

# **Continuity and Accountability**

**Review of Placer County Grand Jury  
Reports from 2020-2021**

## **Continuity and Accountability Review of Placer County Grand Jury Reports for 2020-2021**

### **Summary**

The primary duty of the Placer County Grand Jury is to investigate the functions of city and county government, schools, and special districts. Each year in June, the grand jury issues its final report which includes reports on inspections and investigations done during the term.

The report provides findings and recommendations for each investigation and inspection. Traditionally, a response report is issued in the November timeframe by the grand jury containing the responses from the investigated entities to their respective recommendations.

The 2021-2022 grand jury believes it is important to verify that the responses were compliant with Penal Code § 933.05, which outlines what each response is to include. The intent of this report is to confirm that entities comply with the penal code. The Placer County Grand Jury produced its first continuity report in June 2021. This is the grand jury's second continuity report.

### **Background**

A continuity report is not required by the penal code. The grand jury reviews the responses and compiles the response report for publication. In a review of past Placer County Grand Jury final reports, it has been identified that several responses have not complied with Penal Code § 933.05. Since there has been no follow up to the responses, there has been no accountability for responding entities to comply with the penal code.

In previous years, the task of following up on responses that did not comply with the penal code has been taken on by the Placer County Grand Jurors' Association (PCGJA). This association is comprised of former grand jurors. Although the PCGJA assumed this task in the past, it has not been their focus in recent years. This resulted in many non-responsive recommendations not being addressed.

### **Methodology**

The grand jury reviewed all the reports and responses to the 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury Final Report, which was published on June 16, 2021. The final report contained eight individual reports, with sixty-nine findings and forty-five recommendations. The current grand jury did not review nor have access to the prior grand jury's investigative evidence, which is confidential.

**California Penal Code § 933.05**

(emphasis added)

- (a) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Penal Code § 933, as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:
- (1) The respondent **agrees with the finding.**
  - (2) The respondent **disagrees wholly or partially with the finding; in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons, therefore.**
- (b) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Penal Code § 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:
- (1) The recommendation **has been implemented**, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
  - (2) The recommendation **has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.**
  - (3) The recommendation **requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe** for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. **This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.**
  - (4) The recommendation **will not be implemented** because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, **with an explanation**, therefore.
- (c) However, if a finding or recommendation of the grand jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or department headed by an elected officer, both the agency or department head and the board of supervisors shall respond if requested by the grand jury, but the response of the board of supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision-making authority. The response of the elected agency or department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency or department.
- (d) A grand jury may request a subject person or entity to come before the grand jury for the purpose of reading and discussing the findings of the grand jury report that relates to that person or entity in order to verify the accuracy of the findings prior to their release.
- (e) During an investigation, the grand jury shall meet with the subject of that investigation regarding the investigation, unless the court, either on its own determination or upon request of the foreperson of the grand jury, determines that such a meeting would be detrimental.
- (f) A grand jury shall provide to the affected agency a copy of the portion of the grand jury report relating to that person or entity two working days prior to its public release and after the approval of the presiding judge. No officer, agency, department, or governing body of a public agency shall disclose any contents of the report prior to the public release of the final report.

## Discussion

After research on a topic has been completed, the grand jury determines what facts of the investigation or inspection have been discovered. What is a fact? According to the California Grand Jury Association (CGJA), facts are:

- objective (neutral, unbiased, and not judgmental),
- not subject to interpretation,
- precise and accurate – numbers, dates, amounts, etc., and
- verified – not raw evidence, such as hearsay.

Once the grand jury has determined the facts they have discovered, findings are developed. The grand jury's findings are listed in each report and may or may not lead to a recommendation. What is a finding? Per the CGJA, findings:

- contain a conclusion or value judgment,
- express approval or disapproval,
- show the need for action, and
- are clear and contain one main idea.

From the findings, recommendations are written, which are actions the grand jury concludes the investigated/inspected entities should implement. Recommendations should be SMART, meaning they must be **s**pecific, **m**easurable, **a**ctionable, **r**easonable, and **t**ime framed.

When the entities respond, they must follow Penal Code § 933.05, which specifically states what responses must include. The grand jury discovered that some of the respondents did not agree with several of the findings but did implement the recommendation the grand jury published.

The following charts provide the findings, recommendations, and responses to eight reports published by the Placer County Grand Jury in June 2021. Following each response in the charts is the 2021-2022 grand jury's evaluation of the response and its compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.

**INDEPENDENT SPECIAL DISTRICTS AND THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION**

**Summary**

California enacted Assembly Bill 2257, codified in California Government Code § 54954.2, requiring all legislative bodies, such as city councils, special districts, school districts, and boards of supervisors, to have a prominent direct link to their agenda on their website's homepage. Included in the bill were other specific requirements which became mandatory after January 1, 2019.

