

2015-2016
TEHAMA COUNTY
GRAND JURY
FINAL REPORT





Table of Contents

Approval for Filing the 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury	
Final Reports by Superior Court Judge Jonathan W. Skillman	3
Submission of the 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury	
To Presiding Superior Court Judge Jonathan W. Skillman	4
The Tehama County Grand Jury: an Overview	5
The Tehama County Grand Jury Foreperson Statement	7
Acknowledgements	9
2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury Members	10
2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury Committees and Members	11
2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury Agency Inquiries	
Tehama County Parks	12
Red Bluff City Parks	14
Corning City Parks	17
Tehama County Jail Inquiry	19
Tehama County Juvenile Hall	24
Tehama County Conservation Work Camps	27
Tehama County Veterans Service Office	31
Tehama County Library	35
Tehama County Mental Health Department	39
Red Bluff High School	40
Auditor's Summary Report	43
Past/Future Grand Jury Recommendations and Citizen Complaints	46

Responses to the Recommendations of the 2014-2015 Grand Jury	47
Board of Supervisors Response	48
Tehama County Sheriff's Response	54
Tehama County Probation Department Response	56
Tehama County Social Services Response	58
Tehama County Public Works (Water District) Response	60
Summary of Agencies Visited by Past Grand Juries	64

The 2015-2016 TEHAMA COUNTY GRAND JURY

Approved this FINAL REPORT

Thomas Moulton

Foreperson, 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury

I Accept for Filing the Final Report of this

2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury

Honorable Jonathan W. Skillman

Supervising Judge of the 2015-2016 Grand Jury

**2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury
County of Tehama
PO Box 1061
Red Bluff, CA 96080**

Honorable Jonathan W. Skillman
Judge of the Superior Court Dept. 4
County of Tehama
PO Box 248
Red Bluff, CA 96080

Dear Judge Skillman:

In compliance with California Penal Code 933, the 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury submits its final report.

The 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury Final Report includes reports on eighteen individual inquires made of local government departments. The members of the 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury reviewed and voted on all the reports. All of the reports received affirmative votes by super majority for inclusion and publication in the 2015-2016 Tehama County Jury Final Report.

We respectfully submit the 2015-2016 Tehama County grand Jury final Report for you review and approval for filing.

Sincerely,

Thomas Moulton
Foreperson, 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury

The Tehama County Grand Jury

The California Constitution mandates the establishment of a grand jury in each county. The functions of the grand jury are defined in the California Penal Code. The grand jury is administered by the Superior Court and is part of the judicial branch of the county government. Its functions are investigatory and fall into two basic categories, civil and criminal.

In its civil function, the grand jury investigates city and county governmental agencies, as well as special districts, examining procedures, methods and systems to ensure that the interests of the citizens of the county are being met effectively. Problems within these agencies may be noted, and solutions recommended, in the grand jury's reports. This is often referred to as serving in a civil "watchdog" capacity.

In its criminal function, the grand jury has a responsibility to inquire into possible public offenses and misconduct of public officers while in office. In addition, the grand jury may be called on to determine whether to return indictments charging the commission of felonies.

The Tehama County Grand Jury consists of 19 persons chosen from the citizens of the county. Individually, and as a group, they are expected to exercise diligence and sound judgment independent of other governmental agencies in carrying out their mandated responsibilities. Unlike most other counties, where the members of the grand jury are chosen from a list of applicants or volunteers, the members of the Tehama County Grand Jury are chosen from a randomly selected group of citizens as in a regular jury pool. This mode of selection provides a wide range of localities, ages, employment, and educational backgrounds among the members of the grand jury. This diversity not only brings a broad base of knowledge and experience to the group, but also brings an important variety of perspectives and insights into each of the situations investigated. This strengthens the ability of the grand jury to ensure that the needs of all the citizens of the county are being considered.

Inquiries into county agencies can be initiated within the grand jury itself, or can be initiated through complaints from the citizens of the county alleging misconduct or irregularities in the functions of the government. These complaints are acknowledged and considered by the grand jury to determine if an investigation is warranted. Some complaints are investigated independently. Others are included as part of a routine inquiry into the agency in question. Some are not acted upon by the grand jury because they are already being resolved through another venue, and do not fall within the jurisdiction of the grand jury, or there is not sufficient time left to do a thorough investigation. In this last situation, the complaint is passed on to the next grand jury with a request that the members consider acting upon it.

Reports issued by the grand jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code Section 929 requires that reports of the grand jury not contain the name of any person, or facts leading to the identity of any person who provides information to the grand jury. The California State Legislature has stated that it intends the provision of the Penal Code Section 929 prohibiting disclosure of witness identities to encourage full candor in testimony in grand jury investigation by protection the privacy and confidentiality of those who participate in any grand jury investigation.

The Presiding Judge, the District Attorney, the County Counsel and other county departments and agencies assist the grand jury in its responsibilities.

Foreperson's Statement

Overview

The 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury has completed its responsibilities as charged by the Superior Court Supervising Judge of the 2015-2016 Grand Jury, the Honorable Jonathan Skillman. The activities of the grand jury impaneled and sworn in on June 25, 2015 are detailed in the pages that follow.

On July 22-23, 2015 a two day training seminar was held by the California Grand Jurors' Association (CGJA) for the jurors and an additional one day seminar for the foreperson and foreperson pro tempore. These were extremely beneficial in defining our responsibilities, providing guidance for organizing our team and laying out the sequence for proceeding with our activities for the year. Three of our members attended a report writing seminar in November that provided a detailed process for documenting work and writing reports. All of the seminars were informative, well organized, and provided excellent workbooks for reference.

Start Up

We quickly learned that no one is born to be a Grand Juror! The initial shock trying to assimilate all the legal data and procedures contained in the notebooks from the Judge and the CGJA was overwhelming. We scrambled to get organized, establish committees, meeting times, agendas and direction. We started from scratch. None of us realized just how much time would be required each month. In fact some of our jurors discovered they could not attend with these requirements and were replaced later in the year. As to be expected, not everyone could make every meeting: full plenary sessions usually twice a month, committee meetings usually once a month.

