

2003-2004
SOLANO COUNTY
GRAND JURY

FINAL REPORT

2003-2004
SOLANO COUNTY
GRAND JURY
FINAL REPORT

Honorable Peter B. Foor
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California
County of Solano

Table of Contents

Pages

Table of Contents	i-ii
Letter to the Presiding Judge	iii
2003-2004 Grand Jury Photo	iv
2003-2004 Members List	v
Note to All Affected Agencies	vi
Index of Affected Agencies	vii

I. AUDIT AND FINANCE

County and City Budget Review	1-10
East Vallejo Fire District	11-12

II. CRIMINAL JUSTICE

California Medical Facility	14-15
California State Prison Solano Tour and Facility Inspection	16-17
Delta Fire Camp	18-19
Fouts Springs Youth Facility	20-21
Solano County Juvenile Hall Inspection	22-23
Detention/Holding Facilities	24-26
Solano County Sheriff/Coroner's Office Tour and Facility Inspection	27-28

III. EDUCATION AND LIBRARY

School Inspections:

Angelo Rodriguez High School – Fairfield	31-32
Bransford Elementary School – Fairfield	33-34
C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School – Dixon	35-36
Hemlock Elementary School – Vacaville	37-38
Jesse Bethel High School – Vallejo	39-41
Tolenas Elementary School – Fairfield	42-44

School Inspections Continued:

Vanden High School – Fairfield 45-47
Will C. Wood High School – Vacaville 48-49

Benicia Unified School District 50-52

Vanden Ball Field 53-54

IV. HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Child Protective Services 55-59

In-Home Supportive Services 60-62

V. LAND PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

Biosolids 63-68

Solano County Flood Control – Sweeney Creek 69-70

VI. TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Americans with Disabilities Acts Compliance 71-73

Solano County Hall of Justice - South Wing Flood Damage 74-76

Vallejo Veterans Memorial Building 77-80

VII. SPECIAL DISTRICTS

Greater Vallejo Recreation District 81-84

Hiddenbrooke Subdivision 85-87

City of Suisun City – Lawler Ranch Park 88-89

VIII. HOMELAND SECURITY AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

Emergency Services - County & Cities of Solano 91-95

June 2004

Honorable Peter B. Foor
Presiding Judge
Solano County Superior Courts
600 Union Ave
Fairfield CA 94533

Dear Judge Foor:

Herewith is the report of the 2003-2004 Grand Jury. It is presented with pride in the accomplishments of this fine group of extraordinary citizens on behalf of the people of Solano County.

The Jury was selected and appointed by the Honorable Scott L. Kays in July 2003, in accordance with the rules for Grand Jury selection. We began service immediately and have served since that time.

You will note that there have been numerous complaints received and processed. In addition, a significant number of cases were left from the previous Grand Jury. Also, follow-up of continuing situations involved substantial Grand Jury time. We are also recommending action in some cases by the 2004-2005 Grand Jury.

This final report is the result of the efforts of all nineteen members, each of whom brought to the jury extensive talent and experience from their varied backgrounds and cultures. We began with nineteen members and three alternates. We lost one member late in the term and decided not to activate a replacement, since the data collections phase had been completed, and a new member would not be able to contribute to the Jury's reporting responsibility.

We are developing, with the assistance of the Chief Executive Officer/Jury Commissioner's assistance, a web page which now is available. The entire report of the Grand Jury is available through this medium. We appreciate the help of the staff for their guidance and experience.

The Jury Commissioner's staff was very helpful, especially the Administrative Assistant assigned to the Grand Jury. Thanks also go to County Counsel and his staff for their help in processing a petition in Superior Court and for their advice regarding law and procedures about which we required information.

To the members of this Grand Jury, my personal appreciation for their cooperation, dedication and understanding; their diligence and persistence in pursuing many different investigations, and for the many hours they have devoted to this year of voluntary service.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis Burgelin
Foreman
2003-2004 Grand Jury

LB/jh

2003-2004 SOLANO COUNTY GRAND JURY

Front Row: Carla Grokenberger, Diane Crosley-Mayers, Louis Burgelin – Foreman, Peter B. Foor – Presiding Judge; Denise LeGrande, Kenneth Barden

Middle Row: Jamielynn Harrison – Administrative Assistant, Larry LaFleur, Ronald Cortese, J.J. O'Malley, Cathy Houck, Fred Oren, Paul Cheng

Back Row: R.A. Jones; Joe Moore, Griffin Bailey, Sr., Luis Delgado, William Cambra, Jack Goldsmith, Thomas Hansen

Not present: Victor Salting

**MEMBERS OF THE
2003-2004 SOLANO COUNTY GRAND JURY**

Griffin Bailey, Sr.	-	Fairfield
Kenneth Barden	-	Vallejo
Louis Burgelin	-	Vallejo
William Cambra	-	Benicia
Paul Cheng	-	Vacaville
Ronald Cortese	-	Fairfield
Diane Crosley-Mayers	-	Vacaville
Luis Delgado	-	Vallejo
Jack Goldsmith	-	Vallejo
Carla Grokenberger	-	Suisun City
Thomas Hansen	-	Vacaville
Cathy Houck	-	Vacaville
R.A. Jones	-	Benicia
Larry LaFleur	-	Rio Vista
Denise LeGrande	-	Fairfield
Joe Moore	-	Vacaville
J.J. O'Malley	-	Fairfield
Fred Oren	-	Fairfield
Victor Salting	-	Vallejo

Note: To All Affected Agencies

California Penal Code §933.05 is summarized as follows:

Findings §933.05 (a)

For each finding in the Grand Jury Report, the responding party must give one of the following two responses:

- Responding party agrees with the finding.
- Responding party disagrees wholly or partially, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons for disagreement.

Recommendations §933.05 (b)

For each recommendation in the Grand Jury Report, the responding party must state that one on the following four actions has been taken:

- Recommendation has been implemented with a summary of implemented action
- Recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation
- Recommendation requires further analysis or entity requires detailed explanation of analysis or study with timeframe not to exceed six (6) months; analysis/study submitted to officer, director or governing body of the agency being investigated.
- Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted, is not reasonable, with an explanation included.

Budgetary and Personnel Matters §933.05 (c)

If a finding or recommendation of the Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county department head by an elected officer, both the department head and Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Grand Jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision making authority. The response of the elected department head shall address all aspects of the findings and recommendations affecting his/her department.

Advance release of a report is prohibited before public release.

Response Time and Responding Party

- **Public Agency:** governing by of any public agency must respond within 60 days.
- **Elected Officer or Agency Head:** elected officers or heads of agencies and department heads are required to respond in 60 days.
- **City or County:** The mayor shall also comment on the findings and recommendations.

INDEX OF AFFECTED AGENCIES

Benicia

Benicia City Manager
City of Benicia
Benicia Police Department
Benicia Unified School Board

Dixon

C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School
Dixon City Manager
City of Dixon
Dixon Police Department
Dixon Unified School Board

Fairfield

Angelo Rodriguez High School
Bransford Elementary School
Tolenas Elementary School
Fairfield City Attorney
Fairfield City Council
Fairfield City Manager
City of Fairfield
Fairfield Police Department
Fairfield Public Works Department
Fairfield Suisun Unified School District
Fairfield Unified School Board

Rio Vista

Rio Vista City Manager
City of Rio Vista
Rio Vista Police Department

Suisun City

Suisun City - City Manager
City of Suisun City
Suisun City – Park/Recreation Committee
Suisun City Police Department

Vacaville

Hemlock Elementary School
Will C. Wood High School
Vacaville City Manager
City of Vacaville
Vacaville Police Department
Vacaville Unified School Board

Vallejo

Jesse Bethel High School
Vallejo City Council

Vallejo Continued

Vallejo Unified School Board
Vallejo City Manager
City of Vallejo
Vallejo Fire Department
Vallejo Police Department

Special Districts

East Vallejo Fire Protection District
Greater Vallejo Recreation Department
Solano County Local Agency Formation Commission

Unified School Districts

Solano County Office of Education
Benicia Unified School District
Dixon Unified School District
Fairfield Suisun Unified School District
Vacaville Unified School District
Vallejo City Unified School District

Travis Unified School District

Travis Unified School Board
Travis Unified School District
Vanden High School

Additional Agencies

California Department of Corrections
California Medical Facility
California State Prison Solano
Colusa County Board of Supervisors
Placer County Board of Supervisors
Regional Water Quality Control Board
Solano County – County Counsel
Solano County Administrative Officer
Solano County Auditor/Controller
Solano County Board of Supervisors
Solano County Department General Services
Solano County Department Health & Social Services

- Child Protective Services
- In Home Support Services

Solano County Department of Agriculture
Solano County Department of Human Resources
Solano County Department of Probation
Solano County Dept of Environmental Management
Solano County District Attorney
Solano County Office of Emergency Services
Solano County Sheriff/Coroner's Office
Solano County Special Districts
Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)

AUDIT AND FINANCE

COUNTY AND CITY BUDGET REVIEW 2003-2004 GRAND JURY REPORT

I. Reason For Investigation

Due to the uncertain fiscal condition of the State of California and the recent downturn of the economy, the Grand Jury elected to review the financial procedures and stability of Solano County and the cities of Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville and Vallejo.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Reviewed budgets and independent audit reports and used the data for this report
- Interviewed Solano County Assistant County Administrator/Budget
- Interviewed Solano County Auditor
- Interviewed City of Benicia Finance Director and Assistant Finance Director
- Interviewed City of Dixon Finance Director
- Interviewed City of Fairfield Finance Director
- Interviewed City of Rio Vista Interim Finance Director
- Interviewed City of Suisun City Mayor and City Manager
- Interviewed City of Vacaville Finance Director
- Interviewed City of Vallejo - City Manager and Interim Finance Director
- Referenced *Reinventing Government* by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler

III. Background

1. The current State budget is reportedly in the worst condition it has ever been in the history of the State, partly due to the recent downturn of the economy. Local public agencies depend a great deal on their share of funding allocations from the State. This income is dependent on the strength of the economy.

2. If the local agencies have not prepared for such an event in the form of a suitable reserve, they must reduce programs and services to the community, lay off employees or look at increasing taxes, fees or other funding sources to offset losses. The problem is compounded by the fact that much of their income is in the hands of those in office in Sacramento.

3. Currently, the State is in a dismal position because it was riding the wave of an economic boom and was not prepared for an economic decline.

Adding to the situation, cities and counties around the State report that:

- Increasing retirement benefit costs will impact fiscal health
- Cutting Vehicle License Fees (VLF) will threaten public safety funding
- Property tax diversion to the State continues to hurt communities

- The State budget process shifts funds from local agencies to balance State budget and precludes local agencies from balancing revenues with expenditures

4. With the election of a new administration in the State and the passage of Propositions 57 and 58, the promise to balance the State budget may even worsen the fiscal position of local agencies. It is uncertain how the new Governor will accomplish his goals, which makes the financial future for cities and counties even more uncertain.

5. The key to riding out an economic downturn is to build an adequate reserve fund into the budget. For local government, there is no requirement to maintain a reserve fund when preparing the budget. Each agency sets its own policy, which can be for the current year or for multiple years.

6. Long-term planning is the solution to increase local agency resiliency to economic uncertainty and downturns without adopting a crisis response in financial decision making. Long-term planning provides stability by taking a long-term view of year-to-year changes and assessing whether a present decision can be supported as envisioned into the future. Even though future planning is based on the best assumptions at hand, history has shown that State, County and City fiscal conditions have peaks and valleys. Therefore, a baseline-operating budget is essential to provide expected services. A few examples of such planning are the City of Fairfield, City of Vacaville and City of Benicia. They all have long-term budget forecasts which have given them financial stability to meet the current financial situation and anticipate upcoming problems.

IV. Findings And Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

SOLANO COUNTY

Finding #1 - The total Solano County 2003/04 Budget is \$786,441,725. Of that amount, the General Fund is \$188,675,041. Since the County receives the majority of revenues earmarked for specific programs, it is credited directly to the appropriate department and not to or through the General Fund. The reserve for the General Fund is \$24.9 million or 13.2%. The Board of Supervisors' goal is to have a \$10 million General Fund reserve. However, reserves for operating departments vary with no apparent goal set by policy. (2, 5)

Recommendation #1 - Increase the General Fund reserve to no less than 15%.

Recommendation #1a - Establish a 5% reserve in each department.

Finding #2 - The County develops a Five-Year Fiscal Forecast model budget for the General Fund. It is not detailed but is established by totals of general categories and makes various assumptions about tax increases, license and permit revenues, state reductions, Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) increases and net expenditure increases. Each operating department does not submit multi-year budgets or a similar fiscal forecast. (5)(6)

Recommendation #2 - The County budget procedure is primarily established on a year-to-year basis. Presently, reductions are taking place to deal with the expected shortfall in the 2003-2004 budget with minimal plans for future projected deficits. It is recommended that a multi-year detailed budget forecast be prepared, based on the current facts, figures and trends that are available with the input of all operating departments. Each year the plan should be reviewed and updated to reflect current trends.

Finding #3 - A Five-Year Plan is prepared and updated each year for capital improvements. Funding sources are identified. (5)(6)

Recommendation #3 - Continue the present procedure which provides protection of current county assets and meets future infrastructure needs. Insure that on-going maintenance costs to support and maintain capital improvements are included in future operating budget forecasts.