In September 2018, California Senate Bill 929 was passed. This bill also updated some requirements for special districts and took effect on January 1, 2020. This law requires that absent a resolution declaring hardship every independent special district "shall maintain an Internet Web site" that "shall clearly list contact information for the independent special district."

The grand jury investigated the special districts within the county for compliance with these laws. This report excludes any joint power authority located in, or associated with, Placer County as well as dependent special districts, non-profit, or County Service Area districts. For this report, the grand jury investigated only the thirty-eight independent special districts.

The grand jury found three districts did not have a website and one non-active district also did not have a website. California SB 929 went into effect on January 1, 2020 requiring each special district to have a website. Of the remaining thirty-four, only fourteen (41%) of the special districts were fully compliant as of March 2021. The grand jury recommends the non-compliant special districts update their websites to be in compliance with the law.

**Key to abbreviations used in the following chart for respondents:**

AFD	Alta Fire Protection District	PCR	Placer County Resource Conservation District
ARD	Auburn Area Recreation & Parks District	PCW	Placer County Water Agency
CCD	Colfax Cemetery District	PHF	Placer Hills Fire Protection Agency
FUD	Foreshill Public Utility District	PMV	Placer Mosquito & Vector Control District
HGD	Heather Glen Community Services District	SLW	Sierra Lakes County Water District
LCD	Lincoln Cemetery District	SPF	South Placer Fire Protection District
LAF	Placer County LAFCo	TPU	Tahoe City Public Utility District
MVW	Meadow Vista County Water District	TCC	Tahoe City Cemetery District
MHW	Midway Heights County Water District	TFH	Tahoe Forest Hospital District
NFD	Newcastle Fire Protection District	TTA	Tahoe-Truckee Airport District
NSD	Northstar Community Services District	TRC	Tahoe Resource Conservation District
PFD	Penryn Fire Protection District	TTS	Tahoe-Truckee Saultation District
		TRI	Talimont Resort Improvement District



Finding	Agree with Finding	TCC	<p>F2: Heather Glen Community Services, Tahoe Forest Hospital, and Tahoe City Cemetery Districts do not have websites. They are non-compliant with both AB 2257 and SB 929.</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>	Agree with Recommendation	<p>R1: By September 1, 2021, Heather Glen Community Hospital, and Tahoe City Cemetery Districts create websites to be compliant with AB 2257 and SB 929.</p>	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	<p>Response</p> <p>Tahoe Forest Hospital District provided a compliant response but did respond that this recommendation has already been implemented. Tahoe City Cemetery District provided a compliant response and replied that this recommendation will not be implemented because they do not have staff to create or maintain a website. Heather Glen did not provide a compliant response, as they did not respond to the findings but they did note the recommendation has been implemented.</p> <p>These websites have been viewed. Heather Glen and Tahoe Forest Hospital now have websites and are compliant. Tahoe City Cemetery District does not yet have an independent website.</p>
	Disagree Partially with Finding	TFH			Disagree Completely with Finding		HGD	<p>Did Not Respond</p>	<p>FD</p>	<p>Will be Implemented with Date</p>	<p>Further Study Needed</p>	<p>Funding Needed</p>	

Finding	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	Response
<p>F3: Three districts, Colfax Cemetery, Penryn Fire Protection, and Talmont Resort Improvement Districts are non-compliant with AB 2257. They do not have a prominent, direct link to their current agenda; agendas are not searchable or downloadable.</p>		<p>PF3</p>	<p>CCD</p>	<p>TRI</p>	<p>R2: By September 1, 2021, Colfax Cemetery, Penryn Fire Protection, and Talmont Resort Improvement Districts update their website so they have a prominent, direct link to the current agenda and the agenda is searchable and downloadable to be compliant with AB 2257.</p>		<p>PF3 TRI</p>					<p>CCD</p>	<p>Penryn Fire District provided a compliant response and responded that this recommendation has already been implemented. Colfax Cemetery District provided a compliant response and said this recommendation was not reasonable for them, as they do not have an independent web site. Talmont did not provide a response to F3, but did provide a compliant response to R2, noting that recommendation had already been implemented.</p> <p>These websites have been viewed. Colfax Cemetery District does not yet have an independent web site. Penryn has a website, but as of this viewing, the link was not to the current agenda but instead a schedule of upcoming board meetings. Talmont's website is compliant.</p>



