity County Jail

The Trinity County Jail is in compliance with the requirements of the California State Department of Corrections. Although there were several issues of concern raised with jail officials during the two inspections conducted by the Committee, all of these problems were either corrected or are currently being addressed by the Sheriff's Department. Several members of the Jury commented on the need for improved maintenance in the waiting rooms for both the entrances to the Jail and the entrance to the Sheriff's Offices. The Sheriff advised the committee members that the maintenance of these areas is the responsibility of the General Services Department.

There is an obvious "overcrowding" situation existing at the dispatch center where booking, oversight of jail operations, and 911 / dispatch communications occur. This problem was also addressed in a previous report issued by the 1998-1999 Grand Jury. The Judicial committee was advised by the Sheriff that he was well aware of

this problem and that a rear oversight station currently being used for storage was again being considered for the Dispatch/911 center. The utilization of the rear oversight station as a Dispatch/911 center would also enable jail staff to visually observe the outdoor recreation area when prisoners are exercising, another issue of concern raised by several Judicial Committee Members. The Sheriff advised the Committee that he felt the outlook was positive that an expansion alleviating the cramped conditions in the dispatch area could occur this year and that the Department was proactively pursuing this initiative internally.

Although the Trinity County Jail is currently staffed with the minimum levels as required by the California Board of Corrections and by law, often Deputies on patrol are pulled in to assist in the management of the Jail. These situations occur when jail staff call in sick, are out on job related injury or maternity leave, attending mandatory training, or during other emergencies. When these events occur, Sheriff Schmidt stated that law enforcement coverage in Trinity County is negatively affected due to the already minimal staffing level of sworn personnel in the Sheriff's Department.

RECOMMENDATION #1 a:

The Trinity County Grand Jury strongly supports the Sheriff Department's efforts to alleviate the overcrowding situation in the 911/Dispatch Center by utilizing the rear oversight station located in the jail. The Grand Jury recommends that the county make every effort to identify funding to implement this much needed relocation as soon as possible.

RECOMMENDATION #1 b:

The Grand Jury recommends that the Director of the Trinity County General Services Department have the waiting rooms to the Jail and the Sheriff's office inspected to determine the appropriate maintenance required making the rooms presentable to the general public and giving such maintenance a higher priority than it has previously enjoyed.

FINDING #2:

Trinity County Juvenile Detention Facility

The Juvenile Detention Facility is in compliance with the California State Board of Corrections standards for Youth Detention Facilities. An additional on-site biannual inspection of the facility by the Board is planned prior to the end of 2001. The Trinity County Juvenile Justice Commission has inspected the facility and identified minor discrepancies that are being addressed by the Trinity County Probation Department. Overall, the Commission concluded that the facility is well run and that a follow-up inspection will be conducted prior to the end of calendar 2001.

The JDF is a showcase operation that most impressed the members of the Grand Jury. It was clearly evident that much effort, commitment and professional expertise were brought to bear in the construction and development of the center. All personnel involved in the development and operation of the center are to be commended for their efforts.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

None

CONCLUSION:

Judicial committee members were impressed with the professionalism and dedication of the staff at both facilities. Sgt. Robert Angulo and his staff at the Trinity County Jail are doing an excellent job under difficult conditions. Under-Sheriff Charles Downen and Sheriff Paul Schmidt were most helpful and responsive in the review of issues at the jail.

The Trinity County Jail is being staffed with the minimum levels as required by the Board of Corrections and by law. However, there are times when Deputies on patrol are pulled in to assist in the management of the Jail during shortages due to illness, injuries or emergencies. The Sheriff has stated both publicly and to members of the Grand Jury that occasionally there is inadequate law enforcement coverage in Trinity County. He has stated that the root cause is low salaries that create a high turnover among his officers. The Grand Jury concludes that the Board of Supervisors needs to work closely with the Sheriff's Department to provide the necessary funding to insure the continued safety of the citizens of this county.

Chief Probation Officer Terry Lee and his staff have done a truly remarkable job of obtaining the necessary funding for and continued oversight of the new Trinity County Juvenile Detention Facility and adjacent Probation Department offices. Professionalism is evident in all aspects of the physical plant and the operation of the program.

RESPONSES REQUIRED

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period:

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	ESPOOND WITHIN
Trinity Co. Board of Supervisors	#1,2	#1 a and 1 b	90 days
Trinity Co. Sheriff	#1	#1 a and 1 b	60 days
Trinity Co. Chief Probation Officer	#2	n/a	60 days
Trinity County General Services Dir.	#1	#1 b	60 days
Judge John Letton	#1,2	#1 a and 1 b	60 days
Judge Anthony Edwards	#1,2	#1 a and 1 b	60 days

Responses

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: J.C. Erikson, Chairman Trinity County Board of Supervisors

DATE: June 4, 2002

SUBJECT: Judicial Committee Final Report; Trinity County Detention Facility and Trinity County Juvenile Detention Facility

The Grand Jury Judicial Committee has requested a written response to their Final Report on the Trinity County Detention Facility and Trinity County Juvenile Detention Facility. The response of the Board of Supervisors is as follows:

Finding #1: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with the need for improved maintenance for the two separate waiting rooms, but questions whose budget will be charged for the maintenance and necessary repairs.

We also agree in regard to the "over crowding problem" at the Jail Dispatch Center. We have been waiting for remodeling, corrective action and funding for several years.

We agree with the findings associated with minimal staffing levels.

Recommendation #1a: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees.

Recommendation #1b: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees that it is the Trinity County General Services Department's responsibility to inspect and determine the "appropriate maintenance" needed and to ensure the waiting rooms are clean, safe and presentable, regardless of who performs the work.

Finding #2: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees.

Conclusion: With regards to the Trinity County Sheriff's Detention Facility, waiting rooms and maintenance issues, responsibility needs to be established between the Sheriff's office and General Services. Also, proper budgeting will lead towards meeting the Grand Jury's desired results. This can be accomplished during the 2002/2003 budget hearings and adoption within the next 120 days.

The Trinity County Board of Supervisors thanks the members of the Judicial committee for their suggestions and hard work.

March 8, 2002

TO: Honorable John K. Letton Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: John Whitaker, General Services Director

SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2001-02 Grand Jury JUDICIAL COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT

Finding and Conclusion #1:

"Several members of the Jury commented on the need for improved maintenance in the waiting rooms for both the entrances to the Jail and the entrance to the Sheriff's Offices. The Sheriff advised the committee members that the maintenance of these areas is the responsibility of the General Services Department."

Response:

General Services disagrees with the finding. We believe the facts are misstated. The custodial service for the administration wing is provided by inmate labor supervised by jail staff. Money for maintenance of structures for the admin wing and jail are found in the Sheriff *budget. When something fails, General Services will estimate the cost and provide information to the Sheriff who then authorizes us to proceed with the work.

Recommendation #1b:

"The Grand Jury recommends that the Director of the Trinity County General Services Department have the waiting rooms to the Jail and the Sheriff's office inspected to determine the appropriate maintenance required making the rooms presentable to the general public and giving such maintenance a higher priority than it has previously enjoyed."