Activities

This is not a volunteer organization, we are citizens summoned to duty and sworn to uphold the law and do our best to perform the "watchdog" oversight of our local governing agencies, then publicly report findings and recommendations to the citizens of our county. As the monthly meetings progressed we came together as a unit, helped and encouraged one another, researched areas of concern, and started inquiring and visiting various departments in our local government. We met with supervisors, department heads, administrators, and employees of various entities within the county. We attended meetings, made requests, took tours, and conducted interviews. Everyone we met was gracious, professional, knowledgeable and willing to answer our questions. As a result, we received an eye-opening education about the inner workings of our local government.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Begin by reviewing the Summary of Agencies Visited by Past Grand Juries at the end of every Grand Jury Final Report. We would encourage new Grand Jurors to study three or four years of previous Grand Jury reports. Note the findings and recommendations and review the agency responses published the following year and decide if they had been addressed properly or if they need further investigating

It's important to make time for all members to get to know one another, discuss areas of interest, experience, and goals before assigning to committees.

We recommend using various sources to research an agency before determining where to visit or investigate. Then make a list of key questions designed to explore the areas of interest. Using tape recorders during the interview are a great help when it comes to documenting the discussion section of your reports.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury would like to extend our sincere and appreciative thanks to several key people who supported us throughout the year.

We thank the Presiding Superior Court Judge Jonathan W. Skillman for his support and encouragement this year. He provided a clear sense of our responsibilities when we were impaneled and attended our first plenary meeting to answer questions, provide guidance and offer his support to us during the course of the year.

We thank Kathy Lytle, an Administrative Secretary for Tehama County, for helping us coordinate all of the interactions with the county government and providing the supplies we needed to make our job easier. She also made arrangements for all our training seminars with the CGJA, (California Grand Jury Association).

We thank District Attorney Gregg Cohen for his help and understanding in guiding us through the sensitive legal aspects of some of our investigations.

We thank County Counsel Arthur Wylene who gave us considerable insight and direction which helped us understand the complexities of county government and the legal methods for presenting our investigative reports.

We are thankful for the welcome cooperation of all the members of the governing community who we found to be professional, responsible, honest and informative in answering our inquiries.

As the foreperson, I also want to thank every member of the 2015-2016 Grand Jury. I was pleased with the respect and focus demonstrated by all of the members of the Grand Jury over many hours of potentially contentious discussions. Their collective wisdom and decisions were valued and very appreciated. As the final reports were being prepared the committee chairs, editorial committee (Thomas Moulton, Cari Rodriguez, Celia McCulloch, Linda Pitter, Zachary Sylvia, Marcos Villalba, Cynthia Shepherd, Harold Dodero) and others were meeting almost on a weekly basis to accomplish what we described as “writing college term papers on eight different subjects all due at the end of the semester”. I commend them all for their willingness and dedication to devoted to the task!

2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury Members

1. Foreperson—Thomas Moulton
2. Pro-Tem—Marcos Villalba
3. Secretary—Celia McCulloch
4. Sergeant at Arms—Harold Dodero
5. Cynthia Sheppard
6. Jessie Herd
7. Darlene Cox
8. Zachary Sylvia
9. Linda Pitter
10. Rod Lucero
11. Ann Freimuth
12. Alson Blomquist
13. Hollis Worley
14. Doug Bauman
15. Gilbert Arellano
16. Cari Rodriguez
17. Raymond Ross
18. Russell Butler

2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury Committees

Audit and Finance

Gilbert Arellano, Chair Committee Members: Hollis Worley
Ann Freimuth

County Government

Linda Pitter, Chair Committee Members: Darlene Cox
Cari Rodriguez
Al Blomquist
Gilbert Arellano

Education

Cynthia Sheppard, Chair Committee Members: Russell Butler
Marcos Villalba
Zachary Sylvia

Law Enforcement

Harold Doderer, Chair Committee Members: Marcos Villalba
Celia McCulloch
Cari Rodriguez
Rod Lucero
Raymond Ross

Parks & Recreation

Doug Bauman, Chair Committee Members: Al Blomquist
Gilbert Arellano
Rod Lucero

Health & Welfare

Celia McCulloch, Chair Committee Members: Cynthia Sheppard
Jessie Herd
Hollis Worley

TEHAMA COUNTY & CITY PARKS AND RECREATION



SUMMARY

Members of the Grand Jury for 2015-2016, conducted an investigation of Tehama County Parks, Red Bluff City Parks and Corning City Parks. Our interest was focused on the safety of our parks and the public's willingness to use them.

METHODOLOGY

In September 2015, we met with City of Red Bluff Parks and Recreation staff as well as the Tehama County Facilities Maintenance staff. In October 2015, we met City of Red Bluff Parks and Recreation staff and toured Dog Island Park, Samuel Ayers Park, Diamond Park, Forward Park and Red Bluff City Park. In November 2015, we met with City of Corning Public Works staff. At that time we toured Lennox Park and Woodson Park. In January 2016, we met with Tehama County Parks Commission and two county supervisors.

BACKGROUND

The Tehama County Grand Jury is charged by law to periodically review management and operation of the County government and any city within the county. One area of review is Parks and Recreation. This current investigation is not complaint based. Following areas were of interest City of Red Bluff, City of Corning, and Tehama County Parks.

DISCUSSION

Tehama County Parks

Members of the Grand Jury met with the Tehama County Facilities Maintenance Department. The role of the Maintenance Department oversees the county buildings, courthouse and the parks of Tehama County. The department maintains seven county parks including Cone Grove, Gerber Park, Mill Creek Park, Ridgeway Park, Simpson-Finnell, Norland Park, and Tehama County River Park (Woodson Bridge). The Maintenance Department employs eleven people; five janitorial staff and six maintenance workers. All of the playground equipment has been replaced within the past eight years, mostly funded by grant money. Tehama County Parks have been able to utilize AB109, ISHI Conservation and Salt Creek labor, for a nominal fee of \$200 per day per crew. The Tehama County Parks were well maintained, but in need of updated mowers and a tractor.

FINDINGS

F1: Tehama County Parks were well maintained but in need of a mower and tractor.

RECOMMENDATIONS

R1: Tehama County Parks needs funding for a new mower and tractor.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933.05, the grand jury requests responses from the Tehama County Chief Administrator and the Tehama County Board of Supervisors.



Red Bluff City Parks

DISCUSSION

Red Bluff City Parks

Members of the Grand Jury met with certain members of the City of Red Bluff Parks & Recreation Department staff. The entire staff consists of a Recreation Director and two employees. As a result of budget cuts the staff was reduced from five to two employees. It was noted that the City of Red Bluff Parks staff duties encompass the roads of the City of the Red Bluff. As a result the primary workload is focused on the roads and not the parks.