Finding	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	Response
<p>F4: Alta Fire Protection, Auburn Area Recreation &amp; Park, Foresthill Public Utility, Lincoln Cemetery #1, Meadow Vista County Water, Midway Heights County Water, Newcastle Fire Protection, Northstar Community Services, Penryn Fire Protection, Placer County Resource Conservation, Placer County Water Agency, Placer Hills Fire Protection, Placer Mosquito &amp; Vector Control, Sierra Lakes County Water, South Placer Fire Protection, Suburban Pines Community Services, Tahoe City Public Utility, Tahoe-Truckee Airport, Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation, and Talmont Resort Improvement Districts do not have a prominent, direct link to the current agenda on the home page of their website.</p>	<p>FUD LCD NFP NSD PCR PHF PMV SPF SLW TPU TTA TTS</p>		<p>MVW PCW</p>	<p>AFD ARD MHW</p>	<p>R3: By September 1, 2021, Alta Fire Protection, Auburn Area Recreation &amp; Park, Foresthill Public Utility, Lincoln Cemetery #1, Meadow Vista County Water, Midway Heights County Water, Newcastle Fire Protection, Northstar Community Services, Placer County Resource Conservation, Placer County Water Agency, Placer Hills Fire Protection, Placer Mosquito &amp; Vector Control, Sierra Lakes County Water, South Placer Fire Protection, Suburban Pines Community Services, Tahoe City Public Utility, Tahoe-Truckee Airport, and Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Districts create a prominent, direct link from their home page to their current agenda as required by AB 2257.</p>		<p>AFD ARD FUD LCD MVD NFP NSD PCR PHF PMV SPF SLW TPU TTA TTS</p>					<p>PCW</p>	<p>Foresthill Public Utility, Lincoln Cemetery #1, Meadow Vista County Water, Newcastle Resource Conservation, Northstar Community Services, Placer Resource Conservation District, Placer Hills Fire Protection, Placer Mosquito &amp; Vector Control, Sierra Lakes County Water, South Placer Fire Protection, Suburban Pines Community Services, Tahoe City Public Utility, Tahoe-Truckee Airport, and Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Districts provided compliant responses and responded that this recommendation has already been implemented. Midway Heights County Water District provided a compliant response, noted this recommendation has been implemented and also disputes the requirement that the website be on a separately hosted agenda management platform.</p>

Finding	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	Response		
						R3 (continued):									
													<p>Placer County Water District provided a compliant response but disagrees with the grand jury regarding a requirement to have an integrated agenda management platform. Suburban Pines, Tahont Resort Improvement, and Penryn Fire Protection Districts were not required to respond. Alta Fire provided a compliant response noting the recommendation had been implemented. Auburn Area Recreation &amp; Park District did not provide a compliant response as they did not indicate agreement or disagreement with the findings, nor did they indicate their implementation of the recommendation.</p> <p>These websites have been viewed and all were compliant as of this viewing, except the following districts: Midway Heights, Placer Hills Fire, and Placer Mosquito &amp; Vector Control Districts' websites contained links to previous agenda, rather than the current meeting agenda. Newcastle Fire has a board meeting calendar but no links to their current agenda.</p>		



Finding	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	Response
<p>F8: Suburban Pines Community Services District is a non-active district.</p>		LAF	LAF		<p>R7: By September 1, 2021, Placer County LAFCo will take the necessary steps to dissolve Suburban Pines Community Services District and incorporate the maintenance of the six fire hydrants to another entity.</p>				LAF				<p>Placer County LAFCo provided a compliant response. Suburban Pines consists of maintaining six fire hydrants and cannot be dissolved until a successor agency can be identified to maintain the hydrants.</p>
<p>F9: Placer County LAFCo does not keep records of the ethics training, completed by board members of the districts they oversee.</p>	LAF				<p>R8: By September 1, 2021, Placer County LAFCo will establish and maintain a list of the ethics training completed by each independent special district board member.</p>							LAF	<p>Placer County LAFCo provided a compliant response. Each agency is required to keep their own list of ethics training completed. It is not reasonable to recommend Placer County LAFCo to maintain a duplicate list of this training.</p>
<p>F10: Collax Cemetery, South Placer Fire Protection, and Tahoe Resource Conservation District websites do not comply with SB 929.</p>			CCD		<p>R9: By September 1, 2021, Collax Cemetery District will add contact information to its web site to be compliant with SB 929.</p>							CCD	<p>Collax Cemetery District provided a compliant response and said this recommendation was not reasonable for them, as they do not have an independent web site.</p>

Finding	Response							Response					
	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date		Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	
F10 (continued): Colfax Cemetery, South Placer Fire Protection, and Tahoe Resource Conservation District websites do not comply with SB 929.	SPF				R10: By September 1, 2021, South Placer Fire Protection District will add a contact email address to its website to be compliant with SB 929.	SPF							South Placer Fire Protection District provided a compliant response. This recommendation has been implemented.  South Placer's website has been viewed and it does now contain a clickable email address.
F10 (continued): Colfax Cemetery, South Placer Fire Protection, and Tahoe Resource Conservation District websites do not comply with SB 929.		TRC			R11: By September 1, 2021, Tahoe Resource Conservation District will list their board members on its website.	TRC							Tahoe Resource Conservation's website has been viewed and it does contain a link to a list of its board members.