Response:

We agree in part and disagree in part. We disagree that there need for further inspection. Had the Grand Jury contacted General Services they would have been informed that prior to the budget process General Services inspects all facilities to determine what capital improvements are needed as well as reoccurring maintenance needs. In the 2001-2002 budget General Services asked for the replacement of the heating, air conditioning and ventilation system (HVAC) system for the Sheriff administration wing, carpet replacement and interior and exterior painting. After the budget, was approved for these items, it was then withdrawn and only the HVAC systems remained funded.

We agree that such maintenance be given a higher priority, we have talked on many occasions and recommended to administration to have the custodial services and maintenance of structure line in the Sheriff budget be given to General Services so that we might better manage the upkeep of the facility.

Response to 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Final Report on the Sheriff's Department - Trinity County Detention Facility and Probation Department - Trinity County Juvenile Detention Facility

April 30, 2002

Chris Erikson, Chairman
Trinity County Board of Supervisors P.O. Box 1258
Weaverville, CA 96093

Charley Fitch, Foreperson
2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury P.O. Box 1117
Weaverville, CA 96093

Finding #1:

I agree.

Recommendation #1 a: I agree.

Recommendation #1b: I agree.

Finding #2: I agree.

RE: Response to 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Final Report on the Sheriff's Department - Trinity County Detention Facility and Probation Department - Trinity County Juvenile Detention Facility

Very Truly yours,

Anthony C. Edwards, Judge of the Superior Court

April 25, 2002

Chris Erickson, Chairman
Trinity County Board of Supervisors P.O. Box 1258
Weaverville, CA 96093

Charley Fitch, Foreperson
2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury P.O. Box 1117
Weaverville, CA 96093

Finding #1:

I agree with the statements made in Finding #1, with the following qualifications.

1. I do not know if the Sheriff's Department or the General Services Department is responsible for maintenance of the waiting rooms and entrances to the jail and sheriff's offices.

2. Following the 1998-1999 Grand Jury Report I was under the impression that the rear oversight station had been cleared of the "stored" items and other more appropriate storage space was being used. I was surprised to read in this year's grand jury report that the rear oversight station was still being used for storage.

Recommendation #1 a: I agree.

Recommendation #1b: I agree.

Finding #2 I agree.

Very Truly yours,

John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

Date: March 11, 2002

To: John K. Letton, Superior Court Judge

From: Terry Lee, Chief Probation Officer

Re: Grand Jury Report

I would like to thank the members of the Grand Jury for their thorough and insightful report concerning the operations of the Trinity County Juvenile Detention Facility. It was a pleasure to meet with you and go over the operation of our facility. This project has been the culmination of a lot of work from my staff and they are truly in need of my recognition. Without the insight of the Grand Jury early on in this project, it is doubtful the State and the California Board of Corrections would have recognized the need for our facility. Since your last visit, we have added mental health and substance abuse programs in addition to our Court School program. My staff and I are committed to working with your again and the Courts to provide a quality program for our youth.

April 29, 2002

TO: Trinity County Grand Jury
Superior Court Judge
Trinity County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Paul Schmidt, Sheriff

SUBJECT: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Judicial Committee Final Report: Trinity County Detention Facility & Juvenile Detection Facility

I would like to express my thanks to the Grand Jury for their care in preparing this report.

In regards to Recommendation #1 A, we are in the process of getting costs for relocation of the 911/Dispatch Center as recommended from the various entities that would be involved. Not all of these parties have been forthcoming, but we will continue to gather information on the costs involved.

I agree with Recommendation #1, B, that the General Services Department address the maintenance issues affecting the public areas of the Detention Facility.

This report was Filed on May 2, 2002

**2001-2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY
DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT**

**CITIZEN COMPLAINT
EMERGENCY 911 MAPPING SYSTEM**

PURPOSE:

The Trinity County Grand Jury investigates, as it deems appropriate, complaints received from citizens of Trinity County. This report is the result of the Grand Jury investigating a citizen's complaint of the emergency 911 mapping system and contains findings, recommendations and conclusions concerning this project.

BACKGROUND:

Approximately seven years ago Trinity County obtained a grant to start an address system for the county. A contract was awarded to a company by the name of Docugraph. Addresses were assigned using a 1000 number per mile system. The numbering was not completed for the whole county. In June of 1997 Mary Arey was hired by the Planning department to complete the numbering using a Geographic Information System (GIS) method.

In October 2001 Mary Arey left the planning department and relocated to Nevada. In November 2001 a GIS committee was formed to see the project to completion. This committee included at the time of our interviews Ralph Modine, Chris Ericson, Dero Forslund, Kelly Sheen, Brian Muir, Lyle Hymas, John Jelichich and a member from the Sheriff's department.

Part of the project would be to update the information the telephone companies now use, replacing erroneous data and adding data for many parcels not on the database at this time. Trinity County has two different telephone companies serving the residents at this time. They are Pacific Bell and Verizon, which complicates the project.

The complaint stated that Trinity County was to complete three elements by June 1999:

1. Global Positioning system (GPS) mapping of the county and addresses assigned to all Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN's);
2. Satellite image maps with all roads overlaid and marked;
3. Road signs supplied to the fire districts.

As of July 2001 this had not happened.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

The Development and Environment committee interviewed the Director of the Planning Department and Mary Arey who were responsible for the county mapping, members from two volunteer fire departments, a Sergeant from the Sheriffs Department, a member of the Board of Supervisors, a member of the GIS Committee and two Road Department employees.

FINDING #1:

After many interviews and much examination it has become apparent that this is a very complex and highly technical issue. The county wide emergency 911 and GIS mapping and addressing system is unfinished at this time. The county has been mapped showing 10,468 addresses and related information such as driveways and private roads. This information is still incomplete.

The Grand Jury finds the primary reason the system is still unfinished is lack of direction from the Planning Department whose responsibility it is to hire the personnel and oversee the project to its completion. The delays now seem to be exacerbated with the departure of

Mary Arey who was the Project Specialist II.

FINDING #2:

The lack of a countywide mapping and address system was expressed as a major concern by the fire departments and interviewees and expressed in letters to the editor of the Trinit Journal by citizens of Trinity County.

RECOMMENDATIONS #1 AND #2:

The Grand Jury recommends that the GIS committee should make the hiring of the necessary GIS trained person a very high priority and assure that this position is advertised widely.

The Grand Jury further recommends that one committee member be appointed to monitor the progress, make recommendations and follow through until completion of the project.

The Grand Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors in conjunction with the GIS Committee set a date for the completion of the project.

FINDING #3:

The mapping and addressing system information compiled by the planning department needs to be combined with the telephone company's Databases. Some special programming will be needed to accomplish this.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

The Grand Jury recommends that the GIS committee appoint a person to work with the telephone companies to determine what is needed to accomplish the necessary transfer of data.

FINDING #4:

In order to secure a proper sign for private roads connecting to county roads it is the individual property owner's responsibility to obtain any necessary permit and road sign to comply with County Ordinance #1162 which calls out such items as height of sign, distance from the road etc.