The City of Red Bluff Parks staff is challenged by two things: the homeless population and antiquated equipment. Equipment problems include buried sprinkler valves, old mowers, and security cameras that have been stolen. The use of old sprinkler valves has created many hours of maintenance. The need to improve the parks is to purchase new equipment, purchase new playgrounds, upgrade the parking lots, and restrooms. One way to attract the public is to invest in water spray parks. A new boat ramp and restrooms at the Red Bluff River Park have been approved and the expected start date is the fall of 2016. Currently the City of Red Bluff Parks do not have grants secured to help update the parks.

FINDINGS

- F1: Red Bluff City Parks are understaffed with two full time employees and the Parks and Recreation Director focused on City of Red Bluff roads and the city parks.
- F2: Grant money needs to be procured for maintenance and updating of equipment for the City of Red Bluff Parks.


- F3: City of Red Bluff Parks has buried sprinkler valves and old mowers creating more work. Camera systems have been stolen creating security risks.
- F4: There is an increase of homeless people staying in Dog Island Park and River Park causing these two parks to be unsafe and not family friendly.

RECOMMENDATIONS


- R1: Recommend the use of alternative work forces such as AB109 inmates where applicable. City of Red Bluff Parks must increase staff.
- R2: City of Red Bluff must research and do a better job of applying for grant monies that are available for parks.
- R3: City of Red Bluff Parks must update sprinkler valves, purchase a new mower, and replace security cameras that were stolen.
- R4: The Parks need to have more frequent security presence utilizing the City of Red Bluff Police and Tehama County S.T.A.R.S.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933, the grand jury requests a response from the City Council of the City of Red Bluff.



Dog Island Park, River Park and Diamond Park



Corning Parks

DISCUSSION

City of Corning Parks & Recreation

In November 2015, the Grand Jury met with City of Corning Public Works staff. There are nine parks totaling forty acres in Corning. Corning Parks has one full time and one part time employee designated to the nine parks. The Parks are starting to experience a homeless population impacting their parks however a strong police presence is helping maintain safety. Locking restrooms at night has prevented vandalism. Salt Creek inmates are used occasionally, but cost a fee. Enlisted at times are church groups that have helped in cleanup. The city of Corning pays an outside firm to clean the restrooms in their city parks as well as to clean county buildings and administration offices. They have been successful in generating grant money for some of the newer parks, but have been unsuccessful in getting grant money for their older parks. Two new parks have been built recently, Lennox Field opening on June 9th 2015 and a new skate park opening on March 14th 2014.

FINDINGS


F1: City of Corning Parks is understaffed with one full time employee and one part time employee.


RECOMMENDATIONS

R1: City of Corning Parks needs to increase staff.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933, the grand jury requests a response from the City Council of the City of Coming.





Tehama County Jail Inquiry 2015-16

SUMMARY

Penal Code 919(b) stipulates that the Grand Jury shall inquire into the condition and management of the public prisons within the county, which includes both state and local correctional facilities. Members of the current 2015-16 Tehama County Grand Jury toured the County Jail and conducted interviews as required.

The members of the grand jury found that the Tehama County Jail was:

- Within the legal limits for the number of inmates housed
- Housing inmates for longer sentences than for which it was designed
- Having difficulty filling a Bilingual staff member
- Running day reporting programs at alternate locations
- Providing inmates with the option to participate in the online GED program
- Utilizing the new communications center with success
- Within legal requirements in regards an inmate complaint

GLOSSARY

JC—Jail Chief
CO – Correctional Officer
CS – Correctional Sergeant
DA - District Attorney
DOE—Department of Education
GED – General Education Degree
IP – Internet Protocol
IT – Information Technology
EHM-Electronic Home Monitoring

BACKGROUND

Civil Grand Juries are required to examine, evaluate and report on physical and administrative conditions of public jails within their county. The County Jail located at 502 Oak Street, was visited by members of the 2015-16 Tehama County Grand Jury.

METHODOLOGY

The grand jury visited the jail facilities in August 2015. The interview and tour was conducted with senior Jail personnel. Inmate complaints, grievances, and incident reports were reviewed.

DISCUSSION – COUNTY JAIL

Staffing and Cells

The facility was found to be well kept and clean. The Jail’s “rated capacity” by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) is 191; however, it has 227 beds. As of the interview date, there were 191 inmates.

The jail is divided into two wings, the East wing, built in 1994, and the West wing, built in 1974. The West wing is where the “hard cells” are located. As noted in the last two previous Grand Jury reports, there still is only one sobering cell and one safety cell. This is a continuing problem during rodeo times as there may be up to ten persons in the one sobering cell at a time. These cells are video monitored with physical checks each hour. It was originally planned that with the addition of the new communications center, relocating the former dispatch would free up room for additional sobering and safety holding cells, but due to building code issues, the funding needed to be able to bring the old building up to current code standards is too high. It is hopeful that the new facility being built across the street can be utilized for this need.

The current management feels there is plenty of staff and administration to run the jail, however, due to the effects of AB 109, in respect to occupancy in the jail, they should always remain fully staffed.

As of August 2015 there are no multi-lingual instructors with plans to hire a candidate by December 31, 2015, it has not been possible to do so. This is beyond their control due to applicants failing background checks. This is not a budget issue. It was also explained that hiring one language specialist (Spanish) does not meet the needs of non-English speaking inmates due to the many diverse languages spoken within the facility. Hiring strictly a Spanish speaker would not fill the gaps. In addition to Spanish, there are many different languages spoken by inmates, such as Hmong and other Asian dialects. The most recent applicants who were multi-lingual failed to pass the necessary protocol to work at the jail. The jail staff does have access to translators through social services. They also have current inmates translate as necessary, if the staff is in a bind; they have a fluent Spanish speaking staff in the main front office who can

translate in an emergency situation. It was indicated that approximately 1% of the inmates currently do not speak English. So far, the lack of having a multi-lingual staff member has not compromised the efficiency of the jail.

There must be one female staff member on every shift. At the time of this interview the staff consisted of two female CS's.

State inspections for Medical/Mental, Environmental and Nutritional Health took place 12/16/2014. The menus are reviewed by a dietary specialist and were last reviewed in April, 2015.

Because of AB 109, they have EHM, a day reporting program as well as the cabinet and auto programs for inmates who "pose the least amount of threat to society". They also have 100 people in their ankle monitor and work program, monitored by five people, paid for with AB109 funding.

Continuing Education

Inmates have access to a GED (high school diploma) program through the online program provided by the Tehama County Department of Education. Inmates also can take Parenting Classes and Drug & Alcohol prevention programs.