## **LACK OF COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY IN HOUSING THE HOMELESS OF PLACER COUNTY**

### **Summary**

Homelessness in California, as well as Placer County, is no longer confined to the big cities. It is in both urban and rural communities across the state which impacts local resources.

Homelessness is closely connected to declines in physical and mental health; homeless persons experience high rates of health problems. Health problems among homeless persons result from various factors, such as lack of access to adequate food and protection, and limited resources and social services.

The grand jury recognizes there are many types of housing and programs used by county, state, and federal governments to house the homeless. However, this report focuses only on the Placer County Whole Person Care Pilot program. Some Placer County citizens have been critical and outspoken regarding a lack of communication and transparency by the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding the Placer County Whole Person Care Pilot program. A perceived lack of oversight provided by Placer County Health and Human Services of the Placer County Whole Person Care Pilot program was also a concern raised by citizens. In addition to communication and transparency, there have been questions and concerns that reference the perceived improper use and efficacy of funds awarded to nonprofit organizations selected to provide housing for the Placer County homeless and mentally ill.



Finding	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	Response
F4: Placer County Health and Human Services has no single division or department charged with overseeing all county homeless programs.	X				R3: By January 1, 2022, Placer County Health and Human Services will take steps to add a division or reorganize the department, to create a single designated division to manage all homeless programs in the county.				X				Placer County Health and Human Services has provided a compliant response. This recommendation requires further analysis. Due to the complexity of this recommendation, a timeline for follow up is unknown at this time.
F5: The agencies, both public and nonprofit, elected not to disclose home purchases until after client move-in to exclude community input.		X	X		There was no recommendation associated with this finding.								
F6: The Gathering Inn and Advocates for Mentally Ill Housing, Inc. did not openly communicate with the neighborhood residents prior to the purchase of the homes pursuant to contracts SCN102104 and SCN102143.		X	X		R4: By October 1, 2021, Placer County Health and Human Services will verify that The Gathering Inn and Advocates for Mentally Ill Housing, Inc. have initiated open communication with neighbors surrounding all permanent supportive homes, as required by their contract.			X					Placer County Health and Human Services has provided a compliant response. The recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the near future and before October 1, 2021.





## LINCOLN REGIONAL AIRPORT

### Summary

Over the last twenty years, the Lincoln Regional Airport (LRA) has struggled financially under city ownership and the current operating model. Following the audit by the State of California Joint Legislative Audit Committee, the City of Lincoln acknowledged the airport's annual deficit. To correct this deficit, the city agreed to fund the airport with a formal interfund loan. In the future, the LRA must substantially increase the earnings of the two primary revenue streams, hangar rentals and fuel sales.

The grand jury determined that no one in LRA operations, management, or city leadership has a background in airport management nor experience in aviation, marketing, sales, or airport business development. City management has been reluctant to address this lack of expertise because of the potential cost. As a result of not addressing this critical need, the airport operates at a substantial annual deficit, financially and structurally.

An airport master plan represents a blueprint of an airport's current, intermediate, and long-term infrastructure development. Perhaps the most serious oversight of Lincoln's approach to the management of the LRA is having no current master plan documents since the 2007 Lincoln Regional Airport Master Plan.

The grand jury interviewed other regional aviation managers to determine if it is typical for an airport to be in debt to a city or county's general fund. Typically, indebtedness is periodic and short-term in nature, such as capital payments due before receiving grant funds from other government entities. However, LRA's indebtedness to the general fund is structural and long term and is outside standard fiduciary practices.

Finding	Response Options							Response					
	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation		Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement
F1: The Lincoln Regional Airport does not have a general aviation manager nor does any city management professional responsible for the airport have an aviation management background.				X	R1: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will complete and adopt a feasibility study to evaluate hiring a general aviation manager with aviation management experience and/or American Association of Airport Executives certification.						X	X	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln, there is insufficient revenue to support a full time manager. The city does not believe such a position is necessary.
F2: The Lincoln Regional Airport does not have ongoing efforts to evaluate the airport's competitiveness in the marketplace and maximize revenue opportunities, such as fuel pricing and development of vacant airport land.				X	R2: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will review current airport leases for opportunities to increase rents to the maximum amount allowable by the terms of the contracts until rentals reflect market value.						X	X	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln 2019 market survey, their rates and leases have been adjusted and do not require further adjustment.
F3: The Lincoln Regional Airport does not have a separate audited annual financial report for the airport operation as an Enterprise Fund requires.				X	R3: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will produce a separate audited annual financial report for the airport operation as an Enterprise Fund requires.						X	X	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. Per City of Lincoln, this recommendation is not consistent with accounting principles and there is no reason to conduct a separate audit.