FINDING #5:

Not all information to correspond with private road names and address numbers that have been assigned are accurate or seem to correspond with some residents perception of what these names or numbers either are or should be. In addition not all APN's have been given an address road name and/or house.

RECOMMENDATIONS #4 AND #5:

The Grand Jury recommends that once the project is complete and all parcels have been assigned an address, the Planning Department make available to all Trinity County property owners their new or corrected addresses. The Grand Jury recommends that the Planning Department provide to the property owners a person available by telephone to assist the property owners in making corrections or additions to the information they receive, as well as assist them in obtaining any applicable permits and road sign specifications.

CONCLUSION:

After reviewing the many interviews conducted by the Development and Environment Committee, the Grand Jury has concluded that the completion of the E911 mapping and address system is a major concern to all Trinity County residents in event of an emergency and the implementation of that project is long overdue.

The Grand Jury also concludes that the fault lies with the Planning department due to lack of direction and focus on their part. Mary

Arey who was the primary person responsible for the E911 system was often required to work on unrelated projects. As late as August of 2001 the Planning Department had no firm plan for the implementation of the system.

The Grand Jury urges the Board of Supervisors to make it one of the highest priorities to hire a GIS trained person to complete the project and assure that the person in that position has the full support of the Board.

The Grand Jury further urges the Board of Supervisors in conjunction with the GIS committee to set a date for the completion of the project.

RESPONSES REQUIRED:

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period:

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPOND WITHIN
Trinity Co. Board of Supervisors	1,2,3,4,5	1,2,3,4,5	90 days
County Planning Director	1,2,3,4,5	1,2,3,4,5	60 days
Chair of GIS Committee	1,2,3,4,5	1,2,3,4,5	60 days

Responses

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: Brian Muir, Auditor - Controller

SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2001-02 Grand Jury Development & Environment Committee Final Report re: Citizen Complaint: Emergency 911 Mapping System

DATE: June 25, 2002

The Grand Jury Development & Environment Committee has requested a written response to their final report on Citizen Complaint: Emergency 911 Mapping System. In my capacity as Auditor - Controller and Chair of the GIS Committee, my response is as follows:

Finding #1: I agree.

Response: The emergency 911 and GIS mapping and addressing is a complex project that has been slowed due to the departure of a key employee.

Finding #2: I agree.

Response: Lack of a countywide mapping and address system is a concern for County citizens.

Recommendations #1 and #2: The recommendation will be implemented. The GIS Committee is scheduled to meet to review recruitment for an appropriately trained person. As the Planning Director, John Jelcich has already been appointed by the Board of Supervisors as the person to monitor the project.

Finding #3: I disagree

Response: The Planning Department has purchased software, which will obviate the need to combine the addressing system with the telephone company's database.

Recommendation #3: The recommendation will not implemented because the data transfer will not be necessary. The Planning Director will oversee any needed coordination with the telephone company.

Finding #4: I agree.

Response: Individual property owners are responsible for road signs on private roads.

Finding #5: I agree.

Response: The project is still incomplete, and residents do not always agree with the names and numbers that are assigned.

Recommendations #4 and #5: The recommendation will be implemented.

Honorable John K. Letton
 Superior Court
 P.O. Box 1258
 Weaverville, CA 96093

June 5, 2002

SUBJECT: 2001/2002 Grand Jury Development & Environment Committee Final Report re: "Citizen Complaint: Emergency 911 Mapping System".

Dear Judge Letton:

My response to the findings and recommendations of the above referenced Grand Jury Report is as follows:

Finding # 1:

I agree with the grand jury's first paragraph finding that the county-wide emergency 911 and GIS mapping and addressing system is a very complex and highly technical issue and is unfinished at this time. The completion of the project was exacerbated by the departure of Mary Arey and the inability to hire a replacement at a suitable salary.

Finding #2:

I agree.

Recommendation #1 and #2:

Hiring of the necessary GIS trained person was widely advertised and three top candidates were selected for further consideration. Unfortunately, during this review period the county reduced the pay scale for the position and those who were most qualified declined to accept the reduced pay. The GIS committee is currently reviewing other options and will forward its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.

Since the GIS committee is largely composed of user groups, administration and Board members, my recommendation is that a subcommittee of two or three people with some familiarity with addressing and 911 be appointed to assist in carrying out the project. Information Technology and Sheriffs office personnel responsible for dispatching should be included on this subcommittee because of their knowledge of the complexities involved in completing this project and the need for coordination with emergency dispatching.

Setting a date for completion is a laudable goal, provided that the necessary personnel and financial resources are committed to the project and that diversions to other important projects (such as the 2000 census) do not occur.

Finding #3, I agree

Recommendation #3

The telephone company is not requiring the special programming. The programming I discussed with the Grand Jury is designed to allow the dispatcher to be aware of changes in addresses. An important goal of the county's program is to assign addressing and coordinate that addressing system with the county's dispatchers. This is normally done through the telephone company. The software which has been chosen will allow a person to call in with an address (a correct address assigned by the county) and the dispatcher will be able to locate the call based on that address or the address shown on the dispatch screen provided by the telephone company (which may not be correct). This will provide some assurance that emergency vehicles will not be sent to the wrong address location. This is a critical concern that will enable the county to bypass the time consuming correction process established by the telephone company and complete the addressing update in a timelier manner with little risk to the public. It is a solution that Mary Arey and I were quite proud of.

Assigning a person from the GIS committee to work on this is not necessary; however, the subcommittee described in the response to Recommendation 1 and 2 may desire to address this issue as well.

Finding #4:

I agree, although the county has been coordinating with local fire districts regarding this issue. The county has secured temporary funding through the Transportation Commission's Local Transportation Fund to purchase signs for private roads that intersect with public roads and the fire districts have provided volunteer labor to install them. It is entirely the responsibility of private property owners to purchase and install private road signs when they intersect with other private roads.

Finding #5:

This statement is not entirely correct. The addresses assigned by the county are of two types: those patterned after the original addressing system (a.k.a. Docugraph) and those assigned based on the recommendation of the Fire Chiefs Association (a.k.a. modified coordinate system). Both are correct. It was necessary to assign addresses to some areas of the county based on the existing Docugraph system to maintain consistency. As an area was converted to the modified coordinate system, all of the addresses needed to change to the new system, including some that had been recently assigned. It would have been inappropriate for some addresses along a road to be based on one address system when other addresses along the same road are based on a different system.

Recommendation #4 and #5:

This recommendation is already part of our procedure. In addition, we will coordinate with the U.S. Post Office, UPS, emergency dispatch, telephone company (which also has its own verification system), and local fire districts.

Conclusion:

The plan for implementing the address system, described in part above, is well established and was in the process of being implemented when Mary Arey, who was an Associate Planner gifted with the ability and acquired knowledge to develop and implement the county's GIS system, left county service for a better paying job as a GIS Coordinator in Reno.

I agree that the Board of Supervisors should establish a high priority to hiring a "GIS trained person" to complete the project and that this position needs to have the full support of the Board.