The jail contracts with the Tehama County Department of Education and offers a General Education Degree (GED) to inmates that wish to participate. It is strictly a volunteer program and inmates do not have to qualify for this program. An inmate simply needs to complete an application and they are enrolled. The self-paced curriculum is computer based and the computers are available 24/7. There are eight computers for inmate use, and the jail recently contracted with a new IT company called West Coast, and they have experienced no issues with online classes since the transition to West Coast. The new IT Company has brought the computers up to current standards. Inmates also have the option of completing the GED course by using a book, if they would rather not utilize computer online services.


There are five inmates utilizing the GED services provided. The administration anticipates numbers to increase to ten, as their current software license can support ten inmates. They are looking to fill the vacancies this spring.

Because of the self-paced curriculum, there are no instructors; however tutors are available, if requested. The Dept. of Ed is looking into providing English as a Second Language (ESL) class as well as adding new vocational schooling via online learning.

Parenting classes are available in conjunction with the Department of Social Services. The classes are available to all inmates but they must initiate a request for this service. These classes are on a request-only basis and are an individual "one on one" forum, not classroom based.

New Communications Center

At the time of the tour, a new dispatch facility was being built at the jail, and it they were hoping to combine the city of Corning and the city of Red Bluff, which would save the county money. Follow-up interview confirms that the facility is up and running and fully operational, and despite a few bugs when first started, the facility is a success. The new dispatch center values employees, as the facility is updated and provides an excellent work environment. Contract negotiations are currently underway with the City of Corning.



Complaints, Grievances, and Incident Reports

Most inmate complaints are due to the food (too hot, too cold) or medical. They have a medical staff through the Health Services Agency available Monday-Sunday, and that includes one doctor, two physician assistants, two nurses and one supervisory nurse. All medical issues are documented. Inmates are almost all released on Medi-Cal or ACA (Affordable Care Act) when they leave the facility. Inmates have rotating visiting hours, listed on their website.

1. Food: Another continuing complaint is regarding the food. This too is regulated under Title 15 which regulates food and calories. The facility is only required to offer one hot meal per day. However, this jail offers two; one at breakfast and one at dinner. Lunch is a cold meal. The jail tries to honor legitimate religious diet requests that require vegan or vegetarian meals. Some inmates are used to help with food preparation.
2. Medical: The latest complaint is in regards to Health Services. The jail is required to have some type of medical services available to all inmates. Currently, the jail employs two full time nurses who work 12 hour shifts during the day. If a medical emergency arises after hours, the inmate is transported to the local hospital by either the Sheriff or ambulance depending on the issue. Social Services work with inmates who don't have insurance, but are eligible; so that they will have medical insurance upon their release.

3. Inmates are provided with visiting hours, which are updated and easily accessed on their website.

FINDINGS

- F1: The Tehama County Jail Facility is within its legal inmate count.
- F2: Additional Sobering/Safety cells are hoped to be constructed at new facility.
- F3: Inmates have the opportunity to complete their GED
- F4: Jail Administration has been unable to find a qualified applicant for a bilingual staff position.
- F5: Jail Administration has remained within legal requirements related to inmate meals and inmate medical care.
- F6: A new communications center is successfully operational.
- F7: The Jail is housing inmates with longer sentences and charged with more serious offenses than for which it was designed. There is a proposal to add an additional 64 beds to the facility.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1: None
- R2: None
- R3: None
- R4: Continue to search for a bilingual instructor
- R5: None
- R6: None
- R7: The Tehama County Sheriff's Department shall continue to report outlining any changes to the facility that will be required to maintain the health and safety of the inmates and the staff at the Tehama County Jail as a result of incarcerating inmates for longer sentences and more serious offenses than the Jail was designed. The findings of this report shall be considered in the planning of any proposed additions to the facility.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05, the grand jury requests responses as follows:
The grand jury requires a response from the Tehama County Sheriff and the Tehama County Board of Supervisors.

Tehama County Juvenile Hall 2015-16

SUMMARY

The Tehama County Juvenile Hall is operated by the Tehama County Probation Department, and was inspected by the Grand Jury under the authority of Penal Code section 925. Members of the current 2015-2016 Tehama County Grand Jury toured the Juvenile Hall.

The jury was provided a thorough tour of this facility in December 2015.

During the tour it was found that the Juvenile Hall:

- Was well below its maximum capacity.
- Educational facilities include a classroom, teacher and teacher's aide.
- Each pod was continuously monitored from a control station that overlooked the facility.

GLOSSARY

MRT – Moral Reconciliation Therapy

Ward – Juvenile Inmate

BACKGROUND

Civil Grand Juries are required to examine, evaluate and report on physical and administrative conditions of public "prisons" within their county, and are further authorized to investigate all other "departments or functions of the county." While the Juvenile Hall is not a conventional jail or "prison," it is responsible for the confinement of troubled minors and consequently warrants active examination by the Grand Jury. The Juvenile Hall located at 1840 Walnut St. was visited by members of the Tehama County Grand Jury.

METHODOLOGY

In December 2015, the Grand Jury interviewed management-level personnel of the Tehama County Probation Department, who provided a tour of the facility.

DISCUSSION

We found the facility to be in excellent condition, other than the lobby chairs. These are the orange chairs found upon entering the facility. They have holes, are worn and dirty. This facility was built in 2003 based on a 50-year population estimate. The capacity is 64 beds, however in the last five years the highest number they've had is 25. There are currently 14 wards in residence.

Within the first 90 hours or so, all juveniles go through an M.A.T.T. (Multi Assessment Treatment Team). They are seen by a doctor to make sure there are no medical issues to

determine if they are harmful to themselves or others. Then wards go to court to determine the length of their stay. Education Assessments are conducted to determine their educational level.

The ward area is divided into three pods. Each pod has a classroom and day area. There are currently 14 wards split between two pods. Wards with behavior issues are housed in Pod A. Once they improve, they can be moved to Pod B. Each day area is equipped with a TV that has cable. One pod has a foosball table and a ping pong table. The third pod is currently being used as storage, and the classroom within this pod is used as a staff training room.

The wards are awakened at 7:00 a.m. and have time for personal hygiene and then breakfast. School starts at 8:30 a.m. The Tehama County Dept. of Education provides a principal, a teacher and a teacher's aide. The curriculum is individualized to each ward based on assessments. Their packets are designed according to where they are in their studies. The teachers work closely with the public schools because it is the goal of this facility that when a ward leaves, they are prepared to return to mainstream school. School session is over at 2:30 p.m.

The current age range of wards can be 11-19. Legally, this facility can keep a ward until the age of 21. However, if the ward was tried as an adult, then at the age of 18 that ward is remanded to prison or county jail depending on the crime.