Finding	Response				Recommendation	Action								Response		
	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond		Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement				
F4: An updated version of the Lincoln Regional Airport Master Plan of 2007 has not been published.				X	R4: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will publish an updated Lincoln Regional Airport Master Plan to include a blueprint of the airport's current, intermediate, and long-term infrastructure development, as well as a financial plan supporting a sustainable revenue stream commensurate with the capital expenditures necessary for planned airport evolution.		X								X	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln, this recommendation was already implemented as part of its annual capital improvement process completed in coordination with the FAA.
F5: The Lincoln Regional Airport fuel prices are not regularly adjusted to market prices.				X	R5: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will implement weekly fuel price adjustments reflecting current market rates.										X	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln, fuel prices will only be adjusted when fuel is purchased, which occurs infrequently.

Finding	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	Response
	F6: The Lincoln Regional Airport loan agreement of \$4.95 million from the City of Lincoln General Fund formalizes repayment of past operating deficits with a sixty-year repayment schedule.					X	R6: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will evaluate and restructure the Lincoln Regional Airport's 60-year loan amortization to align with the physical, functional, and economic obsolescence of airport infrastructure and equipment.						
F7: The City of Lincoln does not perform a regular evaluation of the airport's fuel sales contract.				X	R7: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will solicit competitive bids for airport fuels, contracts, and services.						X	X	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Competitive bids have been solicited twice within last 5 years and vendors indicated Lincoln doesn't sell enough fuel for the airport fueling to be a viable private business opportunity. Also, Lincoln currently receives full sale related revenue in excess of what would be received from a fuel flowage fee and/or lease of the fuel system.

Finding	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	Response
	F8: The Lincoln Regional Airport management staff have no relationships with airport related industry associations or professional development organizations that provide updates to industry best practices.					X	R8: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln will identify common airport related industry associations and professional development programs to expand and enhance vendor relationships, recruitment, and develop industry best practices.						
F9: The Lincoln Regional Airport has no airport emergency plan, safety program, or first responder emergency training exercises.				X	R9: By October 1, 2021, the City of Lincoln shall implement plans and policies for safety and emergency response training drills at the Lincoln Regional Airport.						X	X	The City of Lincoln did not provide a compliant response. No response was provided for the finding. Per City of Lincoln, responses to major emergencies at the airport are carried out pursuant to Lincoln's Emergency Operations Plan which addresses roles and responsibilities during an emergency response.

## PUBLIC LIBRARIES OF PLACER COUNTY: A RESOURCE FOR ALL

### Summary

Throughout history, libraries and their accumulated knowledge have improved our communities, strengthened literacy, and even helped shape our civilization. Over 2000 years ago, the Great Library of Alexandria, Egypt, collected and held the bulk of the knowledge of the known world. Libraries have propelled intellectual growth, broadened shared understanding, and encouraged new discovery. This is still true of libraries today. In 1995, Walter Cronkite said, "Whatever the cost of our libraries, the price is cheap compared to that of an ignorant nation."

The 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury agreed with this sentiment and sought to understand the current status of the various library systems located within the county. There are fourteen public libraries located in Placer County. The county operates its own public library system, consisting of nine branches. Additionally, there are municipally operated libraries in Loomis, Lincoln, and Roseville, which has three branches.

While each library has its own issues and concerns, a common denominator this year was the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19). The COVID-19 restrictions on the function and operation of each library were frustrating to both the public and the library staff. In a typical year, however, funding is the most pressing need for each system. With sufficient funding, budget concerns such as adequate staffing and public outreach could be addressed.

The grand jury is impressed by the state of the libraries in Placer County. The libraries are staffed by knowledgeable, dedicated, and passionate employees. Although there are areas for improvement, all the libraries in Placer County fulfill their intended purpose. They provide both learning opportunities and personal enrichment to their patrons and up-to-date services via user friendly and accessible technology.