Sincerely,

John Alan Jelichich, Planning Director

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Co
FROM: J.C. Erikson, Chairman Trinity County Board of S
DATE: July 16, 2002
SUBJECT: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Development and Environment Committee Final Report on the Emergency 911 Mapping System.

The Grand Jury Development and Environment Committee has requested a written response to their Final Report on the Emergency 911 Mapping System. The response of the Board of Supervisors is as follows:

Findings #1 and #2: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Findings #1 and #2.

Recommendations #1 and #2: The recommendation will be implemented. The GIS Committee has met and is moving forward with the project. The Board has been trying to fill the vacancy of a GIS Operator. The Planning Director has been assigned the responsibility for this project for nearly 7 years.

Finding #3: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #3. The data bases of the telephone companies and the county 911 system need to recognize a single address for each residence in the future. At present, the design of the system allows the dispatcher to have both systems information displayed concurrently to avoid confusion.

Recommendation #3: The recommendation will not be implemented. When the County system is complete, then the telephone companies will have to update their system. To attempt to implement the new system on a piecemeal basis will further confuse the process and waste time and money.

Finding #4 and #5: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #4 and #5.

Recommendation #4 and #5: The recommendation will be implemented upon completion of the project.

Conclusion: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors has been embarrassed by the lack of progress Conclusion: The this system. The GIS Committee has established the following work priorities:

1. To provide each Volunteer Fire Department and other emergency responders with street maps of their areas of responsibility.
2. To hire a GIS technician to assign street addresses according to the Docugraph System of 1000 numbers per mile in accordance with the standard adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1985. There may or may not be some exceptions.
3. To provide a coherent data base to the telephone companies that can be uploaded all at once to update their data bases.

This report was Filed on June 28, 2002

**2001 - 2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY
CONTINUITY COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT**

**COUNTY OFFICIALS' RESPONSES TO
2000 - 2001 GRAND JURY REPORTS**

PURPOSE:

By California state law the Grand Jury is charged with reviewing county government operations. To document these reviews, reports are written and responses are required from affected county officers and boards.

BACKGROUND:

Each year beginning July 1ST a new Grand Jury is seated in Trinity County. The term of that Grand Jury is July 1 through June 30 of the following year. By law each Grand Jury is required to document the results of the various investigations conducted throughout its term. These reports include findings and recommendations that require responses from various county employees to the presiding judge. Response times dictated by Penal Code 933 are 60 days for each elected official or department head and 90 days for each governing board. In addition Trinity County has enacted Policy Statement #3-90 Responses to Final Report (copy attached). Under this Trinity County policy statement the timetable for each Elected Official and Department Head is changed from the 60 days under Penal Code 933 to 30 days. The 90 day response time for the Board of Supervisors remains unchanged as does the response time for elected boards. Penal Code 933.05 dictates the form to which each response must adhere. Though the Penal Code requires the time frame for responses to the Grand Jury reports, there is no companion rule or law as to any penalty for failure to respond in the required time frame.

Trinity County Grand Juries have traditionally adopted the procedure of incorporating any submitted responses in their final reports. This procedure allows for simultaneous public disclosure of the Grand Jury report and the county agency head or governing body responses. Public official responses may include proposed actions or determination of no action to follow the Grand Jury recommendations.

The Grand Jury function is that of a citizens' "watchdog" organization. It is deemed to be more meaningful and helpful to the general public to receive each Grand Jury report together with its responses.

However, by waiting for the responses the publication of the Final Report of the Grand Jury is delayed until the responses are received. By Penal Code this would be 90 days after the last report is filed, which is usually before June 30 of each year. Responses that are late cause additional delay of the publication of the Final Grand Jury report for that year. As of the writing of this report in April of 2002, the 2000-2001 Final Report is still not published.

Responses to Grand Jury reports are sent to the Superior Court Judge presiding over the Grand Jury. The Court Executive Officer logs in all responses and furnishes the sitting Grand Jury with a copy. The sitting Grand Jury then determines the completeness of the responses and need for any follow-up. In the case of late responses the sitting Grand Jury foreman and Court Executive Officer determine the need for reminders to be sent out or contacts to be made.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

The Chairman of the Board of Supervisors (BOS) was interviewed to determine the existing arrangement they use for completing responses to Grand Jury reports. The Clerk to the BOS was also interviewed to determine what processes are used in that office to

facilitate timely responses to any Grand Jury reports.

FINDING #1:

Responses to the 2000-2001 Grand Jury reports were noticeably late from many department heads and especially late from the BOS.

The following chart shows the required response time under Penal Code 933 and actual response time for each County officer or Board required to respond to the 2000-2001 Final Grand Jury reports. By county policy all responses from County Officials/Department Heads were actually due in 30 days rather than the 60 days allowed under Penal Code 933.

Trinity County Board of Supervisors
12 reports were due in 90 days.
0 reports were received within 90 days.
Shortest response time was 101 days.
Longest response time was 216 days.
Average response time was 148 days for twelve reports submitted.

County Administrative Officer
7 reports were due in 60 days.
5 reports were received within 60 days.
2 reports were received over the maximum time (76 & 80 days).
County Clerk Recorder
2 reports were due in 60 days.
0 reports were received within 60 days.
2 reports were received over the maximum time (76 & 76 days).

Auditor/Controller
5 reports were due in 60 days.
5 reports were received within 60 days.

Treasurer/Tax Collector
1 report was due in 60 days.
1 report was received within 60 days.

Sheriff
1 report was due in 60 days.
0 reports were received within 60 days.
1 report was received over the maximum time (73 days).

District Attorney
2 reports were due in 60 days.
2 reports were received within 60 days.

Superintendent of Schools
2 reports were due in 60 days.
1 report was received within 60 days.
1 report was received over the maximum time (98 days).

Director of General Services
4 reports were due in 60 days.
0 reports were received within 60 days.
4 reports were received over the maximum time (74 & 74 days).

County Counsel
2 reports were due in 60 days.
0 reports were received within 60 days.
2 reports were received over the maximum time (74 & 74 days).

Trinity County Board of Education
1 report was due in 90 days.
0 reports were received within 90 days.
1 response was received over the maximum time (237 days).

Hospital Board of Directors
2 reports were due in 90 days.

2 reports were received within 90 days.

Hospital Chief of Staff

1 report was due in 60 days.

1 report was received within 60 days.

Hospital Administrator (Incumbent left this position during the report due period. Reports were answered by the replacement.)

2 reports were due in 60 days.

0 reports were received within 60 days.

2 reports were received over the maximum time (75 & 165 days).

Greater Hayfork Park and Recreation District 1 report was due in 90 days.

1 response was received within 90 days.

Salver Community Service District

1 report was due in 90 days.

0 reports were received within 90 days.

NO response was ever received.

RECOMMENDATION #1A:

All County department heads and elected officials must adhere to the time frames established in Penal Code 933 in completing their required responses.

The BOS should mandate that all County Department Heads prepare their responses as per Trinity County Policy Statement #3-90, which will allow the BOS to prepare and approve a response within the required 90 days it is required to respond within.