Finding #4 - Department budgets are established by line items. However, the amounts projected are often overspent, transferred or not expended. The bottom line of the budget is the single source that dictates the financial status of the department. (5)

Recommendation #4 - If line item procedures are used to establish a budget, the department should make projections and expenditures accordingly. Transferring funds from one line item to another should be discouraged, tightly controlled and should require the authorization.

COMMENTS

The County of Solano was recognized for its excellence in financial reporting by the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States. The findings of the June 30, 2003 Audit Report found the County's financial procedures to be within accounting principles generally accepted in the United States. The offices of the Audit/Controller and Assistant County Administrator/Budget are to be commended for their work.

CITY OF BENICIA

Finding #1 - The City of Benicia approves a two-year budget which is reviewed quarterly and updated each year. The General Fund revenues are projected at \$23,206,245 for 2003-2004 and \$23,510,320 for 2004-2005. Capital improvement and maintenance programs are integrated into the biannual budget cycle. (2)(3)(5)(6)

Recommendation #1 - Produce a long term plan (five or ten years), especially for capital improvement projects. This can be reviewed and updated in conjunction with the budget review cycle.

Finding #2 - Benicia's budget reserve level is set by City Council resolution at 20% of proposed expenditures. The General Fund reserve is projected to be \$5,787,910 (25% of General Fund expenditures) at the end of the 2003-2004 fiscal year. The General Fund reserve level has grown from 15% in 1995 to its current level. (5)(6)

Recommendation #2 - Use a city ordinance rather than a resolution to set the budget reserve so that the citizenry will be better informed if reserve levels are reduced. Continue to maintain healthy reserves so that the City is not adversely impacted by State budget problems.

Finding #3 - The City of Benicia's budget includes a conservative projection of revenues for the next two years. For example, although revenue from the VLF was \$1,500,000 in 2002-2003, the City assumed for budgeting purposes that none of those fees would be returned by the State in 2003-2004 or in 2004-2005. At the time of the Grand Jury interview, it appeared that the State might actually reinstate approximately \$500,000 of the VLF. (2)(3)(6)

Recommendation #3 - Continue to forecast using conservative projections of revenues.

Finding #4 - Benicia's budget projects significant increases in expenditures, particularly regarding expenses in the Public Employee Retirement System (PERS). Expenditures for the PERS are anticipated to increase from \$700,000 in 2002-2003 to \$1.9 million in FY 2003-2004 to \$3.2 million in FY 2004-2005 (170% increase followed by a 68% increase). (3)(5)(6)

Recommendation #4 - Continue to monitor this situation. If the PERS increases level off in the next few years, consider establishing a PERS reserve to avoid impacting other city services.

Finding #5 - Benicia's projections of reduced revenues and increased costs were addressed by reducing General Fund expenditures by 6% for the FY 2003-2004, thus maintaining a healthy reserve level. This was achieved by not filling some vacant positions, reducing some purchases, and deferring equipment purchases. These are considered temporary reductions. (1)(2)(4)

Recommendation #5 -The City should continue to monitor the State budget situation. If additional revenue is withdrawn, the City may need more permanent expense reductions or may need to enhance revenue sources.

COMMENTS

The City of Benicia is taking prudent steps to insure its financial well-being despite the uncertainty of revenues and expenditures that are controlled at the State level. The City should be commended for foresight in addressing potential budget issues by increasing reserves and reducing expenses before a crisis situation arises.

CITY OF DIXON

Finding #1 – The City of Dixon General Fund contingency for FY 2003-2004 is set at \$1.6million, which amounts to 15% of operating expense. (2)(6)

Recommendation #1 – This solid reserve should be maintained.

Finding #2 – The 15% reserve, which has been met for the past five years, is set each year by City Council resolution. No ordinance or official policy exists calling for a specific goal. (5)

Recommendation #2 – The reserve should be set by a City Council ordinance which would assure that the public would be alerted if a deviation should be recommended in a future budget.

Finding #3 – Dixon prepares its budgets on an annual rather than a multi-year basis. (6)

Recommendation #3 – The Grand Jury recommends that a multi-year financial plan be prepared based on developing facts, statistics and trends. The plan should be continuously updated as new information becomes available.

Finding #4 – Dixon has a five-year capital improvement program which, together with funding, is updated annually. (5)(6)

Recommendation #4 - Insure that on-going maintenance costs to support and maintain capital improvements are included in future operating budget forecasts.

Finding #5 – Notwithstanding significant cuts in State support, Dixon officials report no cuts in basic services. Officials credit this successful outcome to a conservative spending mindset

reinforced by a rigorous process which screens out all uncertain income from the budgeting process. (1)(2)(6)

Recommendation #5 – Continue this successful defensive budget philosophy.

CITY OF FAIRFIELD

Finding #1 - The most recent approved Fairfield budget is for a two-year time period (2003-2005) with review and adjustment scheduled for mid-2004. Total General Fund revenues are budgeted at \$50,986,000 for 2003-2004 and at \$55,094,000 for 2004-2005. For at least the last 17 years, Fairfield has used long term forecasting (10 year time-frame) in developing yearly budgets. Capital improvement and maintenance programs are integrated into the long-term budget forecast. (5)

Recommendation #1 - Continue this admirable system of long-term forecasting with annual revisions.

Finding #2 - Fairfield's budget reserves are set by City Council resolution. They have historically been set at 20% of General Fund expenditures, but that reserve requirement was reduced to 15% for the current budget. General Fund plus PERS savings reserves at the end of the 2003-2004 budget year are estimated to be \$13,320,000 which is 23.7% of General Fund expenses. Budget reserves have grown from 14.6% in the FY 1998-99 to an estimated 44.5% in 2002-03. (5)

Recommendation #2 - Use a city ordinance rather than a resolution to set the budget reserve so that the citizenry will be better informed if reserve levels are reduced. Spending down reserves during this period of State budget difficulties helps to keep service levels at current standards, but it is not recommended to reduce reserve funds any further.

Finding #3 - About 52% of Fairfield's General Fund revenue is controlled by the State. Based on interviews, several million dollars are at risk under various proposals by the State. For example, in 2002-03 the VLF revenue was \$5,843,000 (11.2 % of General Fund revenue). For 2003-04 the city projected VLF revenue at \$1,988,000 (3.9% of General Fund) and the actual amount that will be forthcoming from the State is still in doubt as of this writing. (1)(3)

Recommendation #3 - Continue to monitor developments at the State level and make necessary adjustments when the impact of various proposals is known.

Finding #4 - Significant increases in expenditures are predicted in the coming years, particularly in personnel costs due to substantial increases in retirement expenses in the PERS and large increases in employee health care costs. The City had established a PERS reserve when the costs were low, but that reserve will be depleted in the 2004-05 fiscal year. (3)

Recommendation #4 - Continue to monitor expense trends and make adjustments as early as possible.

Finding #5 - The City is addressing projected budget shortfalls by a combination of: use of reserves, increasing fees and reducing staff (an estimated 19-20 full-time employees will be eliminated in the 2003-04 fiscal year). (2)

Recommendation #5 - Continue to use long-term forecasts to minimize the impact of budget shortfalls.

COMMENTS

The City of Fairfield provides an excellent model of fiscal planning that will provide the ability to focus on problem areas when fiscal resources are still available.

Fairfield pioneered the use of Expenditure Control Budgets in which budgets are developed at the department level which includes incentives to save money. This model has been adopted by a number of other cities. Fairfield has increased its reserves during the last few years in anticipation of upcoming lean years. This allows the City to phase in budget reductions over time and to minimize disruption of services.

CITY OF RIO VISTA

Finding #1 – As of December 31, 2003, Rio Vista was operating on an interim budget. According to testimony received, the interim budget was created by “tweaking” the previous year’s budget. Therefore, it was inadequate as a realistic operating document. (2)(6)

Recommendation #1 - The council should adopt a workable budget as soon as possible, and in the future abide by Government §§ Code 53900 and 53901.

Finding #2 - The City Council has not established a reserve policy. However, the Council did establish a reserve of \$500,000 or 12% of the General Fund expenditures. This reserve can be expended only by authorization of the City Council. This reserve was created with a General Fund cash transfer. (5)(6)

Recommendation #2- The City should strive to maintain its reserve and establish a 5% reserve in each department by using cost saving procedures and revenue enhancements.

Finding #3 – According to testimony, Rio Vista has had a 200% turn over in personnel during the past three years. The following positions were on an interim basis at the time of the interview: City Manager, Finance Director, Public Works Director, Planning Director, and the contract City Attorney. These positions were vacated by request and/or resignation during a three-month period. In addition, some of the City’s difficulty in maintaining a static work force below the department head level can be attributed to its remote and hazardous location on Highway 12, its pay schedules (which appear to be about 25% lower than surrounding cities) and lack of pay increases. (2)(3)(4)

Recommendation #3 - Rio Vista should develop a competitive pay schedule, attempt to hire and train local residents as much as possible and review the pay schedules for enhancements.

Finding #4 - Rio Vista does not have a multi-year budget plan although the planning for a five-year Capital Improvement Budget is in progress. This will include a study on fees and charges which has not been done in the past ten years. (5)(6)

Recommendation #4 - Rio Vista should develop multi-year budget planning. It might be best to start with a three-year plan and progress to a five-year plan which would be reviewed and revised annually by the City Council.

Finding #5 – According to testimony, the City treasury may seem to be “flush” now, but it is due to one-time developer fees, which will not sustain increases of on-going service costs. The City’s maintenance program is reactive instead of proactive but most of the City’s equipment is new and the replacement fund is healthy. The City is dependent on funding from the State up to 18%.

Therefore, the loss of the VLF and unfunded mandates for capital improvements, such as drain and sewer plant upgrades, could be largely impacted. (3)(4)(5)(6)

Recommendation #5 - A capital improvement and maintenance program will have to be funded.

Finding #6 –Billing procedures, budget status reconciliation and other financial reports were not provided in a timely manner to the City Council due to a lack of an effective accounting system, procedures and employee turnover. The council was unaware of the City’s current financial status. (2)

Recommendation #6 - A new accounting system, which has been selected and is in the process of being installed, needs to be implemented and should include employee training.

Finding #7 - An outside audit was completed in June 2002. It allowed the city to “catch-up” by providing accurate financial information. (5)

Recommendation #7 – As set by California law, cities must have outside independent audits every year and the Council should actively review the audit. The Council should change auditor firms on a regular basis.

CITY OF SUISUN CITY

Finding #1 - The Suisun City Council adopted the budget for the City of Suisun City for FY 2003-2004 on December 2, 2003. The Council has not adopted an ordinance or formal policies on the establishment of the reserve.

The projected General Fund reserve for the year ending June 30, 2004 is \$1,133,764, which is 15.6% of General Fund expenses. The City has a budget stabilization reserve of \$694,280 (9.6% of General Fund expenses). The stabilization reserve was designed to accumulate funds for future downturns in revenues and has been used to make one time capital expenditures and cover the structural gap in years where the revenue was less than expenditures. The total projected reserve fund for the year ending June 30, 2004 is \$1,828,044, which includes the stabilization reserve of \$694,280. (2)(3)(5)

Recommendation #1- The Suisun City City Council should adopt an ordinance that establishes the reserve. Any change to such ordinance would require public notice which advises the citizenry of the community. As set forth in State Government Code §§53900-53901, the budget must be adopted and submitted to the County Auditor no later than 60 days beyond the beginning of the budget period.

Finding #2 – The VLF is \$1,278,500 which is 26.62% of the General Fund revenue for the year 2003-2004. There is some uncertainty at the time of this writing about the actual VLF revenue that will be forthcoming from the State and whether there is still a \$306,000 VLF cut or not. (2)(5)

Recommendation #2 - If the VLF is reduced or eliminated, Suisun City faces grave consequences. Therefore, the City must develop future multi-year budget forecasts that consider all revenues that are subject to state reduction and develop reserves and spending plans that will provide future stability.

Finding #3 - The City does not use multi-year budgets but does prepare multi- year Capital Improvement Projects. (6)

Recommendation # 3 - The Grand Jury recommends that a multi-year financial plan be prepared based on developing facts, statistics and trends. The plan should be continuously updated as new information becomes available.

Finding #4 - In FY 2003-2004, the Redevelopment Agency refinanced its 1993 Bond issue of \$43 million in order to lower the interest. (6)

Recommendation #4 - It is a good practice to review the interest rate on the loans and bonds and the City should continue to explore all possibilities in reducing expenses.

Finding #5 - Due to the reduction in VLF and general revenue, staff reduction has become necessary. (5)

Recommendation #5 – Although reduction of staff is necessary to meet budget shortfalls, each position should be carefully examined as to its contribution to City services.

COMMENTS

There was a general lack of promptness by the City of Suisun City in responding to the series of requests by the Grand Jury.

CITY OF VACAVILLE

Finding #1 - The 2003-2004 approved General Fund revenues are \$46 Million and expenditures of \$46,100,000. The City of Vacaville's Council has directed staff to develop a budget with a 15% reserve. (4) (5) (6)

Recommendation #1 - The reserve should be set by Council ordinance.