There is not a strict exercise program for the wards, but there is gym equipment and an obstacle course on site. There is a well-maintained garden that allows wards to learn gardening skills. Extra produce harvested is sent to senior facilities and other programs.

The Juvenile Hall uses the MRT assessment, an evidence based practice. The assessment is used on each ward and it looks at their strengths and tries to reinforce them; then looks at weaknesses and tries to remediate them. As an example the wards are responsible for keeping the facility clean.

Juvenile Hall wards are required to have one hot meal per day and that meal is served at lunch. Dinner, which is around 4:00 p.m., is usually a sandwich, chips, fruit and water.

FINDINGS

F1: The Juvenile Hall is well below its maximum capacity, and should be able to absorb any increase due to population growth in the county.

F2: The wards in the Juvenile Hall are provided with individualized educational opportunities appropriate to their assessed needs.

F3: The lobby chairs are in need of replacement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

R1: None

R2: None

R3: New chairs for the lobby can be built by utilizing AB109 labor.

RECOMMENDATIONS

R1: RBUHSD must provide tighter security by fencing off the campus.

R2: None


R3: Link security camera system to RBPD as recommended by prior Grand Jury.

R4: None

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933, the Grand Jury requests a response from the Board of Trustees of RBUHSD.

The Grand Jury further solicits comments from the Tehama County Department of Education and the Superintendent of RBUHS in regards to the aforementioned findings and recommendations.



INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

To the Board of Supervisors and Grand Jury
County of Tehama
Red Bluff, California

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund and the aggregate remaining fund information of the County of Tehama, California (County), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2015, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the County's basic financial statements as listed in the table of contents.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinions.

To the Board of Supervisors and Grand Jury
County of Tehama
Red Bluff, California

Opinions

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the County as of June 30, 2015, and the respective changes in financial position and, where applicable, cash flows thereof for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Emphasis of Matter

As discussed in Note 1Q to the basic financial statements, in 2015, the County implemented Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement Nos. 68, 69, and 71. The implementation of GASB 68 and 71 resulted in the restatement of beginning net position for the year ended June 30, 2015. Our opinion is not modified with respect to these matters.

As described in Note 11B, the net pension liability is measured as of June 30, 2014 and the pension expense is for the measurement period of 2013-2014. Our opinion is not modified with respect to this matter.

Other Matters

Required Supplementary Information

Accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require that the management's discussion and analysis, County Pension Plans - Schedule of Changes in Net Pension Liability and Related Ratios, County Pension Plans - Schedule of Contributions, Notes to County Pension Plans, County OPEB Plan - Schedule of Funding Progress, and budgetary comparison information as listed in the table of contents be presented to supplement the basic financial statements. Such information, although not a part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. We have applied certain limited procedures to the required supplementary information in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, which consisted of inquiries of management about the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management's responses to our inquiries, the basic financial statements, and other knowledge we obtained during our audit of the basic financial statements. We do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on the information because the limited procedures do not provide us with sufficient evidence to express an opinion or provide any assurance.

Other Information

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the County's basic financial statements. The introductory section and combining nonmajor fund financial statements are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements.


To the Board of Supervisors and Grand Jury
County of Tehama
Red Bluff, California

The combining nonmajor fund financial statements are the responsibility of management and were derived from and relate directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or to the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the combining nonmajor fund financial statements are fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

The introductory section has not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements, and accordingly, we do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on it.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated February 22, 2016, on our consideration of the County's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards in considering the County's internal control over financial reporting and compliance.


Smith & Newell CPAs
Yuba City, California
February 22, 2016

PAST AND FUTURE GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS AND CITIZEN COMPLAINTS

FOLLOW UP

The 2014-2015 Tehama County Grand Jury recommended the 2015-2016 Grand Jury review the following:

Follow up on with the findings and/or progress with water issues in the Antelope area.

Response: The 2015-2016 Grand did not pursue further inquiries after receiving the responses from the agencies requested.

CITIZEN COMPLAINTS

The 2015-2016 Grand Jury acknowledged receipt of six complaints.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2015-2016 Grand Jury received two complaints in May, 2016 and were acknowledged, but had insufficient time to investigate. We recommend the 2016-2017 Grand Jury review them.

RESPONSES TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2014-2015 TEHAMA COUNTY GRAND JURY

After reviewing the 2014-2015 Grand Jury report, the Tehama County Board of Supervisors requested a response to recommendations in four service areas.

1. The Tehama County Jail
2. The Juvenile Hall
3. The Day Reporting Center
4. The State of Water Conservation in Tehama County

Pursuant to Penal Code 933.05, each department responded in a timely manner

On the following pages are six documents:

1. The Tehama County Board of Supervisors response to the submitted responses from the individual departments.
2. The Tehama County Sheriff's Office in response to Grand Jury recommendations concerning the Jail.
3. The Tehama County Probation Department's response to Grand Jury recommendations concerning the Juvenile Detention facility.
4. The Tehama County Department of Social Services response to Grand Jury recommendations regarding the Day Reporting Center.
5. The County of Tehama Department of Public Works response to Grand Jury concerning water usage and water conservation in Tehama County.

TEHAMA COUNTY JUVENILE HALL

Findings

F1 – F4. We concur with the Grand Jury's findings.

Recommendation:

R3. The Chief Probation Officer should investigate alternatives to the evening meal in order to reduce the amount of food wasted.

Response: We are in agreement with this recommendation.

R3. We concur with the steps taken by the Chief Probation Officer as detailed in his response to investigate meal service and meal offerings to reduce waste while meeting "Title 15 Minimum Standards for Juvenile Facilities."

Recommendation:

R4. The Chief Probation Officer should accelerate the search for a Superintendent at the Juvenile Hall.

Response: We are in agreement with this recommendation.

R4. The Juvenile Hall superintendent is an essential position that should be filled at all times. We are pleased that the Chief Probation Officer has confirmed that this position was filled on May 1, 2015.

TEHAMA COUNTY DAY REPORTING CENTER (DRC)

Findings

F1 – F6. We concur with the Grand Jury's findings.

Recommendation:

R4. The Tehama County Sheriff and Chief Probation Officer should complete the plan for expanding the garden to the newly purchased land and begin supplying food to the county jail by 2016.

Response: We are in partial agreement with this recommendation.

- R4. We concur with the response from the Chief Probation Officer, Sheriff and Director of Social Services. In addition to standard food staples for the Jail and Juvenile Hall, the Sheriff has initiated discussions with the University of California Agricultural Extension for advice regarding both the edible and ornamental plants to be included. Concepts include experimental planting to determine if new agricultural crops could be commercially feasible in Tehama County and drought tolerant native plants for replanting on public facilities. This plan should be in place to begin improvements in 2016, with food supplies to the County Jail by 2017.