FINDING #2:

The BOS procedure for completing responses to Grand Jury reports is to assign a report to an individual board member. The board member usually waits for the department head to complete and file the response prior to completing the BOS response. Once drafted the response must be brought before the BOS for adoption as a final recommendation.

The process of bringing the response before the BOS for approval is normally done without an item by item discussion or any open meeting discussion of content. The result appears to be that only one board member becomes fully aware of the content of the response.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

The Grand Jury believes that as the reports are likely to affect all supervisors' districts, and not just the one overseen by the person doing the response, all district supervisors should be knowledgeable about the response. The Grand Jury strongly recommends the full involvement and discussion of the response to the Grand Jury by all members of the BOS. This would require a discussion of the response in an open session of a BOS hearing.

FINDING #3:

Once the response is approved by the BOS it is signed by the current chairman. If there are items requiring action by individual county employees or departments, it is unclear as to who directs the implementation of the action item. In most cases the actions are completed because the Department Head response mirrors the BOS response. However, in one case this did not happen. In the 20002001 report titled Trinity County Treasurer/Tax Collector Department and Related County Operations the Grand Jury recommended that the Treasurer/Tax Collector and the Auditor/Controller meet to discuss possible changes in the recently implemented county money handling policy. The Treasurer/Tax Collector agreed but the Auditor/Controller did not agree. The BOS response agreed with the Grand

Jury recommendation. As of March 2002 such a meeting has NOT taken place.

RECOMMENDATION #3A:

The Grand Jury recommends that the BOS define a process or method of follow-up to insure implementation of what they agree to in Grand Jury reports.

RECOMMENDATION #3B:

The BOS should direct the Auditor/Controller and Treasurer/Tax Collector to meet to discuss and resolve the Treasurer/Tax Collector's input regarding recording errors being incurred by the change in the county money handling system as instituted by the Auditor/Controller.

RESPONSES REQUIRED:

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period.

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	DAYS
Board of Supervisors	1,2,3	1B,2,3A,3B	90
County Clerk/Recorder 1		1A	60
Sheriff	1	1A	60
Superintendent of Schools	1	1A	60
Director of General Services	1	1A	60
County Counsel		1A	60
Trinity County Board of Education	1	1A	60
Salyer CSD	1	1A	60

**POLICY STATEMENT NO. 3-90 (P)
POLICY STATEMENT RE PROCEDURE FOR
COMMENTING
TO GRAND JURY REPORTS AND
THE MANAGEMENT REPORT OF THE ANNUAL
COUNTY AUDIT**

In order to establish a uniform procedure for the preparation and filing of comments to Grand Jury Reports, and the Management Report of the Annual Audit, it is the policy of the Board of Supervisors that the following steps be followed:

Grand Jury Reports:

1. Upon receipt of a final or interim report as provided in Section 933 of the Penal Code, the County Clerk will distribute copies to the members of the Board of Supervisors, the County Administrative Officer, and all affected departments. The Clerk shall establish a timetable for response to the report to comply with the 90 day limitation for the Board of Supervisors and the 60 day limitation for Elective Officers and appointed Department Heads.
2. The County Administrator shall be responsible for the preparation of the response to the recommendations and findings of the Grand Jury.
3. Comments shall be due from affected department heads within 30 days. Upon receipt, the Clerk shall immediately forward copies to the County Administrative officer, Grand Jury and the Superior Court Judge.

4. The County Administrative Officer will review all departmental responses for adequacy and completeness and may comment on the responses but shall not alter them.

5. The County Administrator, in coordination with members of the Board of Supervisors, shall prepare a final draft response which shall be scheduled on the Board agenda for discussion and approval in adequate time to meet the 90 day time frame required by Penal Code Section 933.

6. Upon adoption by the Board, the Clerk will file the original and furnish copies of the response, together with all departmental responses, to the Superior Court Judge, the Grand Jury and others specifically requesting copies.

The response shall reflect substantially the following:

1. As to each finding, whether the responding department agrees with or disputes the finding. If the finding is disputed, an explanation of the dispute should be provided.

2. To enable each Grand Jury to track its recommendations, the response shall indicate that the recommendations:

A. Have been implemented. Provide a summary of significant detail.

B. Will be implemented. A time frame for implementation is required.

C. Requires further analysis. Detailed outline required showing the scope and parameters of the study.

D. Is not feasible. Explanation required.

3. Responses shall be brief and to the point. Each finding and recommendation shall be replied to separately.

Management Reports, Annual Audit:

1. Upon receipt of the Management Report, the County Clerk will distribute copies to the members of the Board of Supervisors, the County Administrative Officer, the Auditor/Controller, the Foremen of the Grand Jury and all affected departments. The Clerk shall establish a timetable for response to the report.

2. Comments shall be due from affected department heads within 30 days. Upon receipt, the Clerk shall immediately forward copies to the County Administrative Officer, the Auditor/Controller, the Grand Jury and the Board of Supervisors.

3. The Management Report and Responses shall be filed in the Office of the County Clerk.

ADOPTED: July 17, 1990

/s/ Howard G. Myrick

Howard G. Myrick - Chairman Board of Supervisors, County of Trinity, State of California.

Responses

June 27, 2002

TO: Honorable John K. Letton Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
FROM: John Whitaker, General Services Director
SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2001-02 Grand Jury Continuity Committee - County Officials' Responses

Finding 1.

Responses to the 2000-2001 Grand Jury reports were noticeably late from many department heads and especially late from the BOS.

Director of General Services
4 reports were due in 60 days.
0 reports were received within 60 days.
4 reports were received over the maximum time (74 & 74 days).

Recommendation #1A:

All County department heads and elected officials must adhere to the time frames established in Penal Code 933 in completing their required responses.

Response to Finding 1. We concur with finding 1.

Response to Recommendation #1A.

We agree in part and disagree in part with the recommendation.

When the issue is simple in nature, we agree that the response should and could be submitted within the 60-day time limit.

However, when more than one report is due and issues are complex in nature and require research, inter-departmental review and consultation; time extensions should be granted in order for the department to give an adequate and appropriate response to the grand jury's queries and recommendations. Regarding the General Services' delay for 2000-2001, along with the issues already listed, County Counsel expressed concern that some reports were improperly formatted, and it took additional time for him to review the reports prior to submittal.

June 26, 2002

TO: Trinity County Grand Jury
Hon. John Letton, Superior Court Judge Trinity
County Board of Supervisors
FROM: Paul Schmidt, Sheriff
SUBJECT: Response to 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Report Continuity Committee-County Officials' Responses

In response to FINDING #1. Sheriff and Recommendation#1A. I agree with the Grand Jury's recommendation.

I acknowledge that in one instance a report was provided outside the time limit. In this case I discovered while out of town that a response to a Grand Jury report had not been prepared as required. Upon returning the response was prepared as quickly as possible but still missed the deadline by about 13 days.

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton Judge of the Superior Court
FROM: David R. Hammer, County Counsel
CC: Trinity County Board of Supervisors
SUBJECT: Response to 2001-02 Grand Jury Continuity Committee Final Report County Officials' Responses to 2000-01 Grand Jury Reports

DATE: July 15, 2002

Finding #1: Two reports due from County Counsel within 60 days were received over the maximum time (74 and 74 days).