Finding #2 - The City's five-year budget projection shows a reduction of the General Fund reserve from 22% to 10.9%. (6)

Recommendation #2 – The five-year plan allows the City adequate time to make necessary adjustments in order to maintain a reserve.

Finding #3 - Vacaville is faced with a \$2,000,000 PERS payment, which is not included in this year's budget or any future budget. (1)(2)(6)

Recommendation #3 - There is a \$1,400,000 PERS reserve available. However, the City must determine how the \$600,000 shortfall will be resolved.

Finding #4 - Vacaville does have a multi-year budget plan. Although the planning forecast is for five years, they do have a long range plan, which represents a "total build out" (City Manager's terminology) of the City. This includes a study on fees and charges and how the City will provide services for new residential developments (by Mello Roos). They have planned and built infrastructure such as water and sewer plants to provide for "total build out". A study is being done (to be completed by January 2004) to make sure that the correct impact fees are imposed on all new development. (5)(6)

Recommendation #4 - The City should be congratulated for foresight and planning and should forward to the Grand Jury a copy of the study when completed.

Finding #5 - The City has funding available for interdepartmental loans at a competitive interest rate which may be used for projects. (1)(2)

Recommendation #5 - The City should continue to authorize these loans by Council action and insure that a repayment schedule is included in the council action/resolution.

COMMENTS

Vacaville has a very aggressive Redevelopment Agency which draws new business into the city and thereby increases revenues. Each department operates at City Council performance standards which set goals and objectives. The City uses developer fees to fund capital improvement projects. The City has been able to maintain a 15 to 20% general fund reserve during the past five years.

CITY OF VALLEJO

Finding #1 – The 2003-2004 approved General Fund revenues are \$73,944,400 and expenditures of \$73,367,100. In the last five years, the City has gone from a deficit budget to a current General Fund reserve of \$3,900,000. The entire budget reserve is \$7,846,315 or 11.8%, which includes reserve for insurance, inventory and economic uncertainties. (5)(6)

Recommendation #1 - Continue to work towards the City Council-established policy of a 15% General Fund reserve.

Finding #2 - To balance this year's budget, an early retirement plan was implemented to reduce the workforce by 12 employees. In addition, a grant writer was employed to secure available funds for various programs. (2)

Recommendation #2 - Continue to seek grants and review each vacant staff position as to need for replacement.

Finding #3 – Annually, a five-year plan is prepared and presented to the City Council. It assumes the current economic conditions and does not address any future economic trends and growth pattern needs. (5)(6)

Recommendation #3 - It is recommended that a detailed, multi-year financial plan be prepared, based on the current facts, figures and trends that are available. Each year the plan should be reviewed and updated to reflect current trends.

Finding #4 - The City has a five-year Capital Improvement Program, which is reviewed and updated each year. (5)(6)

Recommendation #4 - Continue the present procedure which provides protection of current city assets and meets future infrastructure needs. Ensure that on-going maintenance costs to support and maintain capital improvements are included in future operating budget forecasts.

V. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE COUNTY AND CITIES WITHIN

- Implement a Supervisor/City Council-adopted policy that instructs staff to prepare **detailed** budget forecasts, based on the best economic assumptions at hand, for a period of no less than five years. (5)

- Develop and maintain a General Fund Reserve and a Contingency Fund of no less than 15% in combination. (2)(6)
- Cities must file with the County Auditor a copy of their annual budget within sixty (60) days after the beginning of the fiscal year (California State Government Code Section 53900-53901).
- The County and Cities through their organizations (League of California Cities and the State Association of Counties) should work toward changing the state constitution to correct the structural flaws in the state's finance system of local agency funding. This would protect county and cities' general revenues from future diversions or cost shifts. (3)
- Change audit firms on a periodic basis.

VI. Comments

As long as legislators in Sacramento continue to change the funding basis for local agencies, it will be virtually impossible on a year-to-year basis to determine what resources are available for basic community services, especially, if there is a major downturn in the economy and spending was built on a high point. California has an economic history that has peaks and valleys, and counties and cities should be aware that this situation is not unique at this point in time. By considering historical data, local growth projections and basic community service needs, long-term planning can take place and provide budget reserve information that will protect agencies when adverse situations, as we currently see today, take place. There are models of such planning throughout the state that have been prepared in detail to create long term budget forecasts. When agencies using these procedures are examined, the majority are found to be in good financial position to deal with the uncertainties that the State financial procedures create.

VII. Affected Agencies

- City of Benicia
- City of Dixon
- City of Fairfield
- City of Rio Vista
- City of Suisun City
- City of Vacaville
- City of Vallejo
- Solano County Board of Supervisors
- Solano County Auditor/Controller

East Vallejo Fire Protection District 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The Grand Jury received a complaint stating that the money received by the City of Vallejo to provide services to the East Vallejo Fire Protection District was not sufficient to cover the actual costs of providing fire protection services to the District.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Reviewed the agreement, dated February 7, 1995, between the City of Vallejo and the East Vallejo Fire Protection District for Fire Protection Services, as amended on May 6, 1997, February 15, 2000 and May 14, 2002
- Interviewed the complainant
- Received information from the City of Vallejo about the cost of providing fire protection services
- Reviewed Solano County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Procedures
- Interviewed members of the Solano County Board of Supervisors

III. Background

1. The East Vallejo Fire Protection District (EVFPD) is a special district established on July 5, 1939, to provide fire services to the unincorporated areas of Eastern Vallejo. Currently the EVFPD serves several unincorporated areas, some of which are completely surrounded by the City of Vallejo.

2. The Board of the EVFPD was dissolved in 1994 and the County Board of Supervisors now serves as the EVFPD board. The district contracts for fire protection services with the City of Vallejo.

3. Under the terms of the current agreement, the City of Vallejo bills the EVFPD for fire protection services based on a complex proportional formula that includes weighted factors for assessed valuation, population, service demand, and square miles protected. The most recent annual bill for services based on this formula was \$417,823.

4. The City of Vallejo estimates that the actual cost to provide fire protection services in the City is \$501.37 per household. This is calculated by dividing the total City of Vallejo Fire Department budget (\$20,665,900) by the number of housing units (41,219) in the City which totals \$501.37 per housing unit. Thus the actual cost to provide fire protection services to the 1,100 households in the EVFPD is \$551,507 per year which is \$133,684 more than the City billed EVFPD. This could even be an underestimate because the City reports that over the last three years, approximately 5% of their service calls have been to locations in the East Vallejo Fire Protection District. If the actual cost was based on the percentage of service calls, the amount EVFPD would pay for annual service would be over \$1,000,000 (5% x \$20,665,900).

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1 - The current agreement between the EVFPD and the City of Vallejo results in a bill for services (\$417,823) that is less than the cost of providing these services (\$551,507) as estimated by the City of Vallejo. Thus the taxpayers in the City of Vallejo are subsidizing the cost of fire protection services for the taxpayers in the EVFPD. (3)(4)

Recommendation #1 - The City of Vallejo and the Solano County Board of Supervisors negotiate a new agreement for services that fairly compensates the city for the actual cost of providing fire protection services.

Finding #2 - The EVFPD serves an unincorporated urban area almost entirely within the sphere of influence of the City of Vallejo. The EVFPD Board was dissolved ten years ago and the district exists only to pass through tax revenue from the County to the City of Vallejo to fund fire protection services. (1)(2)

Recommendation #2 - The City of Vallejo and the Solano County Board of Supervisors should review the status of the EVFPD with a view toward determining the most equitable and efficient method of providing fire services to these areas. This should be done in conjunction with the LAFCO guidelines which include the following considerations:

- Does the district tailor its services better than a city?
- Does the district link its costs to benefits better than a city?
- Is the district more responsive to its constituents than a city?
- Are there inefficiencies or redundancies?
- Is a district more accountable than a city?
- What are the funding mechanisms and would a change reduce existing services?

Finding #3 – The Grand Jury received maps of the area comprising the EVFPD from the County, the City of Vallejo and LAFCO. Certain core areas appear on all three maps. However, other areas including Sandy Beach, a section bordering the Napa River north of the Mare Island Strait, an area north of Columbus Parkway, west of Sulfur Springs Creek and an area on the east side of Vallejo bordering the Cordelia Fire District did not appear on all three maps, creating some uncertainty about the areas covered by the EVFPD and the responsibility for paying for fire protection services.

Recommendation #3 – The City of Vallejo and the Solano County Board of Supervisors should ensure that they are in agreement about the contracted area covered by the EVFPD.

V. Affected Agencies

- East Vallejo Fire Protection District
- Solano County Board of Supervisors
- City of Vallejo
- Solano County Local Agency Formation Commission

Summary of Cases

In addition to the reports by the Audit & Finance Committee of the 2003-2004 Solano County Grand Jury, the following citizen complaints were received and acted upon:

Nature of Complaint	Action taken by Grand Jury	Resolution
Complaint that the Mayor of Dixon violated the Brown Act by sending an e-mail to City Council members	Reviewed e-mail, consulted with County Counsel, met with Dixon Mayor	Case closed. The Grand Jury did not find the e-mail to be in violation of the Brown Act.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

California Medical Facility 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The California Penal Code §919(b) mandates that the Grand Jury inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Interviewed the Chief Deputy Warden and staff
- Inspected the facility
- Observed on-site health care facilities

III. Background

1. The California Medical Facility (CMF) is a joint operation between the California Department of Corrections (CDC) and the California Department of Mental Health (CDMH) providing a centrally located medical and psychiatric institution for the health care needs of the male felon population in California's prisons. The facility was designed to house 2,315 inmates but has been reconfigured by adding beds to house additional inmates.

CMF includes a general acute care hospital, in-patient and out-patient psychiatric facilities, a hospice unit for terminally ill inmates, housing and treatment for inmates identified with AIDS/HIV, general population, and other specialized inmate housing. Additionally, the CDMH operates a licensed, acute care psychiatric hospital within CMF.

2. For fiscal year 2003-2004 the facility has a budget of \$177 million. Annual cost per inmate is approximately \$54,000 compared to the California average of \$18,000 to \$20,000 for non-medical correction institutions.

3. Inmates are classified by level based on age, types of crimes committed and other factors. There are four (4) levels: 1-minimum security, 2-dormitory housing, 3-cell housing and 4- highest security rating. A Separate Housing Unit is for violent inmates.

4. The inmate appeal process (complaints) is handled under Title 15. There are four (4) levels of review.

- Informal – to be resolved within fifteen (15) work days with the staff
- Appeals Coordinator – to be resolved within twenty (20) work days
- Second level – to be resolved within thirty (30) work days
- Reviewed by CDC. and to be resolved within sixty (60) work days

5. The Education program is staffed by fourteen (14) credentialed teachers – 8 in education and 6 in vocational education.

6. CMF employs approximately 1,400 people. It was stated by CMF administrative staff that recruiting and retaining medical personnel is an ongoing problem. Testimony indicated a shortage of nurses and other medical personnel. Inmate visits to the CMF clinic exceed 100,000 per year, an average of 30 visits per inmate per month.

7. Inmate smoking is prohibited throughout the prison, however, correctional officers were observed smoking outside and in view of the inmates.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1 - The facility is overcrowded and using spaces not originally intended for inmate housing. (1)

Recommendation #1 – Overcrowding should be addressed and resolved by the responsible agencies.

Finding #2 – There is a major shortage of nurses and other medical personnel. (6)

Recommendation #2 – The state Department of Corrections should look at employment hiring practices with a view to resolve this ongoing problem.

Finding #3 – Correctional Officers were observed smoking in non-designated areas while on duty. This practice could adversely affect officer-inmate relations. (7)

Recommendation #3 – Specified smoking areas should not be visible to inmates..

V. Comments

The facility was very clean and orderly. The staff was well organized and up to date regarding policy and procedures. It was noted that the warden has final authority over both agencies (CDC & CDMH). It is commendable that there is reciprocal use of resources between CMF and California State Prison Solano. They are able to cut costs by sharing such things as utilities and staffing. Their goal was to assure that they meet the most important objectives to the inmate morale – mail, food and visitors. However, an inconsistency was noted in the smoking policy.

VI. Affected Agencies

- California Medical Facility
- California Department of Corrections

California State Prison Solano Facilities Inspection and Tour 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The California Penal Code §919(b) mandates that the Grand Jury inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Interviewed the Warden and staff
- Toured and inspected the facility
- Observed on-site health care facilities
- Reviewed vocational and education programs
- Reviewed and observed in the Substance Abuse Program (SAP), a prerelease program for recovering addicts

III. Background

1. The mission statement of the California State Prison (CSP) Solano is “ To incarcerate and control felons, while providing the opportunity for meaningful work, training and other programs”.

2. CSP Solano in Vacaville was designed to house 2,610 inmates and reconfigured to house 5,762 inmates through double bunking and other methods. At the time of the inspection, the facility housed 5,831 inmates. The facility was clean, well organized and orderly.

3. The prison provides a comprehensive work training program for medium security inmates, which includes academic training, vocational training and work assignments within the prison.