Recommendation:

- R5. The County should initiate a study to recommend a location for housing transitional women upon release to the DRC.

Response: We are in agreement with this recommendation.

- R5. As noted in the department responses, the ongoing effort to locate and fund additional housing has included non-profit agencies as well as multiple county departments. Housing is just one of many needs being addressed by the AB109 Re-entry Team.

Recommendation:

- R6. The County should investigate accessing AB109 or other monies to provide resources to departing inmates. This includes creating a plan for exit in collaboration with county social services to help inmates acclimate back into the community upon release.

Response: We are in agreement with this recommendation.

- R6. Re-entry efforts require cooperation between the many agencies listed in the response from the Chief Probation Officer, including a dedicated Sheriff's re-entry Sergeant and the formation of the AB109 Re-entry Team. Tehama County recognizes the importance of a support system and acquired life skills to reduce or prevent recidivism. The Director of Social Services identified specific needs during transition that are keys to success. Community based groups play a large role in meeting these needs.

THE STATE OF WATER CONSERVATION IN TEHAMA COUNTY
(TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT)

F1 – F4. We concur with the Grand Jury's findings.

Recommendation:

- R1. The Grand Jury recommends the Tehama County Board of Supervisors direct the Tehama County PWD to provide information to the citizens of Tehama County on how flow changes in the levels and sustainability of ground water will affect the citizens in a clear and concise format that would be understandable to the average person.

Response: We are in agreement with this recommendation.

- R1. The response by Tehama County Public Works describes in detail the ongoing groundwater monitoring conducted by the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (FC & WCD). This data and pertinent educational materials are available on the district web site. Outreach through schools and partner agencies is funded to provide the community with drought related information.

Recommendation:

- R3. The Grand Jury recommends the Tehama County Board of Supervisors follow up with the progress and implementation of the Joint Powers Authority. The Grand Jury also recommends the 2015-2016 Grand Jury follow up with the findings and/or progress with water issues in the Antelope area.

Response: We are in agreement with this recommendation.

- R3. The Board is aware of the ongoing water issues in the Antelope area. Resources from Public Works, Environmental Health and the FC & WCD are being used to seek grant opportunities to help offset the cost for installing a new water system. The formation of a JPA with the City of Red Bluff could broaden the number of future funding opportunities.

Recommendation:

- R4. The Grand Jury recommends the Tehama County Board of Supervisors direct the Tehama County PWD create a specific budget category and project number for educational outreach.

Response: We are in partial agreement with this recommendation.

R4. Public Outreach and education is an important function of FC & WCD, especially prior to, during and after a major storm event. Accounting of expenses has been improved by creating a specific project number. This will provide accountability and transparency with greater flexibility than establishing a new budget category.

In closing, the Board of Supervisors again would like to express its appreciation to the members of the FY 2014-2015 Grand Jury and offer our recognition of the extraordinary commitment required to serve as a member of the Grand Jury.

Sincerely,

Burt Bundy
Board Chair

Attachments



TEHAMA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Dave Hencratt, Sheriff-Coroner

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 729, Red Bluff, CA 96080

Main Office: 22840 Antelope Blvd., Red Bluff, CA 96080

(530) 529-7940 / (530) 529-7933 FAX


Jail/Dispatch: 502 Oak St., Red Bluff, CA 96080

(530) 529-7900 / (530) 528-7614 FAX

July 8, 2015

Honorable Matthew C McGlynn
Judge of the Superior Court
County of Tehama
633 Washington Street
Red Bluff, CA 96080

Dave Torgersrud, Foreperson
Tehama County Grand Jury 2014-2015
P. O. Box 1061
Red Bluff, CA 96080



RE: Tehama County Sheriff's response to 2014-2015 final report.

Let me start by saying, I have thoroughly reviewed the Tehama County Grand Jury Final Report for 2014-2015. As related to the Tehama County Jail, I agree with the grand jury members findings. I am pleased to respond to items R3, R4, and R7.

- R3: The recommendation has been implemented and the system is currently in operation and inmates in the Tehama County Jail are participating in the GED program. This system has been plagued by technical difficulties, as related to the computer system and compatibility with the online/web based program. The Tehama County Sheriff's Office has employed a grants specialist who continuously investigates and explores avenues for grant funds. The Tehama County Sheriff's Office is working with the superintendent of schools to keep the GED program current.
- R4: I agree with the recommendation of the Grand Jury that a bilingual instructor would be an asset to the GED program. I feel that needs assessment study should be conducted and included in the assessment should be how a position like this would be funded. Currently, there are no funds within the Sheriff's budget for such a position. The Department of Education would be better suited to administer such a position.
- R7: The Tehama County Sheriff is thoroughly aware of the issues and challenges as related to longer sentences and the need to house more serious inmates. We have had a need assessment study completed regarding the impact of AB 109. We have secured funding for a new 64 bed jail facility and are working toward a construction date.

Serving Our Community with P.R.I.D.E.
Professionalism, Respect, Integrity, Dedication, Equality

Thank you again to the Grand Jury for their service. I was impressed with the Grand Jury's willingness to meet with staff and their desire to be thorough. As always, we will continue our dedication to meeting the needs of the community and the Office of the Sheriff-Coroner.

Sincerely,



Dave Hencratt
Sheriff-Coroner

cc: Kathy Lytle, County Administration



COUNTY OF TEHAMA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
9380 San Benito Avenue
Gerber, CA 96035-9701
(530) 385-1462
(530) 385-1189 Fax

Road Commissioner
Surveyor
Engineer
Public Transit
Flood Control & Water
Conservation District
Sanitation District No. 1

August 14, 2015

R-15-055

Honorable Matthew C. McGlynn
Judge of the Superior Court
Tehama County
633 Washington St.
Red Bluff, CA 96080

RE: 2014-2015 Grand Jury Final Report – Tehama County Public Works Department

Honorable Judge McGlynn:

The Grand Jury reviewed the Tehama County Public Works Department and the following is the Grand Jury's Summary:


"The 2014-2015 Tehama Grand Jury conducted an investigation of the Tehama County Public Works Department due to public concern regarding water usage, and water conservation in Tehama County. The Tehama County Public Works Department was last visited by the Tehama Grand Jury in 2004-2005."

The report also stated that *"The grand jury found the following; Issues related to water conservation are overseen by the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District."*

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the 2014-2015 Grand Jury Report for the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (FC&WCD), which is overseen by the Tehama County Public Works Department, pursuant to California Penal Code section 933.05.