Response: I agree that the reports were late.

Recommendation #1A: That all department heads adhere to the time frames in completing their required responses.

Response: To the extent possible, I will implement the recommendation as to my department. The reports from the Grand Jury to which I responded were quite lengthy and required extensive research. It may not always be feasible to respond within the time set forth by the Code.

Recommendation #1B: The BOS should mandate that all County Department Heads prepare their responses as per Trinity County Policy Statement #3-90, which will allow the BOS to prepare and approve a response within the required 90 days it is required to respond within.

Response: I generally agree with the policy that was set by the Board in 1990.

Finding #2: The BOS procedure for completing responses to Grand Jury reports is to assign a report to an individual board member. The board member usually waits for the department head to complete and file the response prior to completing the BOS response. Once drafted the response must be brought before the BOS for adoption as a final recommendation.

The process of bringing the response before the BOS for approval is normally done without an item by item discussion or any open meeting discussion of content. The result appears to be that only one board member becomes fully aware of the content of the response.

Response: I do not agree.

Recommendation #2_ The Grand Jury believes that as the reports are likely to affect all supervisors' districts, and not just the one overseen by the person doing the response, all district supervisors would be knowledgeable about the response. The Grand Jury strongly recommends the full involvement and discussion of the response to the Grand Jury by all members of the BOS. This would require a discussion of the response in an open session of a BOS hearing.

Response: I have no authority to implement the recommendation.

Finding #3: Once the response is approved by the BOS it is signed by the current chairman. If there are items requiring action by individual county employees or departments, it is unclear as to who directs the implementation of the action item. In most cases the actions are completed because the Department Head response mirrors the BOS response. However, in one case this did not happen. In the 2000-2001 report titled Trinity County Treasurer/Tax Collector Department and Related County Operations the Grand Jury recommended that the Treasurer/Tax Collector and the Auditor/Controller meet to discuss possible changes in the recently implemented county money handling policy. The Treasurer/Tax Collector agreed but the Auditor/Controller did not agree. The BOS response agreed with the Grand Jury recommendation. As of March 2002 such a meeting has NOT taken place.

Response: I do not have sufficient information to agree or disagree.

Recommendation #3A:, The Grand Jury recommends that the BOS define a process or method of follow-up to insure implementation of what they agree to in Grand Jury reports.

Response: I have no authority to implement the recommendation.

Recommendation #3B: The BOS should direct the Auditor/Controller and the Treasurer/Tax Collector to meet to discuss and resolve the Treasurer/Tax Collector's input regarding recording errors being incurred by the change in the county money handling system as instituted by the Auditor/Controller.

Response: I have no authority to implement the recommendation.

I request this response be published.

To: John Letton, Judge Trinity County Superior Court

From: Dero Forslund, Trinity County Clerk

Date: August 14, 2002

Response Re: County Officials' Responses to 2000-2001 Grand Jury Reports

Finding #1: Responses to the 2000-2001 Grand Jury reports were noticeably late from many department heads and especially late from the BOS

Recommendation #1A: I concur with the recommendation and will implement the recommendation.

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: Trinity County Board of Supervisors
SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2001-02 Grand Jury Continuity Committee Report
County Officials' Responses to 2000-2001 Grand Jury Reports

DATE: September 17, 2002

The Grand Jury Continuity Committee has requested a written response to their Final Report on County Officials' Responses to 2000-2001 Grand Jury responses. The Board of Supervisors responds as follows:

Finding #1: The Board agrees with the findings. The Board of Supervisors was particularly guilty of not responding in a timely manner. In many cases, the assigned Board member did not receive all of the other respondents' comments in a timely manner, and this delayed to Board's response.

Recommendation #1 A: The Board concurs.

Recommendation #1B: By adopting County Policy statement #3-90 in July of 1990, the Board of Supervisors has already mandated that County Department Heads prepare their responses in accordance with this policy. Action has been completed 12 years ago.

Finding #2: The Board agrees with the findings to the extent that it describes the Board's procedure for handling responses to Grand Jury reports. The Board disagrees that this results in only one Board member being aware of the response. The responses are provided to all the Board members three or four days prior to a vote being taken on the item.

Recommendation #2: The Board disagrees and will not discuss all Grand Jury Responses in open session. All Supervisors receive a separate copy of the Grand Jury reports when the clerk receives them. Supervisors then request that the chairman of the Board assign them to draft particular responses. Grand Jury reports usually require that the assigned Supervisor investigate with the concerned department the issues involved in the report. The Department Head also is required to provide a response if requested by the Grand Jury. If each Supervisor were to investigate each issue, we would probably violate the Brown Act by having too many supervisors together at a meeting, or holding a serial meeting that the public is not invited to attend. The Board of Supervisors routinely assigns an individual supervisor to represent the Board's interests. This is cost effective and a great time saving. Issues raised by a Grand Jury report are known to all Supervisors, and it is a good process to allow the Supervisor who is most interested in the topic to formulate the response.

Finding #3 and Recommendation #3B: The Board agrees with the

findings and supports the Grand Jury recommendation that the Treasurer/Tax Collector and the Auditor/Controller meet and iron out their problems. However, as they are both elected officials, it is not within our power to implement the recommendation. It is surprising that the Grand Jury did not provide a copy of this report to either official, nor request a response from them.

Recommendation #3A: The Board concurs. We have made great strides this year working with the Clerks' office to respond in a timely manner. Perhaps we can find a way to incorporate the recommendations that we accept into our goals and objectives for the budget review and mid-year budget review.

The Board recognized our poor performance in responding to Grand Jury reports, particularly last year. However, the County Clerk has provided us with an excellent way of tracking the reports and responses and that update is provided at each Board meeting. The increased visibility provided by the Clerk of the Board has improved our response time. However, if we were to have waited until we received all other responses to this report, we would still be waiting. Three of the requested responses still have not been received.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

J. C. Erikson, Chairman

Trinity County Board of Supervisors
September 16, 2002
Donna Regnani, Court Executive Officer
Trinity County Grand Jury PO Box 1117
Weaverville CA 96093

Dear Ms. Regnani:

The Trinity County Superintendent of Schools will adhere to the time frames established in Penal Code 933 in completing their required responses.

Sincerely,

James B. French
Trinity County Superintendent of Schools

September 16, 2002
Donna Regnani, Court Executive Officer
Trinity County Grand Jury P O Box 1117
Weaverville CA 96093

Dear Ms. Regnani:

The Trinity County Board of Education will adhere to the time frames established in Penal Code 933 in completing their required responses.

Judith Stewart, President
Trinity County Board of Education

This report was Filed on April 5, 2002

2001-2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY SPECIAL DISTRICTS COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT
FINANCIAL AUDITS OF SPECIAL DISTRICTS HANDBOOK FOR SPECIAL DISTRICTS

PURPOSE:

The Grand Jury is charged with the responsibility to review the management of the departments and special entities of the County government. The Special Districts Committee of the 2001-2002 Grand Jury reviewed the delinquency of financial audits of three Special Districts and the currency of the Handbook for Special Districts.