4. The Prison Industry Authority program offers meaningful work and occupational training for inmates who qualify. This program offers numerous manufacturing and services enterprises within the prison such as the manufacture of special vehicle equipment for Caltrans, disabled person placards for the Department of Motor Vehicles and prescription eyeglasses for Medi-Cal recipients and inmates. The program is totally self sufficient and no tax funds are used for direct costs. A portion of inmates’ wages is transferred to the Crime Victims Restitution Fund.

5. Inmate programs offered include adult basic education (high school/G.E.D.), English as a second language, literacy programs and substance abuse programs.

6. The Grand Jury observed the Substance Abuse Program (SAP) as provided by an outside contractor. This program is designed to provide comprehensive support services to recovering addicts and others involved in the drug culture through education, training and counseling. There are currently 400 inmates enrolled in the program. The program is provided to inmates who are within 24 months of release. When combined with a 90 day after-release care program, the recidivism rate for those in the program reduced 40% compared to those not in the program.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1 – The facility is overcrowded. (1)

Recommendation #1 – The overcrowding should be addressed by the affected agencies.

Finding #2- Training programs offer opportunities for inmates to acquire helpful skills. (3)(4)(5)

Recommendation #2 – Continue programs and develop statistics to evaluate their effectiveness of the programs.

Finding #3 – The Substance Abuse Program, based on data provided by the contractor, reduced recidivism rate those inmates taking the program and participating in the after care program. (6)

Recommendation #3 – Continue the program if the stated recidivism rate reduction is maintained or improved.

V. Comments

The Warden and staff of the California State Prison Solano are to be commended for their leadership and management of the facility. The Substance Abuse Program is a challenging undertaking, and the Grand Jury commends it heartily. Data on recidivism rates was provided by the contractor administering the program. There was no additional documentation.

VI. Affected Agencies

- California State Prison Solano
- California Department of Corrections

Delta Fire Camp

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The California Penal Code §919 (b) mandates that the Grand Jury inquire into the conduct and management of public prisons within the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Interviewed management personnel, staff and inmates
- Inspected the facility
- Reviewed vocational and educational programs

III. Background

1. The Delta Fire Camp is a joint venture of the California Department of Forestry (CDF) and the California Department of Corrections (CDC).

2. There are 12 fire captains, eight correctional officers, one lieutenant, two sergeants and an administrative assistance.

3. The camp has the capacity of 132 inmates. There are six fire crews of 17 inmates each and 30- 45 inmate support staff. The fire crews are trained and certified in fire fighting.

4. For Northern California Fire Camps, minimum security inmates are recruited only from the Susanville Prison. Inmates convicted of violent or sex crimes are not eligible for the program.

5. Statewide, there are 38 camps: 22 camps throughout Southern California and a total of 16 camps throughout Northern California.

6. Inmates receive \$1.47 per day for work, such as community service, with an additional \$1.00 per hour when working on a fire line.

7. Inmates receive two days off their sentence for every day served in the program.

8. Fire Camp policy provides a positive family visitation program, which includes multi-day visits in an on-site facility.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1 - The benefits of being in this program are very desirable to inmates, and thus, minimal security is required at the facility. (3)(4)(6)

Recommendation #1 – None

Finding #2 - A house is maintained on site for family visitations. The Fire Camp has a limited budget for furnishings. The camp relies on donations to augment the budget. (8)

Recommendation #2 – Solicit donations from local service groups and non-profit organizations.

Finding # 3 - Inmates are certified in fire fighting and are eligible to be employed by CDF upon release. (3)

Recommendation #3 – None

Finding #4 - When not on the fire lines, inmates perform community service such as roadside clean up, removing vegetation from creeks, etc. In addition, inmates make signs for non-profit and governmental agencies. (6)

Recommendation # 4 – None

V. Comments

The Delta Fire Camp is a good alternative placement for those inmates who meet the qualifications. Inmates who are assigned to this facility experience more privileges than in state correctional facilities.

VI. Affected Agencies

- California Department of Forestry
- California Department of Corrections

Fouts Springs Youth Facility

2003 – 2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason For Investigation

The California Penal Code §919 (b) mandates that the Grand Jury inquire into the condition and management of public detention facilities.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury

- Interviewed Fouts Springs Youth Facility staff
- Toured Fouts Springs Youth Facility grounds and buildings
- Spoke with wards at Fouts Springs Youth Facility

III. Background

1. Fouts Springs was established in 1959 as an all male facility for the Juvenile Courts of Solano, Colusa and Placer Counties as an alternative placement to the California Youth Authority (CYA). A program for females was added in May 2003.

2. Fouts Springs is located at a remote site in the Mendocino National Forest in Colusa County on land leased from the Federal Government.

3. The facility is operated under a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) among the counties of Solano, Colusa and Placer. Many other California counties also send juvenile wards to Fouts Springs.

4. Solano County is designated by the JPA as the administering county for the purpose of being the designated employer for facility staff, providing budget and accounting functions, claims processing, purchasing, etc.

5. Nielson High School, located at Fouts Springs, operates out of the office of the Colusa County Superintendent of Schools and has a graduation rate of 95%. The school has 6 teachers, 5 aides, 1 secretary and 1 registrar. All wards are required to attend school. 25 percent have an Individual Education Plan (IEP).

6. Fouts Springs has a capacity of 160 wards and at the time of the Grand Jury visit had 88 wards, 81 males and 7 females.

7. The staff at Fouts Springs consists of 6 Administrators, 3 Supervising Group Counselors, 7 Senior Group Counselors and 27 Group Counselors.

8. There is one hour of family visitation per week. Female wards receive visitors on Saturday, males on Sunday.

IV. Findings And Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1: Fouts Springs is not being used to its capacity by the JPA counties. (3)(6)

Recommendation #1: JPA counties should look into assigning more wards to Fouts Springs and increase efforts to promote the use of Fouts Springs by other California counties.

V. Comments

Fouts Springs Mission Statement: To protect society by restructuring unacceptable anti-social behaviors of youth.

After observing the Fouts Springs staff and wards and comparing their success rate with other juvenile detention facilities, it seems that the JPA communities should explore the possibility of making more use of the facility. Fouts Springs changes the behavior of its wards and the recidivism rate suggests they have a strong program.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Board of Supervisors
- Solano County Department of Probation
- Colusa County Board of Supervisors
- Placer County Board of Supervisors

Solano County Juvenile Hall Inspection

2003 – 2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The California Penal Code §919 (b) mandates that the Grand Jury inquire into the condition and management of public detention facilities within the county.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Interviewed Juvenile Hall staff
- Toured Solano County Juvenile Hall
- Spoke with wards in Juvenile Hall

III. Background

1. The Grand Jury met with the Superintendent and Supervising Group Counselors and discussed the current facilities, policies, philosophies and the construction of the new facilities. Following the meeting, the Grand Jury was led on a tour of the facilities, including the receiving area, holding cells, dormitory areas, kitchen, classrooms and exercise yards.

2. Upon detention, juveniles are fingerprinted, photographed and examined by the medical staff. Juveniles are held for a maximum of 72 hours before a detention hearing. The court hearing determines whether the juveniles are to be detained or released to parents/guardians.

3. The facility has 118 beds – 88 beds for detention and 30 beds in a treatment unit. At the time of the visitation there were 60 male and 19 female wards in the hall.

4. The staff-to-ward ratio is 1-10 during the day and 1-30 at night. The average length of detainment is 16.4 days. The cost per day per ward is \$133.00.

5. While the facility is an old building, it appears to be well maintained. The rooms, halls and yards were free of litter. Books and school supplies were all stored in book cases or on desks.

6. Visitation is allowed every Wednesday from 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. and Sunday from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. Visitation is limited to 30 minutes per ward.

7. School attendance is required daily from 8:30 a.m. – 2:15 p.m. Emphasis is placed on improving the reading skills. There are 5 classroom teachers, 1 resource teacher, and 1 reading facilitator.

8. A new Juvenile Hall is under construction on the current site and is scheduled to open in June 2004. The new facility will increase the capacity to 90 beds in the detention unit and 58 beds in the treatment unit. The new facility will include modern cells, classrooms, a larger library, better visitation area and a more accessible entrance for the public.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1 - The ongoing construction has created very poor parking and access to the facility. Inclement weather only exacerbates the problem. (8)

Recommendation #1 - For future projects, temporary parking and walkways should be planned and placed as close as possible to the entrance.

Finding #2 - Staff dress code seemed very lax. It was sometimes difficult to identify staff from wards. (1)

Recommendation #2 - Develop some type of dress code. Senior staff stated that the dress code was currently under negotiation.

Finding #3 - Ward complaint form dispensers were empty in several areas. (1)

Recommendation #3 - Keep the dispensers supplied with complaint forms.

Finding #4 - Supervising staff stated that mental health issues among wards are rapidly increasing. Currently 15-18 wards are on "psychotropic" medication. (2)(3)

Recommendation #4 - Provide necessary training for staff and designate an area in the new facility to house such wards.

V. Comments

All staff spoken to expressed enthusiasm for their positions and for the overall atmosphere of the Juvenile Hall.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Sheriff/Coroner's Office
- Solano County Department of Probation
- Solano County Juvenile Hall

Detention/Holding Facilities 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The California Penal Code §919 (b) mandates that the Grand Jury inquire into the conduct and management of public prisons within the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury inspected detention/holding facilities in each of the following:

- City of Benicia
- City of Dixon
- City of Fairfield
- City of Rio Vista
- City of Suisun City
- City of Vacaville
- City of Vallejo

III. Background

1. The California Board of Corrections, in accordance with the California Code of Regulations “Title 15 Crime Prevention and Corrections”, closely monitors the various detention/holding facilities. The Grand Jury conducted visits to the various facilities throughout the County. The local police departments control the detention/holding facilities in their cities. These are facilities where detainees are held temporarily until transported to the County Jail in Fairfield.

2. Local Fire Marshals and the Board of Corrections annually inspect these facilities. To ensure compliance with Title 15, the Grand Jury also does an inspection.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Benicia Police Department

Finding #1- Holding cells and booking area are old but adequate. The Benicia facility is located in an old school. There is no Sally Port (enclosed, secure parking area for transferring prisoners from a vehicle to the detention facility) and no separate toilet facilities for prisoners. The building is seismically unsafe. The 2003 bond issue on the ballot to replace/upgrade the facility failed. (1)(2)

Recommendation #1- The city of Benicia should explore alternatives to correct deficiencies.

Dixon Police Department

Finding #1 – Police facility is considered a “temporary holding facility”, not holding cells, because staffing levels are not adequate to qualify for standard holding procedures. The facility is clean and appears safe. (1)(2)

Recommendation #1 – Review the need for holding cells in light of projected population growth.

Fairfield Police Department

Finding #1 – Holding cells and booking area appeared safe and clean. (2)(3)

Recommendation #1 – None

Finding #2 – The Sally Port was a combination of a prisoner transfer area, supply storage and the maintenance facility for department vehicles. Tools and supplies, which could be used as weapons, were within easy access of prisoners. General clutter was observed. The same deficiencies were noted in the 2002-2003 Grand Jury report and have yet to be corrected. Statements by city personnel indicate the maintenance facility will not be relocated to a former fire station until approximately September 2004. (1)(2)

Recommendation #2– All items stored directly adjacent to the prisoner transfer area should be moved and/or secured. Better safety precautions should be in place for the protection of maintenance personnel during prisoner transfer. The Sally Port should be used for safely transferring prisoners from vehicles to holding cells. Any other use should be secure enough to prohibit possible injury to prisoners or staff from items in the area used as weapons. The transfer of the maintenance facility out of the Sally Port should be expedited.

Rio Vista Police Department

Finding #1 – The booking area appeared clean and safe. A secured bar is available to attach restraints for violent prisoners. There are no holding cells on site so prisoners are transported directly to the County Jail. (1)(2)

Recommendations #2 – The Rio Vista Police Department should consider adding holding cells to current or future facilities to accommodate projected population growth.

City of Suisun City Police Department

Finding #1 – The Booking area and the holding cells appeared clean and safe. (1)(2)

Recommendation #1– None.

Vacaville Police Department

Finding #1– The holding cells and booking area are cramped but adequate. Areas appeared clean and safe. There is a separate cell for holding juveniles. (1)(2)

Recommendation #1 – None.

Finding #2 – The Department does not have a Sally Port. However, a new police facility with a Sally Port is planned with ground breaking in the Spring of 2004 and completion estimated in the summer of 2005. (1)(2)

Recommendation #2– None

Vallejo Police Department

Finding #1 – The holding cells and booking area appeared clean and safe. (1)(2)

Recommendation #1– None.

V. Comment

The Vallejo Police Department Sally Port is a model facility and should be used as a standard for other Police Departments.