#### Key to abbreviations used in the following chart for respondents:

BoS	Placer County Board of Supervisors	P	Placer County Library
Li	Lincoln Public Library	Lo	Loomis Library and Community Learning Center
R	Roseville Public Library		

Finding	Response					Recommendation	Response							
	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Agree with Recommendation		Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement		
F1: All the libraries in Placer County provide similar basic services to their patrons, including resource lending, computer use, and programming for children and adults.	P R Li Lo BoS					There was no recommendation associated with this finding.								All the libraries in Placer County and the Placer County Board of Supervisors agree with this finding.
F2: The Placer County Library system would benefit from increased promotion and community outreach to increase both membership and public awareness of library services.	P BoS					R1: By January 1, 2022, Placer County Library will develop a promotion and outreach plan to increase membership and circulation.			P					Placer County Library provided a compliant response. Their response indicated the recommendation would be implemented beginning in December 2021.
F3: A citizen of Placer County who wishes to borrow across all county library systems must have four separate library cards.	P R Li Lo BoS					R2: By January 1, 2022, Placer County Library, Roseville Public Library, Lincoln Public Library, and Loomis Library and Community Learning Center will work together to develop a single county-wide library card.								P R Li Lo BoS Placer County, Roseville, Lincoln and Loomis libraries all provided compliant responses. The responses all indicated this recommendation was discussed among all four library systems and will not be implemented due to the costs of implementation. All library systems have indicated a commitment to pursuing additional interlibrary cooperation in the future.



Finding	Response									
	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date		
F4: The Placer County Library, Roseville Public Library, and Lincoln Public Library have websites that are incorporated into their respective county/city websites.	P R Li BOS				R3: By November 1, 2021, Placer County Library, Roseville Public Library, and Lincoln Public Library will each develop and manage their own independent website.			P	R	Placer County Libraries provided a compliant response, indicating this recommendation will be implemented beginning December 2022 if sufficient funding is available. Roseville Public Library and Lincoln Public Library also provided a compliant response, which indicated this recommendation will not be implemented as it is not warranted or reasonable.
F5: The Placer County Library and Roseville Public Library do not own their own web domains separate from their county/city-managed website.	P R Li BOS				R3 Continued: By November 1, 2021, Placer County Library, Roseville Public Library, and Lincoln Public Library will each develop and manage their own independent website.			P	R Li	Placer County Libraries provided a compliant response, indicating this recommendation will be implemented beginning December 2022 if sufficient funding is available. Roseville Public Library and Lincoln Public Library also provided a compliant response, which indicated this recommendation will not be implemented as it is not warranted or reasonable.









Finding	Response				Recommendation	Response								
	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond		Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement		
F3: The implementation of the Placer Youth Center pilot program has been placed on hold due to the pandemic and is expected to be beneficial when COVID-19 restrictions are lifted.	X				There was no recommendation associated with this finding.									
F4: While initial funding was provided for the Placer Youth Center program, ongoing funding is necessary for its success.	X				R1: By September 1, 2021, the Placer County Board of Supervisors commit to funding the Placer Youth Center in future budgets.		X							The Placer County Board of Supervisors provided a compliant response. The FY 2021-2022 adopted budget includes the funding for the Placer Youth Center program and is planned to be included in future year's budgets as well.







Finding	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement	Response
F7: The security camera system at the Auburn Historic Courthouse facility is inadequate.	X				R1: By September 1, 2021, the court administrative officer and county executive officer will complete an evaluation of the security camera system at the Auburn Historic Courthouse.			X					The court administrative officer and county executive officer provided compliant responses. The recommendation will be implemented but neither the court administrative officer nor county executive officer will be involved in the evaluation of the security camera system.
F7: The security camera system at the Auburn Historic Courthouse facility is inadequate.	X				R2: By October 1, 2021, the court administrative officer and county executive officer will present to the Board of Supervisors a request for funding to replace poorly functioning security cameras and add cameras in key locations at the Auburn Historic Courthouse.		X						The court administrative officer and county executive officer provided compliant responses. The recommendation will be implemented but neither the court administrative officer nor county executive officer will be involved in the evaluation of the security camera system.

Finding	Agree with Finding		Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation		Response
	Disagree Partially with Finding			Implemented Recommendation	X	
	Disagree Completely with Finding			Will be Implemented with Date		
	Did Not Respond			Further Study Needed		
F7: The security camera system at the Auburn Historic Courthouse facility is inadequate.	X		R3: By March 1, 2022, the court administrative officer and county executive officer will oversee the new security camera system installation at the Auburn Historic Courthouse.	Funding Needed		The court administrative officer and county executive officer provided compliant responses. The recommendation will be implemented but neither the court administrative officer nor county executive officer will be involved in the evaluation of the security camera system.
				Do Not Agree		
				Will Not Implement		





Finding	Response				Recommendation	Implementation							Response			
	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond		Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement				
F9: Voters placing a stamp on their return ballot envelope could have their ballots delayed getting to the Auburn Elections Office.	X				There was no recommendation associated with this finding.											
F10: There will be additional drop box locations for the public to return their vote-by-mail ballots if they choose not to use the US Postal Service.	X				There was no recommendation associated with this finding.											
F11: The live real-time connection between the VSC locations and the voter registration database has not been previously used.	X				There was no recommendation associated with this finding.											
F12: The full cost for the November 2020 election is unknown.	X				R2: By March 1, 2021, the Placer County Registrar of Voters will provide to the 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury a written summary that documents all costs associated with the November 2020 general election.			X								
																Placer County Registrar of Voters provided a compliant response. This recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future. Vendor receipts have been submitted so documented costs for November 2020 election will be submitted by March 1, 2021.