It is a requirement under Section 26909 of the California Government Code that all Special Districts obtain an annual financial audit. The 2001-2002 Grand Jury is reinvestigating this matter as a result of the failure to comply by three Trinity County Special Districts (Greater Hayfork Valley Park and Recreation District, Salyer Community Service District, and the Lewiston Community Service District) as reported in the 2000-2001 Grand Jury Report.

BACKGROUND:

The management of a special district is responsible for establishing and maintaining an internal financial control structure. The financial reports shall be filed within 12 months of the end of the fiscal year. The 2000-2001 Trinity County Grand Jury concluded that there were three special districts in Trinity County not in compliance: the Greater Hayfork Valley Park and Recreation District, Salyer Community Service District and Lewiston Community Service District. That Jury recommended that the County Auditor/Controller, as per Section 26909 of the California Penal Code, should oversee the audits of these special districts and take any action needed to bring all the districts into compliance.

In his response to the 2000-2001 Trinity County Grand Jury Report dated July 5, 2001, Brian Muir, Auditor/Controller for Trinity County stated that all the special districts had been informed of the requirement regarding yearly financial audits, that due to the expenses incurred by such audits and the limited funds available to these districts, he was giving them "...every opportunity to contract with a local firm." Mr. Muir further stated that if a district failed to obtain an audit on its own, he would contract for an audit as required by government code.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

On October 30, 2001, members of the Special Districts Committee of the Trinity County Grand Jury met with Mr. Muir regarding the delinquent audits of the three special districts.

FINDING #1:

At the October 30, 2001, meeting, Mr. Muir basically reiterated the position that his office is aware of the delinquency of the audits from the three special districts in question. However, due to the expenses required to conduct the audits and the limited funds available to the districts, he was giving them as much latitude as possible in the completion of the requirement under the Code. In the case of the Lewiston Community Service District, Mr. Muir concurred with the 2000-2001 Grand Jury that due to the Lowden Fire, their records had been destroyed and he was allowing them time to reconstruct these records. Mr. Muir assured the committee members that his office was aware of its responsibilities under the Code regarding audits of special districts and would continue to monitor their progress.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

The 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury concurs with the previous year Grand Jury's conclusion that the Greater Hayfork Valley Park and Recreation District, the Salyer Community Service District, and the Lewiston Community Service District are more than 12 months overdue in audits of their respective districts and are not in compliance with government code.

The Grand Jury recognizes that at times state regulations impose financial hardships on small county governments, including special districts. Nevertheless, the County Auditor/Controller needs to work closely with the special districts, assist them in their efforts to comply with the required financial reviews and insure that overdue audits are completed by the end of the 2001-2002 fiscal year.

FINDING #2:

Responding to a follow-up suggestion from the previous Trinity County Grand Jury, the 2001-2002 Grand Jury decided to update the Handbook for Special Districts originally prepared by the 1996-1997 Grand Jury.

State Law defines a special district as "any agency of the state for the local performance of government or propriety functions within limited boundaries." In plain language, a special district is a separate local government that delivers public services. Trinity County has 17 special districts. The 1996-1997 Grand Jury concluded "that there is no reliable, comprehensive source of accurate information that special districts can use for the legislative aspect of district business." That Grand Jury created a Handbook for Special Districts to assist the governing bodies of special districts in Trinity County in the performance of their duties. The handbook had not been updated since 1997.

The Grand Jury Education/Special Districts Committee reviewed the Handbook for Special Districts, determined what changes were needed and edited and updated the handbook.

Changes to the Handbook include but are not limited to: 1) an updated Special Districts Index to include the current names of Board Members, mailing addresses, meeting times and locations; 2) the insertion of a summary of the requirements of the Brown Act (the intent being to have public agencies conduct their business and make their decisions in open public meetings); 3) the insertion of a memorandum dated May 18, 2000, from David Hammer, County Counsel, establishing a procedure for advising newly elected and appointed officials and designated employees of special districts of certain conflict of interest laws; and 4) an overall consolidation and standardized format of the handbook.

The handbook will be distributed to all Special Districts in Trinity County and to the County Board of Supervisors.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

None.

RESPONSES REQUIRED:

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period:

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPOND WITHIN	
Trinity County Board of Supervisors	#1, #2	#1	90 days	Finding #2. The Board further appreciates the work and efforts of the Grand Jury in compiling and updating a Handbook for Special Districts.
County Auditor/Controller	#1	#1	60 days	TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Greater Hayfork Valley Park & Recreation District	#1	#1	90 days	FROM: Brian Muir, Auditor-Controller, performing the duties of County Administrative Officer
Salyer Community Service District	#1	#1	90 days	SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2001-02 Grand Jury
Lewiston Community Service District	#1	#1	90 days	Special Districts Committee Financial Audits of Special Districts and Handbook for Special Districts Final Report

Responses

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: Steve Richards, President - Lewiston Community Services District

SUBJECT: Response to 2001-2002 Grand Jury Special Districts Committee Final Report

DATE: August 8, 2002

DATE: May 28, 2002

The Grand Jury Special Districts Committee has requested a written response to their final report on Financial Audits of Special Districts and Handbook for Special Districts. In my capacity as Auditor-Controller, my response is as follows:

The Grand Jury Special Districts Committee has requested a written response to their Final Report on Financial Audits of Special Districts. On behalf of all the Directors on the board of the Lewiston Community Services District, I am answering their request.

Finding #1: I agree.

Response: Audits from the Greater Hayfork Valley Park and Recreation District, the Salyer Community Service District, and the Lewiston Community Service District are overdue.

Recommendation #1: The recommendation will be implemented.

Finding #1: We agree that the District is overdue with an audit.

Response: We appreciate the latitude given by Brian Muir, County Auditor. We have engaged the services of Hathaway & Ksenzulak, LLP to conduct an audit for fiscal year 2000-2001. The results of this audit will be filed with the County Auditor as soon as it is completed.

Finding #2:

Response: The District appreciates the endeavors of the Grand Jury in updating the Handbook for Special Districts and thank them for our copy.

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: J.C. Erikson, Chairman Trinity County Board of Supervisors

DATE: July 16, 2002

SUBJECT: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Special Districts Committee Final Report on the Financial Audits of Special Districts and Handbook for Special Districts.

The Grand Jury Special Districts Committee has requested a written response to their report Financial Audits of Special Districts and Handbook for Special Districts. The response of the Board of Supervisors is as follows:

Finding #1: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #1.

Recommendation #1: The recommendation will be implemented. The Auditor/Controller is currently contracting with a firm to provide an audit of the district not in compliance. The audit is to be completed by 9/30/02.

Finding #2: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with

This report was Filed on April 15, 2002

2001 - 2002 TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

CALIFORNIA WORK OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO KIDS (CalWORKS) PROGRAM

PURPOSE:

The Grand Jury is required to periodically review the operations of each County department. This year the Social Services Committee of the Grand Jury was tasked to review the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) Program for Trinity County.