Finding, F1. The Tehama County Public Works Department is working with State and Federal Agencies to monitor the changing use of groundwater and the sustainability of water reserves in Tehama County.

1



Recommendation, R1. The Grand Jury recommends the Tehama County Board of Supervisors direct the Tehama County PWD to provide information to the citizens of Tehama County on how flow changes in the levels and sustainability of ground water will affect the citizens in a clear and concise format that would be understandable to the average person.

Response: Agree: The FC&WCD currently participates in the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) program. The District currently monitors eight (8) groundwater wells throughout the county in conjunction with Department of Water Resources (DWR) monitoring efforts. This monitoring is generally completed in the spring, summer, and fall of each year, although data is recorded continually throughout the year. This data is made available on both the District's and DWR's website, and is presented publicly during District Board meetings.

A Drought Information page has been created on the District's website, and links to this site have been placed on both the main Tehama County website and the County Environmental Health Department's site. This webpage includes educational materials, information on current drought regulations and assistance programs, and links to additional websites with pertinent information. The educational brochures cover topics such as "Where does my domestic water come from?", "Being a proactive domestic well owner", and "What do I do if my well has gone dry", and were created by the University of California Cooperative Extension office. These 2-3 page brochures were developed to help explain these complicated concepts to the average person. The District has also distributed a Tehama County Water Conservation Tips flyer (May 2015) to over 4,500 school children throughout the county, and gave an additional 1,000 copies to partner agencies for further distribution.

The District is working to form a Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the groundwater subbasins located within the County as required by the 2014 Sustainability Groundwater Management Act. This agency will be heavily involved in educational outreach during the development of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan through public outreach, quarterly Board meetings, the Districts website, and upon requests from local groups.

Finding, F2. A comprehensive water conservation strategy is being developed in cooperation with the state and federal government.

Recommendation, R2. None.

Response: Agree: The FC&WCD is working on forming a Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the groundwater subbasins within the county. Once formed, this agency will develop a Ground Water Sustainability Plan, which will include measurable objectives and milestones that will assist the County in achieving sustainability within 20 years. This process should increase the Districts

monitoring efforts and overall understanding of groundwater resources throughout the County, ultimately leading to improved groundwater management and conservation practices.

Finding, F3. Tehama County Public Works Department is working with the City of Red Bluff in developing a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to access what assistance can be given to residents in the Antelope Area.

Recommendation, R3. The Grand Jury Recommends that the Tehama County Board of Supervisors follow up with the progress and implementation of the Joint Powers Authority. The Grand Jury also recommends the 2015-2016 Grand Jury follow up with the findings and/or progress with water issues in the Antelope area.

Response: Agree: The FC&WCD continues to make progress towards developing a plan to improve the water issues in the Antelope area. Staff has worked on drafting language for a JPA agreement, and has created a GIS database showing the most heavily impacted areas and potential water systems. Staff also continues to work with the Department of Water Resources and the Tehama County Environmental Health Department on grant opportunities to potentially fund a feasibility study for installing a water system to the area. Staff will continue to work with the City of Red Bluff on developing a JPA.

Staff will make quarterly updates on these efforts during future District Board meetings. The District welcomes the 2015-2016 Grand Jury to follow up on the findings and/or progress on this recommendation.

Finding, F4. The Tehama County Public Works Department is making efforts to inform and educate county residents most affected by the changes to groundwater systems.

Recommendation, R4. The Grand Jury recommends that the Tehama County Board of Supervisors direct Tehama County Public Works Department create a specific budget category and project number for educational outreach.

Response: Agree Partially: The FC&WCD concurs that educational outreach is extremely important and will continue to perform educational outreach in the areas of flood control and water conservation. As of August 1, 2015, a specific project number has been created for outreach allowing for improved tracking of staff time and materials. Creating a specific budget category for this would be difficult for two reasons. First, an increased amount of outreach is often necessary in response to specific events such as floods, droughts, etc. and can be hard to predict from year to year. Second, our current budget tracking/planning procedures are fairly complicated and are not broken down into simplified categories such as educational outreach. With this new project number, the budget amount expended on educational outreach will be tracked efficiently, and can be


reported to the FC&WCD Board of Directors at the end of each budget year. The District will continue to perform outreach to citizens of Tehama County in the areas of flood control and water conservation.

This concludes the response from the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (which is overseen by the Tehama County Public Works Department) for the 2014-2015 Grand Jury Report. I want to thank the Grand Jury members for the time spent speaking with me and my staff in order to address these issues of concern. Please contact Ryan Teubert, Flood Control and Water Resources Manager, at 530-385-1462, Ext. 3020 with any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Antone, PE, PLS
Tehama County Public Works Director and
Executive Director of Tehama County Flood
Control & Water Conservation District

By


Ryan Teubert, CFM
Flood Control and Water Resources
Manager of Tehama County Flood
Control and Water Conservation District

Cc: Williams J. Goodwin, Chief Administrator

David Torgersrud, Foreperson 14/15 County Grand Jury

**SUMMARY OF AGENCIES
VISITED BY PAST GRAND JURYS**

Agencies visited by Past Grand Juries in last 10 years										
Agencies Listed According to Grand Jury Committee Responsibly	15-16	14-15	13-14	12-13	11-12	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	06-07
Commissions and Special Districts										
Advisory Committee Red Bluff Community/Senior Center										
Agricultural Commissioner							V.C.			
Agricultural Advisory Committee										
Air Pollution Control District Hearing Board							V			
Air Pollution Control Officer				V			V.C.			
Airport Land Use Commission										
Building Inspection Board of Appeals										
Cemetery Districts										
Belle Mill Cemetery District										
Coming Cemetery District						C.	V.C.		V	
Kirkwood Cemetery District										
Los Molinos Cemetery District									V	
Manton Cemetery District										
Paskenta Cemetery District									V	
Red Bluff Cemetery District									V	
Tehama Cemetery District									V	
Vina Cemetery District										
CMSP Governing Board (County Medical Seniors Program)										
Cal Works Administrative Oversight Team										
Commission on Aging Area Agency										
Community Action Agency Tripartite Advisory Board										
Community Service Districts										
Gerber/Las Flores Community Serv. Dist.									C	
Los Molinos Community Service District										
Paskenta Community Service District										
Rio Rancho Estates Community Serv. Dist.										
Coming Health Care District										
Tehama County Veterans Services	V									
County Land Plan Committee										
Fire Protection District (Capay)										
Hardwood Advisory Committee										
Heritage and Historical Records Commission										
Indian Gaming Local Community Benefit Committee					V					
Irrigation Districts										
Anderson/Cottonwood Irrigation District										
Deer Creek Irrigation District										
El Camino Irrigation District									V	C
Job Creation Task Force										