Finding	Agree with Finding	X	Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation		Response
	Disagree Partially with Finding			Implemented Recommendation		
	Disagree Completely with Finding			Will be Implemented with Date	X	
	Did Not Respond			Further Study Needed		
				Funding Needed		
				Do Not Agree		
				Will Not Implement		
<p>F13: As a result of SB 423 and AB 860, Placer County Elections Office has developed many new processes. The efficacy of these processes will not be known fully until after the November 2020 election.</p>			<p>R3: By March 1, 2021, the Placer County Registrar of Voters will provide the 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury a written debrief of issues/problems encountered during the November 2020 general election as well as what the department did to resolve the issues/problems and what the department has learned from this experience, both positive and negative.</p>			<p>Placer County Registrar of Voters provided a compliant response. This recommendation has not yet been implemented because as of yet, staff has not had time to examine all of the challenges that arose during the November 2020 election, but should be able to provide by July 2021.</p>

**Continuity and Accountability: Review of Placer County Grand Jury Reports from 2019-2020**

**Summary**

The primary duty of the Placer County Grand Jury is to investigate the functions of city and county government, schools, and special districts. Each year in June, the grand jury issues its final report which includes reports on inspections and investigations done during the term.

The report provides findings and recommendations for each investigation and inspection. Traditionally, a Response Report is issued in the November timeframe by the grand jury containing the responses from the investigated entities to their respective recommendations.

The 2020-2021 grand jury believes it is important to verify that the responses were compliant with Penal Code § 933.05, which outlines what each response is to include. The intent of this report is to confirm that entities comply with the Penal Code. The Placer County Grand Jury has not produced a continuity report in the past.

Finding	Agree with Finding		Recommendation	Agree with Recommendation		Response
	Disagree Partially with Finding			Implemented Recommendation		
	Disagree Completely with Finding			Will be Implemented with Date		
	Did Not Respond			Further Study Needed		
				Funding Needed		
				Do Not Agree		
				Will Not Implement		
F1: Placer County Grand Jury has not written a continuity report in previous years.			R1: Future Placer County Grand Juries shall continue to produce a continuity report each year.			2021-2022 Placer County Grand Jury is preparing a continuity report for the current term.

Finding	Response				Recommendation	Implementation							Response	
	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond		Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement		
P2: Five responses were not compliant with Penal Code § 933.05.					R2: Future Placer County Grand Juries should follow up with any response that is not compliant with Penal Code § 933.05.									2021-2022 Placer County Grand Jury has followed up on non-compliant responses.
					R3: Future Placer County Grand Juries should require respondents whose response is found to be non-compliant with Penal Code § 933.05 to provide the grand jury with an updated response that is compliant.									2021-2022 Placer County Grand Jury has followed up on non-compliant responses.
					R4: By September 4, 2021, Rocklin School District will respond to the recommendation from the 2019-2020 report with a response that is compliant with Penal Code 933.05.	X	X							Rocklin School District provided a compliant response and has implemented the recommendation.
					R5: By September 1, 2021, Placer County Sheriff will respond to the two recommendations from the 2019-2020 report with responses that are compliant with Penal Code § 933.05.			X						Placer County Sheriff's Office did not provide a compliant response. While they have not yet implemented the recommendations, they plan to do so in the future, but did not provide an implementation date.



Finding	Response to Finding				Recommendation	Response to Recommendation							Response	
	Agree with Finding	Disagree Partially with Finding	Disagree Completely with Finding	Did Not Respond		Agree with Recommendation	Implemented Recommendation	Will be Implemented with Date	Further Study Needed	Funding Needed	Do Not Agree	Will Not Implement		
F3: Alta-Dutch Flat School District website is not currently compliant with AB 2257.	X				R7: Alta-Dutch Flat School District will update their website to be compliant with AB 2257 by September 1, 2021.	X	X							Alta-Dutch Flat School District provided a compliant response and has implemented the recommendation.
F4: Bowman Charter School District website is not currently compliant with AB 2257.	X				R8: Bowman Charter School District will update their website to be compliant with AB 2257 by September 1, 2021.	X	X							Bowman Charter School District provided a compliant response and has implemented the recommendation.
F5: Tahoe-Truckee School District did not respond to the grand jury.					There was no recommendation associated with this finding.									
					R6: Placer County Board of Supervisors will provide an updated timeline for the Tahoe Justice Center construction by September 1, 2021.	X	X							Placer County Board of Supervisors provided a compliant response, advising that the recommendation was implemented on June 22, 2021, when the Board of Supervisors approved the Facilities Capital Improvement Plan for the Tahoe Justice Center. Targeted completion date is May, 2026.