BACKGROUND:

Assembly Bill 2580, Chapter 1025, established the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) Act of 1985. This program was implemented in Trinity County in 1988. In August 1996, the Federal government passed into law the Federal Welfare Reform Act, Public Law 104-193, requiring certain changes to California programs. In January 1998, California established the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS) Program that incorporated the GAIN Program and brought it into compliance with Federal law under its new name. The mission to teach, train, counsel and assist those in the program to find employment remains basically the same.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION:

The Social Services Committee interviewed the Director, Health and Human Services Department, and the CalWORKS Employment Program Supervisor. The Social Services Committee also met with the Administrative Services Officer of the Health and Human Services Department, and reviewed several appeals by applicants, which were submitted to a State Administrative Law Judge located in San Francisco.

FINDING #1:

During an interview, in November 2001, it was reported that there were approximately 180 participants in the CalWORKS Program. This fact, by itself, is most noteworthy when compared to over 400 participants four or five years earlier. However, what cannot be ascertained is the reason for the decline. There are various ways for recipients to be dropped from the Program, i.e., move from the County, non-participation, becoming ineligible, voluntary removal, death, and hopefully by gaining employment. This data is necessary to properly measure the success of the CalWORKS Program.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

The Grand Jury recommends that the CalWORKS Program and the Health and Human Services Department jointly establish internal records to capture data regarding changes in the number of participants enrolled in the CalWORKS Program and the reason for those changes.

FINDING #2:

The administering of the CalWORKS Program, as with most programs which provide assistance, evokes many emotions on the part of both the providers and the recipients. Stress among caseworkers is always a concern. In such an intense area, the enthusiasm, compassion and the "can do" attitude of the Director of Health and Human Services and the CalWORKS Supervisor are most commendable, gratifying, and should be recognized. Their attitude has a direct bearing on the morale of the employees as well as the level of assistance provided to those in need.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

The Grand Jury recommends that commendations be rendered to the Director of Health and Human Services and the CalWORKS Supervisor as well as all case workers who provide such a needed service to all participants in the Program and ultimately benefit all of Trinity County.

RESPONSES REQUIRED:

Under Penal Code 933, the following entities are required to respond to the listed findings and recommendations within the required time period:

ENTITY	FINDING	RECOMMENDATION	RESPOND WITHIN
Trinity County Board of Supervisors	#1, #2	#1, #2	90 days
Director, Health and Human Services	#1, #2	#1, #2	60 days
CalWORKS Employment Program Supervisor	#1, #2	#1, #2	60 days

Date: June 4, 2002

To: John K. Letton Presiding Judge, of the Superior Court

From: Donna Pate, Supervisor Trinity County Health and Human Services CalWORKs Employment Services Program

Re: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Report California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs Employment) Program

The following is my response to the 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Report on the CalWORKs Employment Program.

Recommendation #1

I concur with the Grand Jury's recommendation. Enrollments and exits within the CalWORKs program can now be obtained by generating an ADHOC report through the ISAWS and WTW state computer systems. Additional information regarding specific reasons for exiting the program is accessible through departmental records. We will coordinate these resources into a report containing current and concise information on the number and reasons of recipients who exit from the program.

Recommendation #2

I concur with the Grand Jury's recommendation. I have met my superior, the Director of Health and Human Services, Linda Wright who will draft and deliver letters of commendation to the staff of Trinity County Health and Human Services Department - CalWORKs Employment Services Program.

Conclusion:

I would like to thank the Grand Jury Committee for their review of the CalWORKs Employment Services Program. Their recommendations are greatly appreciated and will be handled appropriately.

To: The Honorable John K. Letton Presiding Judge, of

the Superior Court

From: Linda Wright, Director Trinity County Health and Human Services

Re: Response to 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Report California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program

Date: July 9, 2002

The Grand Jury Social Services Committee has requested a written response to their final report on the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. In my capacity as Director of Health and Human Services, my response is as follows:

Finding #1: (In pertinent part) "However, what cannot be ascertained is the reason for the decline. There are various ways for recipients to be dropped from the Program, i.e., move from the County, non-participation, becoming ineligible, voluntary removal, death, and hopefully by gaining employment. This data is necessary to properly measure the success of the CalWORKs Program."

Response #1: "The Grand Jury recommends that the CalWORKs Program and the Health and Human Services Department jointly establish internal records to capture data regarding changes in the number of participants enrolled in the CalWORKs Program and the reason for those changes."

I agree in part with the Grand Jury's finding. I note that at the time of the review by the Grand Jury, the Welfare to Work computer network had only recently become operational, and staff was not fully trained in all its capabilities.

Recommendation #1: Will be implemented. Health and Human Services is currently training additional staff on Ad Hoc reporting through the WTW and ISAWS computer systems, which will increase our ability to track recipient data, including information on why recipients are leaving the CalWORKs program.

Finding #2: "The administering of the CalWORKs Program, as with most programs which provide assistance, evokes many emotions on the part of both the providers and the recipients. Stress among caseworkers is always a concern. In such an intense area, the enthusiasm, compassion and the "can do" attitude of the Director of Health and Human Services and the CalWORKs Supervisor are most commendable, gratifying, and should be recognized. Their attitude has a direct bearing on the morale of the employees as well as the level of assistance provided to those in need."

Response #2: "The Grand Jury recommends that commendations be rendered to the Director of Health and Human Services and the CalWORKs Supervisor as well as all caseworkers who provide such a needed service to all participants in the Program and ultimately benefit all of Trinity County."

I agree with the Grand Jury's finding.

Recommendation #2: Will be implemented. I appreciate the CalWORKs Employment Services staffs hard work and dedication to the participants of the Employment Services Program. They are recognized on a regular basis by the thanks they receive from the participants they assist, and I will write letters of commendation to each of them.

Conclusion: I thank the members of the Grand Jury Committee for their review of the CalWORKs Employment Services Program. I appreciate their recommendations and will act upon them appropriately.
Sincerely,

Linda Wright, Director
Trinity County Health and Human Services Department

TO: The Honorable John K. Letton, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: J.C. Erikson, Chairman
Trinity County Board of Supervisors

DATE: July 16, 2002

SUBJECT: 2001-2002 Trinity County Grand Jury Social Services Committee Final Report on the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (Cal WORKS) Program.

The Grand Jury Social Services Committee has requested a written response to their report California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (Cal WORKS) Program. The response of the Board of Supervisors is as follows:

Finding #1: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #1.

Recommendation #1: The recommendation will be implemented. The Health and Human Services staff is currently undergoing training.

Finding #2: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors agrees with Finding #2.

Recommendation #2: The recommendation is hereby implemented and the Trinity County Board of Supervisors commends the Health and Human Services Director and the Cal WORKS Supervisor, as well as all case workers who provide such a needed service to all participants in the program and ultimately benefit all of Trinity County.

Conclusion: The Trinity County Board of Supervisors would like to thank the Grand Jury for their review of the Cal WORKS Employment Services Program. The findings and recommendations are appreciated and the Board looks forward to working with the Grand Jury, in the future, on these and other matters of concern.