VI. Affected Agencies

- California Department of Corrections (Courtesy Copy)
- City of Benicia Police Department
- City of Benicia City Manager
- City of Dixon Police Department
- City of Dixon City Manager
- City of Fairfield Police Department
- City of Fairfield City Manager
- City of Rio Vista Police Department
- City of Rio Vista City Manager
- City of Suisun City Police Department
- City of Suisun City - City Manager
- City of Vacaville Police Department
- City of Vacaville City Manager
- City of Vallejo Police Department
- City of Vallejo City Manager

Solano County Sheriff/Coroner's Office
Facilities Inspection and Tour
2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The California Penal Code §919(b) mandates that the Grand Jury inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Met with the Solano County Sheriff and senior staff
- Toured and inspected the Fairfield and Claybank detention facilities
- Interviewed staff at inspected facilities
- Observed on-site health facilities and food preparation (Claybank)
- Toured the Coroner's Office
- Toured and inspected a holding facility for the Solano County Superior Court (Fairfield)
- Reviewed next of kin notification data from the Coroner's Office
- Reviewed Kitchell/DSA/KMD study

III. Background

1. The Solano County Jail (Fairfield and Claybank facilities), the Solano County Superior Court holding cells (Fairfield and Vallejo facilities) and the Coroner's Office report to the Solano County Sheriff. Facilities were inspected and found to be clean. Some of the carpeting in the Claybank facility was worn and could potentially pose a safety hazard. The Claybank administration has obtained a bid to replace the carpet with tile.

2. Based on study by Kitchell/DSA/KMD commissioned by Solano County, total required beds for inmates in Solano County is projected to be 2054 by the year 2015. This compares to 1116 beds currently available.

3. The Fairfield facility has 740 beds. The California State Board of Corrections will allow only 705 beds to be filled based on current square footage of inmate living space. Based on the study, the inmate population at Fairfield is projected to grow to approximately 1200 by the year 2015.

4. The Claybank facility has 411 beds. The inmate population at Claybank is projected to grow to approximately 600 by the year 2015. The facility also provides electronic monitoring of out-of-custody inmates. The Claybank inmates provide laundry service for both jails. Additionally, they grow produce for the jail food service operation.

- a. Vallejo currently does not have a facility to house inmates for Solano County. However, the study projects the need for a facility to house 250 inmates by the year 2015.

- b. Due to the loss of some personal items in the Coroner's office during 2002-2003, a tracking and control system of personal items has been implemented. No complaints have been received since the system was put in place.
- c. The 2002-2003 Solano County Grand Jury reported a complaint about a delay in notification of next-of-kin by the Coroner's Office. The 2003-2004 Grand Jury made a random check of notification of next-of-kin statistics for a period in 2003. It appears all reviewed notifications were made in a timely manner, even in an instance where the decedent was burned beyond recognition.

II. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1 – The carpeting in the Claybank facility is old, worn and poses a safety hazard to staff and inmates (1)

Recommendation #1 – Follow Claybank administration recommendation to replace carpet with tile.

Finding #2 – According to the Kitchell Study, inmate population in Solano County is projected to grow to 2,054 by the year 2015 (2345)

Recommendation #2 – The Solano County Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff's/Coroner Office take the necessary steps to implement and fund facilities to accommodate the projected growth.

III. Comments

The facilities inspected were very clean and orderly. The staffs in all of the facilities inspected were well organized and up-to-date regarding policies and procedures. The Sheriff's Office is to be commended for the prompt implementation of procedures to protect personal property in the Coroner's Office.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Sheriff/Coroner's Office
- Solano County Board of Supervisors

In addition to the reports by the Criminal Justice Committee of the 2003-2004 Solano County Grand Jury, the following citizen complaints were received and acted upon.

Nature of Complaint	Action Taken by Grand Jury	Resolution
Misuse of authority by City of Suisun City Police Chief	Investigated	Resolved by Personnel action.
Harassment by Vallejo Police Department	Requested information from complainant	No response from complainant- No action required
Denial of medication for inmate of California Medical Facility	Reviewed complaint	Insufficient grounds for investigation- case closed
Harassment by Vallejo Police Department	Reviewed complaint	Insufficient grounds for investigation- case closed
Mistreatment of inmate at California Medical Facility	Reviewed complaint	Insufficient grounds for investigation- case closed
False testimony given by Solano County Deputy Sheriff at personnel hearing	Investigated and interviewed complainant	Personnel issue that is not in the purview of the Grand Jury.
Harassment by Dixon Police Department	Investigated	Litigation pending. Not in the purview of the Grand Jury.
Denial of medical claim against the City of Vallejo	Investigated	Complaint not supported- case closed
Inappropriate actions by California Medical Facility Correction Officer	Investigating	Pending CMF investigation and referral to 2004-2005 Grand Jury
False arrest by City of Suisun City due to mistaken identity	Investigated	Complaint found valid. Grand Jury responded to complainant and suggest to resubmit the claim to the proper agency.
Harassment by Vacaville Police Department	Investigated	Complainant does not wish to pursue
Misuse of authority by City of Suisun City Police Chief	Investigated	Two week Suspension of Police Chief by City Manager

Education and Library Committee

Academic Performance Index and Ranking for Schools Visited by the Grand Jury

Test scores are one means of measuring a school's effectiveness. "One means" is important to emphasize because there are other valid means to evaluate a school's success, such as graduation rates, participation in the community and over-all satisfaction of the students and parents. The Grand Jury has included the Academic Performance Index (API) Base scores, state-wide rankings and similar school rankings for the years of 2001, 2002 and 2003. The state target base score is 800 on a scale of 200 to 1000. Rankings for other schools in California and for similar schools are based upon a 1 to 10 scale, 10 being the best. The statistics were taken from the California Department of Education website: api.cde.ca.gov.

School	School District	2001			2002			2003		
		API	Statewide Rank	Similar Schools Rank	API	Statewide Rank	Similar Schools Rank	API	Statewide Rank	Similar Schools Rank
Bransford Elementary	Fairfield-Suisun	573	2	2	567	2	N/A	612	2	2
Hemlock Elementary	Vacaville	698	6	2	731	7	7	715	5	2
Tolenas Elementary	Fairfield-Suisun	804	9	8	780	8	N/A	776	7	5
C.A. Jacobs Intermediate	Dixon	694	6	7	678	6	3	681	5	4
Jesse Bethel High	Vallejo City	568	3	4	608	4	5	594	3	3
Angelo Rodriguez High	Fairfield-Suisun	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	660	6	N/A	677	6	7
Vanden High	Travis	729	9	10	712	8	10	774	9	10
Will C. Wood High	Vacaville	661	6	3	648	6	4	675	6	5

Notes:

API (Academic Performance Index) is based on a scale from 200-1000. The statewide performance target for all schools is 800.

Statewide Rank - All schools that receive APIs are ranked in deciles by school type: elementary, middle, and high.

A rank of 10 is the highest and 1 is the lowest. Each decile in each school type contains 10 percent of all schools of that type.

Similar Schools Rank - Schools are also ranked in deciles when compared to 100 schools with similar characteristics.

N/A = not available

Angelo Rodriquez High School

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for visitation

The Grand Jury elected to visit a random selection of schools in the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Toured the school facility
- Talked with administrators, teachers, classified personnel and students
- Observed students in classes, and moving from class to class
- Observed libraries, computer labs, cafeteria, gyms and classrooms
- Reviewed health, safety and emergency procedures

III. Background

1. Angelo Rodriquez High School is located at 5000 Red Top Road, Fairfield on 50 acres in the Western portion of the Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District. It was completed and occupied in the fall of 2001. Access signs to its parking lots are confusing, especially for visitors.

2. Angelo Rodriguez High School, which accommodates 3,000 students in four grades (9-12) by the 2004-2005 school year, is the district's newest of three comprehensive high schools offering a wide selection of classes and activities. The campus includes three two-story academic wings, a large, well-supplied library, cafeteria and gymnasium. The campus, in general, was clean and has a "no gum" policy.

3. The staff at Angelo Rodriquez High School is composed of 66 certificated staff members, one principal, two assistant principals, three counselors, one librarian, one part-time psychologist, one part-time nurse and one part-time speech therapist. There are 32 classified personnel to assist in the operation of the school.

4. Angelo Rodriquez High School operates on an alternating block schedule, "A" and "B" days in which students attend three of their six classes (102 minutes each) and a tutorial period (40 minutes) each day. Wednesday is collaborative planning day for teachers and periods are reduced to 40 minutes. Students carry six classes with opportunities for Advanced Placement and Honors courses, Special Education Programs, Advancement via Independent Education Development (AVID), Gifted And Talented Education (GATE), a Language Acquisition Program and Resource and Special Day Class programs.

5. Students may all choose to participate in the Interscholastic or Intramural Athletic Programs, Cheerleading Squads, Marching Band, Concert Band, Choir, Drama, Conflict Management and clubs. There are currently ten recognized student clubs on campus representing a variety of student interests.

6. While Angelo Rodriquez High School offers many elective classes such as computer, photography and creative writing, it does not offer Home Economics or shop-type Vocational classes.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 – Directional and access signs to the school’s parking lots are insufficient and confusing. (1)

Recommendation #1 – Post clearer directional and access signs for the school location and parking areas.

Finding #2 – During the Grand Jury visit, the library appeared to be underutilized. Staff indicates that hours of library access before and after school are insufficient for student needs. (2)

Recommendation #2 – Create more opportunities for student access to the library before, during and after school hours.

Finding #3 – Although it is a new school with a “no gum” policy, the school walkways had numerous gum ‘spots.’ (2)

Recommendation #3 – Enforce the “no gum” policy and De-gum’ or steam clean and hose down walkways frequently.

Finding #4 – Angelo Rodriquez High School does not offer Home Economics or shop-type Vocational programs. (6)

Recommendation #4 – The Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District allow courses of study that encompass the Vocational Arts at all high schools or designate a high school as a Vocational Arts High School.

V. Comments

Gum on walkways is not attractive nor is it conducive to the good health of the student population. This is a visual example of what happens when policies are not enforced.

Not all students matriculate to college. For those who don’t, Vocational Arts *could* make their high school and life experience a more meaningful one

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Office of Education
- Fairfield - Suisun Unified School District
- Fairfield - Suisun Unified School Board
- Angelo Rodriguez High School

Bransford Elementary School

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Visitation

The Grand Jury elected to visit a random selection of schools in the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Toured the school campus
- Talked with the principal, teachers, other school personnel and students
- Observed students in classes, moving from class to class, and at lunch
- Observed the library, computer lab, cafeteria, classrooms and hallways
- Reviewed health, safety and emergency procedures

III. Background

1. Bransford Elementary, located in Fairfield, is a Kindergarten through Sixth grade year-round school.

2. The school enrollment population is approximately 950: 52% of the students are Hispanic, 23% White (non-Hispanic), 22% African-American and 3% Asian. Forty eight percent of the students are classified as English Language Learning (ELL).

3. There are 40 classroom teachers, 39 of who are fully credentialed, and one on an emergency credential. There are 35 female and five male teachers; five of the teachers can speak Spanish. 90% of the Bransford teachers are California Language Acquisition Development (CLAD) certified. One teacher is Bilingual CLAD.

4. The hallways are used to display student work, pictures, club announcements and student recognition.

5. The library, while small, is very inviting and warm. Tables are arranged so groups of 3-5 students can work together and not disturb other groups. Along with the many books written in English, there is also a good selection of Spanish and Spanish/English books.

6. The Computer Lab is located in the library. The equipment is arranged in two rows and can be used by individual students or a group of students simultaneously.

7. Music appreciation is a regular part of the curriculum. The music teacher visits the classrooms and often brings older students into the lower-grade level rooms to teach dance movements and songs to the younger students.

8. The "Newcomer" program for Spanish speaking students in grades 4-5-6 provides Level 1 English Language Learners (ELL) a strong opportunity to improve/develop their English skills.

9. "Read 180," a federally funded program, is an intensive reading comprehension program offered to grades 4-5-6.

IV. Findings And Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1 - There is a large number of Spanish speaking students at Bransford Elementary School. (2)(8)

Recommendation #1 - Continue the “Newcomer” program.

Finding #2 - The “Read 180” Program appears to be an effective program. (9)

Recommendation #2 - Continue the “Read-180” program

V. Comments

Bransford is to be commended for implementing the Peace Builder program which promotes getting along with others and displaying good citizenship and manners in all settings. While it is one of the oldest schools in the Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District, Bransford is very well maintained and clean.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Office of Education
- Fairfield - Suisun Unified School District
- Fairfield – Suisun Unified School Board
- Bransford Elementary School

C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The Grand Jury elected to visit a random selection of schools in the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Talked with school board members district administrators, school administrators, teachers, librarians, classified staff members and students
- Toured the school facility
- Observed the library, computer lab, cafeteria, gym and classrooms
- Reviewed health, safety and emergency procedures

III. Background

1. C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School (grades seven and eight) was named for Mr. Chris Jacobs, an educator who served the community of Dixon for 45 years. The school is located at 200 North Lincoln Street in Dixon. The school office hours are 7:30 am. – 4:00 p.m. The website is <http://www.dixonusd.org>.

2. C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School is a closed campus, and its primary goal is for students to feel safe and secure in a caring environment which maximizes academic success and social skills while nurturing growth and development.

3. C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School has 638 students, 28 teachers supported by the principal, one assistant principal, one counselor, two counseling secretaries, one office manager, one psychologist, one speech and language specialist and 15 additional classified staff members. The school is also served by one school resource officer who is a member of the Dixon Police Department.

4. C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School has a Peer Assistants Group which is supervised and trained by the counselor. These students assist other students in resolution of conflicts in a non-violent manner.

5. The school sends out a parent newsletter about every 6-8 weeks with information about school activities and academic programs.