V=Routine Advisory C= Citizens Complaint

Agencies visited by Past Grand Juries in last 10 years										
Agencies Listed According to Grand Jury Committee Responsibly	15-16	14-15	13-14	12-13	11-12	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	06-07
Commissions and Special Districts										
Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)										
Local Transportation Commission										
Los Molinos Veterans Building House Committee										
Red Bluff Veterans Building House Committee										
Senior Center Joint Powers Agency										
Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Agency										
Tehama County Children and Families Commission										
Tehama County Fish and Game Commission										
Tehama County In-Home Supportive Services Advisory Committee										
Tehama County Mosquito and Vector Control District										
Tehama County Olive Fruit Pest Management District										
Tehama County Resource Conservation District										
Tehama County Resource Conservation Advisory Committee										
Tri County Economic Development District										
Board Directors								V		
Loan Administration Board										
Water Districts										
Coming Water District										V
Kirkwood Water District										
Mineral County Water District					V	C				
Proberta Water District										
Rio Alto Water District										
Sky View County Water District										
Thomes Creek Water District										
County/City Governments										
Office of the Chief Administrator								V		
Administration/Risk Management										
Facilities Maintenance								V		
Personnel/Risk Management										
Purchasing Department										
Assessor	V							V.C.		
Auditor Controller	V									V
Board of Supervisors	V			V				V.C.	C	
Clerk of the Board Of Elections	V								V.C.	C
County Clerk & Recorder						C	V		C	
Coming Fire Department								V.C.	C	
Deferred Compensation Committee										
General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee										
Planning Commission										
V=Routine Advisory C= Citizens Complaint										

Agencies visited by Past Grand Juries in last 10 years										
Agencies Listed According to Grand Jury Committee Responsibly	15-16	14-15	13-14	12-13	11-12	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	06-07
County/City Governments										
Coming City Council/City Government							V.C.			
Red Bluff City Council/City Government						C				
Red Bluff Fire Department									C	
Shasta College 1-5 Technology Center Site Selection Advisory Committee										
Tehama City Council/City Government										
Tehama County Fire Department	V				V					
Tehama County Interagency Coordination Council Director										
Tehama Local Development Corporation				V						
Tehama Local Development Corporation Advisory Committee										
Treasurer Tax Collector										V
Treasury Oversight Committee										
Farm Advisor					V					
Librarian/Library	V				V					
School Districts										
Antelope School District						V				
Coning Elementary School District									C	
Coming Union High School District									V.C.	
Elkins School District									V	
Evergreen School District										
Flournoy School District						V		V		
Gerber School District				V						
Kirkwood School District					V	V				
Lassen View School District										
Los Molinos Unified School District		V				C				
Red Bluff Union Elementary School District										V
Red Bluff Joint Union High School District	V		V							V
Reeds Creek School District				V						
Richfield School District					V	V				
Tehama County Board Of Education							V.C.			
Tehama County Department of Education		C					V			
Tehama County Local Child Care Planning Council							V			
Tehama County Animal Care Center					V					

V=Routine Advisory C= Citizens Complaint

Agencies visited by Past Grand Juries in last 10 years										
Agencies Listed According to Grand Jury Committee Responsibility	15-16	14-15	13-14	12-13	11-12	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	06-07
Commissions and Special Districts										
Health and Welfare										
Department of Social Services				C			V			
Adult Services							V			
Adult Protective Services							V			
CalWorks										
Child Welfare Service				V			V			C
Foster Family Service							V		V	
Public Assistance/Eligibility Program							V			
MediCal/CMSP							V			
Food Stamps							V			
General Assistance							V			
Special Circumstances/Emergency Need							V			
Social Security Advocate							V			
Environmental Health										
Environmental Services Joint Powers Authority										
Tehama County Health Officer										
Tehama County Health Partnership					V				V	
Child Health and Disability Prevention Program and Public Health Nursing										
Drug and Alcohol Services Advisory Board									V	
Health Officer										
Mental Health Center	V									
Health Center										
Public Health Advisory Board									V	
Social Services Transportation Advisory Council										
Solid Waste Independent Hearing Panel										
Tehama County Drug and Alcohol Advisory Board										
Tehama County Mental Health Board										
Law Enforcement	V									
911 Response Program							V			
Animal Control							V			C
Child Support Services				V						
Corning Police Department							V.C.		C	
Public Guardian/Public Administrator			V							
Coroner's Office			V							
County Counsel	V						V			
District Attorney	V						C		C	
Victim Witness										
Welfare Fraud										
V=Routine Advisory C= Citizens Complaint										

Agencies visited by Past Grand Juries in last 10 years										
Agencies Listed According to Grand Jury Committee Responsibly	15-16	14-15	13-14	12-13	11-12	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	06-07
Commissions and Special Districts										
Law Enforcement										
Law Library Committee										
Local Law Advisory Board										
Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Advisory Committee										
Neighborhood Watch										
Probation Department									V	
Tehama County Juvenile Hall	V	V			V				V	
Red Bluff Police Department										C
Ishi Conservation Camp	V			V						
Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council										
Salt Creek Conservation Camp			V						V	
Sheriff's Office of Emergency Services										
Supplemental Law Enforcement Oversight Committee										
Tehama County Sheriff's Department	C	C								C
Tehama County Jail	VC	V	V	V.C.	V				V.C.	V
Weights and Measures Department										
Public Works/Parks and Recreation				V						
Building Department									V	
City of Red Bluff Parks and Recreation	V				V					
Coming Public Works/Parks	V									
Director of Public Works		V								
Freeway Emergencies Services Authority										
Planning Department										
Red Bluff Water and Sewer Department										V
Tehama County Building Official										
Tehama County Landfill										
Tehama County/Red Bluff Landfill Management Agency										
Tehama County Parks and Recreation/Courthouse and Grounds	V									
Tehama County Public Works/Parks				V						
Antelope Park Committee (inactive)										
Camp Tehama Committee										
Cone Grove Park Committee										
Gerber Park Committee										
Mill Creek Park Committee										
Norland Park Committee										
Simpson-Finnel I Park Committee										
Ridgeway Park Committee										
Tehama County River Park (Woodson Bridge)										
Tehama County Public Works Works/Roads and Bridges										
Tehama County Public Works/Transportation					V					
Tehama County Sanitation District #1										
V=Routine Advisory C= Citizens Complaint										

This page left intentionally blank.