## Conclusion

The 2021-2022 Placer County Grand Jury is following the precedent set by the 2020-2021 Placer County Grand Jury by publishing this continuity report. This jury believes it is important to verify that respondents were compliant with Penal Code § 933.05 and concludes that this work is too important to not be a requirement of each grand jury going forward.

## Findings

The grand jury found:

- F1:** Placer County Grand Jury wrote its first continuity report in 2020-2021 and is continuing that process this year, following up on noncompliant responses.
- F2:** Newcastle Fire Protection District does not have clickable links on its website to their current agenda, making it noncompliant with the Brown Act.
- F3:** Midway Heights Water District, Penryn Fire District, and Placer Hills Fire District all have links to their agendas, but the agendas posted are not current. This is noncompliant with the Brown Act.
- F4:** The Placer County Sheriff's Office response to the grand jury's report on continuity and accountability was noncompliant with Penal Code § 933.05. While the response indicated that the recommendation would be implemented in the future, no timeline for implementation was provided.
- F5:** Heather Glen Community Services District, Talmont Resort Improvement District, and the City of Lincoln did not provide responses that were compliant with Penal Code § 933.05. The response provided by these entities did not indicate agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings.
- F6:** Auburn Recreation & Parks District did not provide a response that was compliant with Penal Code § 933.05. The response provided did not indicate agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings, nor did it provide any response to the recommendation.

## Recommendations

The grand jury recommends:

- R1:** By the time of each year's grand jury final report preparation, future Placer County Grand Juries shall continue to produce a continuity report each year. The grand jury shall follow up with any response that is not compliant with Penal Code § 933.05 and require an updated compliant response.
- R2:** By November 1, 2022, Newcastle Fire Protection District will insert on their website clickable links to their current agenda.
- R3:** By September 1, 2022, Midway Heights Water District, Penryn Fire District and Placer Hills Fire District will all update their agenda links to include current agendas.
- R4:** By September 1, 2022, the Placer County Sheriff's Office will provide an updated response to the recommendations from the 2019-2020 grand jury report, indicating a timeline for implementation in compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.
- R5:** By September 1, 2022, Heather Glen Community Services District and Talmont Resort Improvement District will provide updated responses to the recommendations from the 2020-2021 grand jury report, indicating agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings in compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.
- R6:** By October 1, 2022, the City of Lincoln will provide an updated response to the recommendations from the 2020-2021 grand jury report, indicating agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings in compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.
- R7:** By September 1, 2022, Auburn Recreation & Parks District will provide an updated response to the recommendations from the 2020-2021 grand jury report, indicating agreement or disagreement with the pertinent findings and a response to the pertinent recommendations in compliance with Penal Code § 933.05.

## Request for Response

Pursuant to Penal Code § 933.05, the Placer County Grand Jury requests a response from the following:

	<b><u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u></b>	<b><u>Response Due Date</u></b>
<b>William Kahrl</b> <b>Chairperson</b> Newcastle Fire Protection District P.O. Box 262 Newcastle, CA 95658	R2	September 1, 2022
<b>David Wiltsee</b> <b>President</b> Midway Heights County Water District P.O. Box 596 Meadow Vista, CA 95722	R3	September 1, 2022
<b>Cheryl Hotaling</b> <b>Chairperson</b> Penryn Fire Protection District 7206 Church St Penryn, CA 95663	R3	September 1, 2022
<b>Peter Hills</b> <b>President</b> Placer Hills Fire Protection District P.O. Box 350 Meadow Vista, CA 95722	R3	September 1, 2022
<b>Devon Bell</b> <b>Sheriff</b> Placer County Sheriff's Office 2929 Richardson Dr Auburn, CA 95603	R4	September 1, 2022
<b>Jim Henderson</b> <b>President</b> Talmont Resort Improvement District P.O. Box 1294 Tahoe City, CA 96145	R5	September 1, 2022

**Max Bailey** R5 **September 1, 2022**  
**President**  
Heather Glen Community Services District  
P.O. Box 715  
Applegate, CA 95703

**Sean Scully** R6 **October 1, 2022**  
**City Manager**  
City of Lincoln  
600 Sixth Street  
Lincoln, CA 95648

**Gordon Ainsleigh** R7 **September 1, 2022**  
**Chairperson**  
Auburn Area Recreation & Park District  
471 Maidu Dr #200  
Auburn, CA 95603

**Copies Sent to:**  
**Cindy Gustafson**  
**Chairperson**  
Placer County Board of Supervisors  
175 Fulweiler Ave  
Auburn, CA 95603