6. The school, as required by law, conducts regular fire and disaster preparedness drills throughout the school year. Student and staff safety is a priority of C.A. Jacobs School.

7. Students who achieve a 3.0 grade point average or higher are honored at a recognition assembly at the end of the first and second trimester and receive certificates. Two students are selected as *Top Cougars* receive special recognition.

8. Each student is given a C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School Student Handbook when they enroll. This handbook is free and is printed in English and Spanish.

9. C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School is part of the Dixon Unified Parent Association (DUPA) which is a district-wide parent organization.

10. The 2003 Standard Teaching and Reporting (STAR) scores reflect that the school's overall test score performance was average. It has a ranking of six out of ten on the 2002 Academic Performance Index (API) but compared to similar schools, it had a below average rank of three out of ten.

11. During the 2002-2003 school year the school had ten students per computer compared to 6.9 statewide.

12. The Federal *No Child Left Behind* Act mandates that every child have a fully qualified teacher.

IV. Finding and Recommendation

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding # 1 – Eighty-three percent of the teachers at C.A. Jacobs Intermediate School are fully credentialed, compared to the state's average of 88%. (3)(12)

Recommendation #1 – The school hire fully qualified teachers and make sure that teachers on emergency credentials become fully qualified.

Finding #2 – The students at the school were very polite and helpful as the Grand Jury visited the site. (2)(4)

Recommendation #2 – The school continue to promote the good citizenship shown to the Grand Jury.

Finding #3 – There was a brick missing in the walkway between portable classrooms, loose wires hanging from one classroom and a contractor's ladder was left unattended. (6)

Recommendation #3 – The school shall repair dangerous walkways and make sure that the students are protected from other dangerous situations.

V. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Office of Education
- Dixon Unified School District
- Dixon Unified School Board
- CA Jacobs Intermediate School

Hemlock Elementary School

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Visitation

The Grand Jury elected to visit a random selection of schools in the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Talked with school principal, teachers and staff
- Toured school facilities and observed students in classes and at recess
- Observed the school library, cafeteria, play areas and classrooms
- Reviewed school informational handouts that are sent home to parents, Academic Performance Index (API) reports, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report and teacher credential listing

III. Background

1. Hemlock is a K-6 school with 370 students located in the Vacaville Unified School District. There are 18 classroom teachers, all fully credentialed. Class sizes are limited to 20 in kindergarten through second grade. Grades 3-6 have class sizes around 30. The school has had four different principals in the last four years, but the current principal is familiar with the school, having previously been a teacher at the school. The faculty age averages in the mid-40's so some retirements are likely in the next few years. In addition to the regular classroom teachers, the school has a PE teacher, reading specialist and special education teachers. There are 18 classified staff at the school.

2. Seventy-five students were enrolled at Hemlock for the first time this year as a result of the closing of Ulatis School. Most of these students are Hispanic and many have parents with limited English. The addition of a bilingual secretary (formerly a secretary at Ulatis) and a bilingual Kindergarten teacher has been helpful in easing the transition for the parents and students transferred from Ulatis. To welcome the incoming Ulatis students and to get to know one another better, many of the Hemlock teachers and students took a special trip for a picnic day to Ulatis before it closed in the Spring of 2003.

3. Hemlock school is an older facility, built in 1955. The school is well maintained, but climate control is very poor, and there is little bulletin board display in the school outside the individual classrooms. Hemlock is scheduled for renovation, using Measure V bond funds, in 2004. This will include better lighting and new heating and air conditioning systems. Handicap access at the school is presently lacking, but will be added during the renovation. The school has 58 computers that are maintained by members of the faculty.

4. Many of the former Ulatis students arrive by bus, so a new bus parking area has been designated on the side of the school, near the Kindergarten playground.

5. The school cafeteria serves both breakfast and lunch.

6. The school has a very active Parent Teacher Association (PTA). One of their activities was a welcome dinner for the parents of the newly transferred students which was well attended. Adults English as a Second Language (ESL) classes are held two nights a week in the school library and it was reported that many parents attend.

7. The library was well stocked and used very frequently. Many of the books came from the former Ulatis school library.

IV. Findings and Recommendation

Each finding is referenced to a background paragraph number.

Finding #1 - Most of the teaching staff is older, so there may be some retirements in the next few years. (1)

Recommendation #1 - When new credentialed staff is needed, consider bringing in more bilingual teachers, not just to ease communication with students, but to encourage communication with non-English-speaking parents.

Finding #2 - The school lacks good handicap access and places to display student work outside the classrooms. (2)

Recommendation #2 - During the renovation process, ensure that handicap access is adequate and add additional bulletin board space in the common areas.

V. Comment

Hemlock School has undergone major demographic changes in the last year as the Vacaville Unified School District boundaries have changed and schools have been closed. The Grand Jury commends the faculty, staff and students at Hemlock for their efforts to welcome and assimilate the new students.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Office of Education
- Vacaville Unified School District
- Vacaville Unified School Board
- Hemlock Elementary School

Jesse Bethel High School

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for visitation

The Grand Jury elected to visit a random selection of schools in the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Toured the school facility
- Talked with administrators, teachers, classified personnel and students
- Observed students in classes and moving from class-to-class
- Observed library, Transition Center, cafeteria, gymnasiums and classrooms

III. Background

1. Jesse Bethel High School is located at 1800 Ascot Parkway, Vallejo and is part of the Vallejo City Unified School District (VCUSD). It is the district's first high school built in 100 years. The school opened in September of 1998 initially with 9th and 10th grades. Currently, the school teaches grades 9 - 12.

2. The campus design is a tiered style. There is a main level with two higher levels. The main level has the administration offices, library and classrooms. The second tier has additional classrooms along with the locker areas and the quad area. The third tier has a gymnasium, cafeteria and the vocational education classes. Due to the "open" campus design, the school is not secure. Vandalism is high during the non-school hours.

3. The original program was a block schedule with four classes per semester, at 90 minutes per class. There was an advisory period at the end of the day for 35 minutes with a maximum of 25 students per class. The school district discontinued the block program after two years. Major reasons cited for discontinuation were lack of teacher support and the cost. The Bethel community (parents, staff and students) has endured the changes well.

4. The current school program is a "traditional" schedule of six periods per day. The Academic Center, a carryover from the original program, is a tutoring center to help students with their class work. Under the old program, students did not fail classes but received an "I" or incomplete grade which was to be made up to a passing grade. Sixty percent of the affected students went from "I's" to passing grades. The remainder retained a failing grade.

5. At the time of this visitation, there were 1,480 students registered. The demographics of the school include 39% Black, 37% Filipino, 5% Hispanic, 5% non-Hispanic White, with a small percentage of Pacific Islander and other ethnic groups.

6. There are 60 teachers: 45 fully credentialed teachers and 15 with emergency credentials are in the process of becoming fully credentialed. There are nine Special Education teachers.

7. VCUSD is its own Special Education district unlike other school districts visited in the County.

8. The Principal has empowered students to participate in the decision making process during faculty and staff meetings because “the school is there to serve the students.”

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 – The school houses a Transition Center which serves all of Vallejo High Schools, Continuation and Middle Schools. This Center is primarily used by Special Education students and is federally funded; however, any student can use the career/placement facility. (2)

Recommendation #1 – The Grand Jury recommends continuation of this admirable program.

Finding #2 – The VCUSD uses the cafeteria as the main kitchen to prepare meals for all of the elementary schools in the district, along with the meals for Jesse Bethel High. The district does not use contracted food service. (2)

Recommendation #2 – The 2004-2005 Grand Jury review the cost-effectiveness of this system.

Finding #3 – Overall school maintenance is poor, considering the age of the school. At the time of the visit, the Grand Jury randomly inspected restroom facilities, drinking fountains (T2 building), locker areas (L4) and overall campus upkeep. A drinking fountain handle was not operable, and the bowl area was dirty but working. Many lockers were vandalized to the point of exposed sharp metal edges protruding into the walkway endangering the students and staff. (2)

Recommendation #3 – Damaged lockers need immediate attention. Drinking fountains need to be clean and operable at all times.

Finding #4 - Many maintenance problems are not addressed because of the deferred maintenance. (2)

Recommendation #4 - Re-evaluate the deferred maintenance policy.

Finding #5 - The Grand Jury observed that the ramps from level two to level three are very steep. Students in wheelchairs need assistance to use these ramps. Even with assistance, coming down the ramp could be hazardous if the assistant were to lose control. (2)(4)(6)(7)

Recommendation #5 - The School District and the Special Education Department should look into the feasibility of either changing the slope of the ramps, putting in a lift or devising a better access from level two to level three for students with ambulatory challenges.

IV. Comments

Better day-to-day campus upkeep needs to be established and enforced. A clean campus promotes school pride and better morale. A more secure campus would reduce the rate of vandalism and reduce maintenance costs. Deferred maintenance will only cost the District more in the long-run.

A teacher took the initiative to adapt a closet into a photography darkroom. The Grand Jury applauds this teacher for her creativity.

V. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Office of Education
- Vallejo City Unified School District
- Vallejo City Unified School Board
- Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)
- Jesse Bethel High School

Tolenas Elementary School 2003 - 2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Visitation

The Grand Jury elected to visit a random selection of schools in the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Toured school facilities in Fairfield
- Talked with administrators, teachers, students and staff
- Observed teacher and student interaction in classes
- Observed campus control and pickup of students at the end of the school day
- Reviewed health, safety procedures and informational handouts

III. Background

1. The school staff was not advised of the Grand Jury visit. Consequently, classroom activity appeared to be spontaneous and unrehearsed. At the end of the class period and during lunch, the teachers, students and staff inquired about the purpose of our visit.

2. The Principal has been at Tolenas Elementary, a Gifted and Talent Education (GATE) Magnet school, for three years. GATE students are enrolled in all-day classes. At the time of the visit, student enrollment was 640 in K-6 grades. Enrollment within grades 1, 2 and 3 was 20 students per class. In a combined 4/5 grade class, enrollment was 32 students. Within grades 4, 5 and 6, enrollment was 34 students per class.

3. Most classrooms are portables, and this summer, the ones that do not meet building code standards are scheduled for replacement. Each classroom has Internet access with four or five computers in the upper classes and 17 in the computer lab. The classrooms and campus area were clean, as were the restrooms.

4. The school's Academic Performance Index (API) score, although high is slightly lower than previous years. Plans have been instituted, including requesting District assistance, to research the cause of the decline. All teachers, except one, are fully credentialed. It was reported that the one teacher would be fully credentialed prior to the release of the Grand Jury report. The school submits grant applications to foundations to obtain money to establish mentoring programs that will benefit new and young teachers.

5. Very active "Stamp Out Bullying," "Making Personal Choices" and "Student Expectations" programs have been established. These student character development programs are school-wide and are highlighted in the *Tolenas Tiger Tribune*, the school and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) newsletter, which is sent to parents. Placards, T-shirts and monthly recognition awards are other methods used to bring attention to these programs.

6. The Grand Jury observed the school "Buddy Program," where sixth grade students lead their Kindergarten Buddies, by the hand, to other campus activities. The school's other activities are: sports, music and band. There is also a Chess Club. The school's PTO, which is very supportive, recently raised money for new playground equipment.

7. A full-service cafeteria is located in a new multipurpose facility where breakfast and lunch are served. There is a fruit and vegetable bar and, from observation, it is very popular. There are adult monitors that assist during breakfast and lunch periods. Also, students assist with meal setup and serving. The Grand Jury spoke with the students and the monitors and each stated they enjoy the responsible roles they perform.

8. Tolenas School is located on a very narrow, two-way street with a double yellow line running down the middle. The double line extends from the intersection of Tabor Ave and Tolenas Road to the end of the school property. The school has one regular bus and a Special Education student bus. Private vehicles transport the majority of the students. This poses several traffic hazards at the start and end of the school day. The Grand Jury, on March 30, 2004, observed these traffic hazards first-hand. During the observation period, the parents that were unable to gain access to school property, waited in their cars, knowing they were blocking all traffic. Traffic congestion at the intersection of Tabor Ave and Tolenas Road is another contributing safety problem. Even with a stoplight controlling car traffic and a crossing guard controlling children crossing, a safety hazard still exists.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 - There are classrooms that do not conform to building codes. (2)

Recommendation #1 - These classrooms should be replaced forthwith.

Finding #2 - The decline in the API score is cause for concern. (4)

Recommendation #2 - The Principal should be reinforced in her efforts to raise the API score. A committee consisting of district personnel, parents and staff should be organized to work with the principal in pinpointing the problem and ensuring that action is taken to reverse the decline.

Finding #3 - Traffic hazards threaten the safety of the entire student population and disrupt normal traffic flow in the surrounding neighborhood. Emergency vehicles would be prevented from entering school property during peak traffic periods. (8)

Recommendation #3 - The City of Fairfield and Fairfield Unified School District should work together to develop solutions to correction these traffic hazards.

V. Comments

“Stamp Out Bullying”, “Making Personal Choices” and “Student Expectation” programs, are character building programs that must be aggressively and continuously utilized in the school's curriculum. These types of programs must be instituted in the early development of each student. To reinforce these programs and ensure their success, every parent must be included in the process. Also, another character building program, “Challenge Days” program for upper class elementary school students, should be reevaluated and re-established. Budget constraints are a very real problem, as is helping our students develop positive character traits.

The adult monitors should be highly commended for their contributions to the children's safety as they perform their duty controlling and protecting the students during the abnormal vehicle congestion periods.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Office of Education
- Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District
- Fairfield – Suisun Unified School Board
- Tolenas Elementary School
- City of Fairfield

Vanden High School

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The Grand Jury elected to visit a random selection of schools in the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Talked to district administrators, school administrators, teachers, librarian, counselor and students
- Toured the school facility
- Observed cafeteria, student eating area, classrooms, gym, library and restrooms
- Observed the presentation by Vanden personnel of “school hubs”
- Obtained school test information from the California Education website

III. Background

1. Vanden High School in Fairfield is adjacent to Travis Air Force Base. A large percentage of the students are dependents of military personnel. Vanden is a four year, comprehensive high school offering a wide variety of classes and activities.

2. At the time of the visit, the enrollment was 1,328 students.

3. According to the principal, the school operates around two “hubs”, which are central focal points for information. They are the counseling department and the library.

4. The counseling department provides a number of services to the students and parents including the following: officially seeing each student once a year, providing parents and students with the opportunity to receive academic/class counseling during the summer months, providing a four-year plan for each student, providing a print-out of transcripts for each student each year, providing college and career counseling and providing personal counseling on an as-needed basis.

5. The library/technical center provides a number of services including: supporting student reading for school work and pleasure, locating information, promoting computer literacy, housing an instructional center, integrating materials with classroom instruction, holding book talks and maintaining a school website.

6. The school has had a consistently high scholarship award-rate. The class of 2003 (324 students) was awarded \$2.5 million in post-high school scholarships.

7. Vanden’s API scores for 2001, 2002 and 2003 were 729, 712 and 774, respectively. Their state-wide ranking for those years in the State of California was 9, 8 and 9. When compared to similar schools, Vanden achieved a ranking of 10. Both rankings were on a scale of 1 to 10. According to the principal, in the school year of 2002-2003, Vanden High School was the highest ranking traditional, comprehensive public high school among schools of similar size in the state of California.

8. The campus appears to be well organized for teacher collaboration and access to teaching materials within each department.

9. In touring the facility the Grand Jury found: thorn bushes extending over the walkway, posing a potential safety hazard; juice machine not functioning properly which limited students' choices of beverages; massive amounts of gum discarded on campus, specifically in the eating area; glass exit door painted with opaque green paint.

10. The school cafeteria program is privately contracted. According to staff, healthy menus are encouraged.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1 - The school has an effective operating program which is driven by the two information "hubs," the library and counseling department. (3)

Recommendation #1 - Continue and strengthen this highly effective system.

Finding #2 - The school logistically is laid out so as to maximize teacher collaboration and resource availability. (8)

Recommendation #2 - Continue to keep similar classes in close proximity for teacher collaboration and resource availability.

Finding #3 - There are dangerous thorn bushes that pose a safety hazard because they overhang the walkways. (9)

Recommendation #3 - Remove the thorn bushes.

Finding #4 - The juice machine was not working properly but the soda machine was working. (9)(10)

Recommendation #4 - Repair the juice machine.

Finding #5 - The campus was littered with gum, especially the outside eating area. (9)

Recommendation #5 - Clean gum residue from campus walkways and eating areas.

Finding #6 - A glass exit door in the cafeteria was painted with opaque green paint posing a potential safety hazard. (9)

Recommendation #6 – Correct the safety hazard.

V. Comments

The school administration and staff are commended for the high ranking it has attained among schools of similar size in the State of California.

The school schedule is meshed with the district master schedule to ensure a smooth progression of activities throughout the school year.

The administration appears to have a clear understanding and firm management of the school budgets to drive the success of the “hubs” of the school.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Office of Education
- Travis Unified School District
- Travis Unified School Board
- Vanden High School

Will C. Wood High School

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for visitation

The Grand Jury elected to visit a random selection of schools in the County.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Toured the school facility
- Talked with the principal
- Observed students in classes and moving from class to class
- Observed the campus grounds, library, cafeteria, and classrooms
- Reviewed school profile and other documents

III. Background

1. Will C. Wood High School is part of the Vacaville Unified School District. The school opened as a satellite campus to Vacaville High School in 1969. In 1974 the school became a Junior High School , grades 7–9. The process to convert W.C. Wood to a four year high school began in 1986. The first graduating class was in 1992.

2. At the time of the Grand Jury’s visitation, the student enrollment was 2,110. The student demographics were: African-American 8.4%, American Indian 2.0%, Asian-American 3.8%, Filipino-American 2.4%, Hispanic/Latino 16.1%, Pacific Islander 1.3%, Non-Hispanic White 65.4%, and Other 0.5%.

3. There are 174 campus employees, of which 112 are faculty. The faculty consists of the Principal, two Assistant Principals, 3.6 counselors, one full time psychologist, one Speech Pathologist and 104 teachers. The school librarian is shared with another school. The entire faculty is certificated.

4. The current curriculum offers Advanced Placement Classes in US History, Physics, Calculus, Statistics, Literature, Art, and Government.

5. Vocational Education class offerings include Home Economics which is food preparation, child development and interior design. Additional vocational shop classes are auto, wood, metal and construction building trades.

6. The graduation rate is 94-95% of the senior class. Historically, 14% of graduating seniors go on to four-year institutions and 30% go to community colleges.

7. Not all campus areas were readily accessible to the physically challenged.

8. While the campus was neat and clean, there was some evidence of deferred maintenance.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number.

Finding #1 - The Library is closed to students during “instructional time” if no certificated person is available to supervise the library. (3)

Recommendation #1 – Consider alternative ways to finance the hiring of additional certificated personnel to allow the students more access time to the library.

Finding #2 - The Gymnasium was found to be very dark due to ceiling lights not working even though requests had been submitted for repair. Lack of adequate lighting is a potential safety hazard. (8)

Recommendation #2 – The District should devise a more timely system to respond to work orders from school sites.

Finding #3 – The Grand Jury observed there is only one ramp for physically challenged persons in the main quad. The ramp is located on the left side of the quad as you enter from the parking lot. It creates a long trip to get to the opposite side of the campus. There are ramps on the outside area to access the wings on the left and right sides but it forces those who need ramps to go out and around the buildings. (7)

Recommendation #3 – Improve access to all campus areas for everyone.

Finding #4 - Two out of three sinks were missing from a girls’ restroom. (8)

Recommendation #4 - Replace the missing sinks in the restrooms.

Finding #5 At the time of the Grand Jury visit there was no certified instructor for the auto shop class. (3)(5)

Recommendation #5 Provide an instructor for the class.

V. Comments

Will C. Wood has an emergency alert system in place. The Grand Jury was pleased to see that the history of the school was on display in the Principal’s office. During the Grand Jury visit the Jury limited their access to the classrooms due to final exams in progress.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Office of Education
- Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)
- Vacaville Unified School District
- Vacaville Unified School Board
- Will C. Wood High School

Benicia Unified School District

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason For Investigation

The Solano County Grand Jury elected to investigate a complaint signed by numerous citizens regarding Benicia Unified School District's (BUSD) fiscal procedures and accounting methods. Included in the complaint were allegations of lack of oversight by the Solano County Office of Education.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury reviewed:

- The complaint signed by numerous citizens
- BUSD Board minutes and attachments for the years 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-2003
- BUSD budgets for the same years
- Independent audit reports for FYs 1999-2000, 2000-2001 and 2001-2002
- Financial Review of BUSD ordered by the Solano County Office of Education, dated March 2003
- Benicia Police Department reports
- Memorandum from State Superintendent of Public Instruction to County and District Superintendent and Chief Business Officials dated August 19, 2003

The Grand Jury interviewed:

- Officers of Benicia Police Department
- Citizens of Benicia
- Member of BUSD Board
- Solano County Office of Education Superintendent of Schools and Assistant Superintendent for Business/Finance

III. Background

1. A complaint came to the grand jury in December 2002 but there was a criminal investigation being conducted by the Benicia Police. An investigation by the Grand Jury could not proceed at that time due to a lack of jurisdiction. The Benicia Police finished their investigation in April of 2003 and forwarded the case to the Solano County District Attorney. There were no criminal charges filed. The 2003-2004 Grand Jury then elected to investigate the complaint.

2. California school districts are required to maintain reserve levels of at least 3 % of annual expenditures. According to the March 2003 Financial Review of BUSD by the Solano County Office of Education, the District had not maintained the required reserve levels for the previous three fiscal years (1999-2002). Despite this, the Solano County Office of Education filed positive interim financial reports for BUSD with the State Department of Education until the first interim report of FY 2002-2003 at which time a "qualified" certification was issued. A "qualified" certification indicates that a district may not meet its fiscal obligations within the next three years or does not have adequate reserves (Ed Code §42127.3 (a) and AB 1200 memo from State Superintendent of Public Instruction). The District received a "negative" certification for the second interim report for 2002-2003. A "negative" certification is assigned to the school district when it is determined that based upon current projections the school district will not meet its financial obligations for at least one of the next two years (Ed Code §42127.3 (e)).

3. There were allegations by complainants and witnesses that the former Assistant Superintendent, Business (Chief Financial Officer) of BUSD used improper accounting procedures and failed to properly inform the school board of the true financial status of the District. They also alleged that this was done in order to allow him to receive a retirement bonus under the District's Public Agency Retirement System (PARS).

4. The State of California requires that districts use a standardized accounting system, and it provides a Standardized Account Code Structure (SACS) and SACS-compatible bookkeeping software. BUSD began using this system during FY 2000-2001 but the Assistant Superintendent, Business and other employees of the district were not fully trained on the system and the result was a delay in producing financial reports and confusion about the true financial status of the District.

5. According to testimony given to the Benicia Police Department, there was ample evidence of "sloppy" accounting and bookkeeping practices. The complainants alleged income from the State was entered twice which made income appear to be greater than it actually was.

6. The March 2003 Financial Review ordered by the Solano County Office of Education states: "The District has not had in place Board policies and budget development and monitoring practices that can prevent and provide early detection of financial issues." The Review also points out a number of steps that the District should take to bring its spending into line with its revenues.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to a background paragraph number

Finding #1 - The Grand Jury found no evidence that the BUSD financial problems were due to illegal activities and agrees with the police and the District Attorney findings that there was no criminal intent involved. (1)

Recommendation #1 - None

Finding #2 - The Grand Jury did find unconventional bookkeeping practices and instances of inaccurate entries of income. (2)(3)(4)(5)(6)

Recommendation #2 -The School Board ensure that the District Superintendent, Chief Financial Officer and appropriate District personnel be fully familiar with and trained to use and understand the Standardized Account Code Structure (SACS) mandated by the California Department of Education.

Finding #3 - The Benicia School Board did not respond appropriately to the serious warning of the outside audits and, later, by the Solano County Office of Education that their budget projections were not accurate. (1)(2)(6)

Recommendation #3 - The BUSD implement board policies and budget development and monitoring practices that provide an early warning of financial problems. The Benicia School Board take immediate action when the County Office of Education issues a warning regarding certification status.

Finding #4 - The Board approved retirement bonuses through the Public Agency Retirement System (PARS) based upon inaccurate and incomplete budget projections. (3)

Recommendation #4 - The Benicia School Board require accurate and complete fiscal information and financial projections prior to approving retirement packages.

Finding #5 - The Solano County Office of Education fulfilled the minimal mandated responsibility of notifying the BUSD Board of potentially not meeting its fiscal budget by issuing “qualified” and “negative” certification. (2)(6)

Recommendation #5 - The County Office of Education take a strong stand in budget discussions when impending problems appear and work with the school district until budget problems are resolved.

V. Comments

School boards are responsible for reviewing and understanding auditors’ reports and reports from the County Office of Education. Boards of Education must be prepared to make difficult financial decisions to keep the reserves in line with State financial guidelines.

Poor budgeting practices by the BUSD over a period of years resulted in a serious budget shortfall in the 2002-2003 fiscal year.

The entire BUSD Board needs to accept the responsibility of elected office and establish an improved communication system with the teachers and public to restore community trust.

The Solano County Office of Education, over a period of years, has not been sufficiently aggressive in overseeing Solano County School Districts’ budget problems.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Benicia Unified School District
- Benicia Unified School Board
- Solano County Office of Education
- Benicia Police Department (Courtesy Copy)
- Solano County District Attorney (Courtesy Copy)

Vanden Ball Field

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason For Investigation

The Solano County Grand Jury elected to investigate a citizen complaint regarding the junior varsity (JV) baseball field on the Vanden High School campus, Vanden High School is located immediately off Travis Air Force Base. A large percentage of the students are dependents of military personnel. Vanden is a four year high school.

II. Procedures

The Grand Jury interviewed:

- Complainant
- Principal of Vanden High School, Vanden Athletic Director and an Assistant Superintendent of the Travis Unified School District

The Grand Jury visited:

- The neighborhood adjacent to the baseball field
- The baseball field in question

III. Background

1. The Grand Jury met with the complainant who stated that he has suffered damage to his home and yard from baseballs flying over his fence. He stated that when he bought his home, the salesperson had stated the seller had given \$15,000.00 to the Travis Unified School District to relocate the JV baseball field to another campus site.

2. The complainant stated that his home had sustained damage from errant baseballs and students coming over the fence to retrieve the balls.

3. The complainant said he had made a formal complaint, along with some of his neighbors, to the Travis Unified School District Board, to pay for the repairs for damages incurred.

4. The complainant said he had also met with three different district superintendents over the years to discuss the problem.

5. Vanden High School administration and students have made efforts to reduce the strain between the district and the neighbors by instructing the students not to go over the fence to retrieve the baseballs.

6. The Vanden Principal, Athletic Director and Assistant Superintendent met with the Grand Jury to discuss steps that had been taken to address the ongoing problem.

7. The baseball field is occasionally used by community teams or neighbors for games when the school is not in session.

IV. Findings And Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 - Travis Unified School District has no record, by either paper documentation, or memory of the present or former superintendents or business managers, of payment or a pledge to relocate the baseball field. The complainant was unable to produce written verification of the funding regarding the relocation of the ball field. (1)

Recommendation #1 - Complainant should obtain original written documentation from the seller.

Finding #2 - According to school board records, the complainant did not appear on the formal agenda to speak to the school board. He spoke during the time of comments from the floor. He did turn in hand-written bills for repairs, which the school board could not accept because they were not original invoices. (1)(2)

Recommendation #2 - The complainant should always seek formal placement on the school board agenda if he wishes to officially address the school board. The complainant should produce original invoices and logs for home repairs of damages.

Finding #3 - The Grand Jury found that both the complainant and the Travis Unified School District administration were open to resolving the conflict in a way that would not involve moving the field. (5)

Recommendation #3 - As a good faith gesture, the district and complainant should continue to work together to minimize the incidences of baseballs accidentally entering private property. One possible solution is to construct an extension of “mesh” atop the existing back stop.

Finding #4 - The field is occasionally used without permission from the school. (7)

Recommendation #4 - Signage on the field should clearly state that the field is for school use only. The school should “lock down” the area between home plate and the pitcher’s mound to discourage unauthorized use of the field. The field should be periodically patrolled during non-school hours.

V. Comments

The Grand Jury commends the Vanden High School personnel and the complainant for their willingness to work cooperatively to resolve the ball field problems.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Travis Unified School District
- Travis Unified School Board
- Vanden High School

Health and Social Services

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES 2003-2004 GRAND JURY REPORT

I. Reason for Investigation

The Grand Jury received a complaint citing the lack of accountability at each level in the Child Protective Services program (CPS) of Solano County Health and Social Services Department (HSS) from Social Workers to the Managers and the Deputy Director. The complaint also cited the need for implementation and enforcement of CPS policies and procedures, along with using best practices to conduct investigations, assessments and recommendations. The complaint suggested that without accountability and adherence to established policies and procedures, the children of Solano County were at risk. Additionally, the complainant cited several newspaper accounts involving serious incidents of child neglect and child abuse, including the death of a four-year-old.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury conducted a careful and systematic nine-month investigation including:

- Touring the CPS worksite
- Interviewing staff at each level in CPS from the Department Director through recent hires
- Reviewing information on program operations, policies and procedures and types of services provided to clients
- Reviewing CPS brochures, newspaper articles and other literature
- Obtaining a court order and reviewed case files from January, 2003, through June, 2003, on the CPS computer system

III. Background

1. The mission of CPS is to address the "...issues associated with the abuse and neglect of children. The ultimate goal of Protective Services is to preserve the family whenever possible while keeping the children safe..." (HSS Brochure 1/02). Children's service programs include: child protective services, family reunification, family maintenance, family preservation, adoptions, foster home licensing, placement assessment and independent living guidance. This report centers on the CPS program. Over the course of the inquiry, the Grand Jury uncovered a series of systemic roadblocks that prevent optimal operation of the CPS program.

2. According to testimony, three of the four current managers are not helpful in providing guidance and direction to either first-line supervisors and/or social workers when guidance is sought concerning case management. It was alleged that there was a general failure of all but one of the four managers to make critical decisions.

Testimony further revealed that:

- Managers were unwilling to sign documents that would indicate managerial review, decisions and/or approval.

- When social workers prepared their court reports based on their observations in the field, the content of the reports were sometimes altered by the supervisors and/or managers. Consequently, social workers were made to choose between refusing to sign altered reports or clarifying at the time of court testimony that they did not personally write portions of what might be viewed as evidence.

3. Interviews revealed conflicting testimony regarding the training of social workers. Management personnel within CPS reported that there was a suitable in-house training program in place with training modules and curriculum designed to address the areas of need for social workers new to the field or new to CPS. It was also reported that there were training opportunities at the Bay Area Academy and monthly All-Staff meetings. The Grand Jury reviewed the in-house training materials offered by CPS. The materials appeared to be adequate. However, testimony from the recipients of the training and some supervisory staff revealed problems in three areas:

Structure of Training

- Some interviewees had heard of the training but had not seen it.
- Supervisors were not aware of whether or not the social workers reporting to them had participated in the training.
- When social workers were scheduled for training, they were sometimes pulled away to do other duties.
- The training was scheduled as late as six to nine months after employment commenced.
- Mentoring was a part of the training program. The time varied as to how long a new social worker might be assigned a mentor in field work.
- Once the social workers returned to their units there was no support system in place to reinforce and support the limited training that was provided.

Content of Training

- Training did not adequately reflect what actually was expected of the social worker in the field regarding protocol and procedures. Thus, social workers were ill-prepared for the practical aspects of the job.
- There are no established standards for case evaluation and the links to remedial action. This results in unequal and sometimes harsher case resolution.

Outcome of Training

Substandard training can produce undesirable outcomes such as:

- Lack of proper training can expose CPS to liability.
- Poor interviewing skills resulted in interviews that were unduly influenced by an alleged offender.
- Minority families (African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, although not as often possibly due to a lower number of residents in the county) received harsher treatment plans than similarly situated non-minority families.
- Social workers have threatened to quit because, without adequate training, they felt they were just thrown into the field.

4. According to testimony, CPS does not have adequate working relationships with law enforcement agencies in all local jurisdictions. The Grand Jury notes that there is a very positive working relationship with the Vacaville Police Department.

5. Further testimony stated that CPS lacks leadership, proper structure and accountability.

- Four positions exist that are not being utilized as intended. The positions are entitled: Family Group Conferencing, Integrated Family Support Initiative, Quality Assurance Quality Control Manager and Placement Worker. Workers do not utilize the positions as designed. For example, there are contracts that exist to locate placements for children, so the Placement Worker position is superfluous.
- First-line supervisors do not feel supported by the managers.
- Managers do not feel supported by the Deputy Director.
- Some social workers do not feel emotionally supported by management when faced with a crisis in their case management.
- Only one manager knows how to fully utilize the computer system. Most other supervisors and managers must depend on the one manager to provide computer assistance. It was stated that there is no computer manual nor is there supervisory computer training offered.
- Instead, social workers end up with larger caseloads. The social workers who shirk their responsibilities are not assigned their fair share of the work and little or no corrective action is taken when social workers shirk their responsibilities.
- CPS lacks personnel performance documentation. Social workers are not advised of the performance expectations for their jobs and are not advised of areas needing improvement early in their probationary period, thereby making it difficult to take corrective action later.
- In spite of the stated open door policy, problems and issues communicated to the Deputy Director are often not documented and often no action results.
- Performance expectations are not communicated to first-line supervisors or the social workers.

6. Testimony revealed that the Director does not get information vital to the successful operation of the CPS program from his chain of command, e.g., concerns regarding the training program and social workers threatening to quit due to lack of training and lack of support within the organization. At times, the Director has found it necessary to obtain information from the Union and employees rather than his senior staff. It was reported that the Director was hired to redirect and clear up organizational inefficiencies.

7. The Grand Jury was shown a Policy and Procedures Manual, which was requested by the previous 2002-2003 Grand Jury. However, those interviewees who would use the manual were not aware of its existence. Upon review of the manual, it was noted that it primarily related to general County procedures such as tuition reimbursement, use of leave, requisitioning supplies/equipment, use of County vehicles, etc. The manual did not provide standard operating procedures for successful casework. It was observed that since the Grand Jury's investigation, the Policy and Procedures Manual was at least visible in the CPS unit.

8. The Grand Jury made a series of on-site visits to CPS to review computerized case records. The case reviews revealed:

- The two-hour response time for investigations was generally met.
- The three-day response time for sexual abuse cases was generally met.
- The ten-day response time for both physical abuse and neglect cases was generally met.

- Cases were not closed in 30 days as required. Most were closed out in 6 to 10 months due to a variety of reasons, including referrals to other organizations and on availability of treatment programs for parents (drug, alcohol, etc.).
- Case plans were often not fully developed. Documentation and follow-up appeared to be lacking. Record keeping was sloppy with no indication of why cases were closed.
- In some records there were gaps of one year with no entries.
- Supervisors did not appear to have reviewed many cases, as indicated by the lack of a supervisory signature.
- Many files were not entered into the computer although they were listed as having been entered.
- Locating paper files that were not on the computer was a time-consuming process, even for experienced personnel.
- Many of the supervisors don't know how to use the computer system. This poses a problem as there is a supervisory module that allows supervisors to see which cases are not complete, or which social workers are not meeting required time lines.
- Initial intake logs were often illegible and difficult to decipher.

9. Testimony revealed that throughout CPS morale is generally low, and upper-level management “operates based on politics” and is focused on maintaining a positive public image rather than enhancing the workers’ ability to serve the children and families of Solano County.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 - The Grand Jury uncovered a series of systemic roadblocks that prevent optimal operation of the CPS program, thereby endangering children in Solano County. Although there have been internal and external attempts to correct these deficiencies, CPS has continued to demonstrate an inability to self-correct. The organizational culture is subverting the achievement of the CPS mission. (1)(2)(4)(5)(6)(9)

Recommendation #1 – The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct the formation of a Blue Ribbon Committee independent of HSS (modeled after the 2003 San Mateo County Blue Ribbon Committee) consisting of former judges, non-Solano County social workers, academics, concerned citizens and union officials to review the entire CPS program and recommend changes.

Finding #2 - Social workers are not receiving the practical training needed for them to conduct proper investigations and interviews in order to make appropriate decisions for the children of Solano County. (1)(3)(5)

Recommendation # 2- Employees should be given performance based training with successful results verified by their responsible line supervisors. This training should be a key component of an employee’s annual performance evaluation.

V. Comments

CPS is a vital program to Solano County and it is imperative that it be supported by effective program operations. It is necessary to bring about constructive change and to create an operation that is better able to meet the designated goals of the organization. To do less is a disservice to the dedicated men and women who serve in CPS out of a genuine desire to protect children and foster positive family

relationships. It is also a disservice to the children and families who depend upon this organization for their survival.

We recommend that the 2004-2005 Grand Jury continue to investigate and monitor CPS for progress in correcting the deficiencies enumerated above.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Board of Supervisors
- Solano County Health and Social Services Department
- Solano County Sheriff's Department
- Law Enforcement Agencies within Solano County
- Solano County Superior Court Judges – Juvenile Division (courtesy copy)

**Health and Social Services
In-Home Supportive Services
2003-2004 Grand Jury Report**

I. Reason for Investigation

The Grand Jury elected to review the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program of the Older and Disabled Adult Services Division of the Solano County Health and Social Services Department.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Toured the IHSS site
- Interviewed the IHSS Administrator
- Reviewed information on program operations, types of services provided to clients and State audits of the program
- Reviewed the County Welfare Directors Association of California Report dated January 2003 entitled *In-Home Supportive Services: Past, Present and Future*
- Reviewed IHSS informational brochures

III. Background

1. The mission of the IHSS program is to maintain consumers' (aged, blind and disabled citizens) quality of life by providing assistance that enables them to remain safely in their own homes, living independently and preventing the need for "costly and [or] less desirable out-of-home placement facilities." According to the County Welfare Directors Association of California Report, California's changing demographics results in having the largest older adult population in the nation with 3.5 million people over the age of 65.

2. The State provides direction while the County staff provides the following services (Activities of Daily Living [ADL]):

- Domestic assistance, such as house cleaning, meal preparation, laundry and shopping
- Bowel and bladder care (diapers and catheters)
- Respiration assistance (cleaning nebulizers and changing oxygen tanks)
- Personal care (feeding, bathing, dressing, grooming and oral hygiene)
- Assistance getting in and out of bed
- Assistance with walking

3. The In-Home Supportive Services Program is funded by federal, state and county sources that are combined to meet the programs' operating budget. The payments made to providers this fiscal year will total a little over \$30 million dollars in Solano County. The County's share of that cost will be approximately \$6.5 million dollars. The County also has responsibility for a 40% share of the administrative cost for IHSS. Administrative costs include staff salaries and all supplies for the operation of the programs.

4. Supporting the IHSS program is the Personal Services Care Program which accounts for 85% of the total number of clients served the IHSS. This service includes caregiver payrolls and benefits, initial one-time cleaning fees and the Public Authority Administration which maintains a registry of clients and care providers.

5. The IHSS Residual Program accounts for 15% of clients served.

6. Solano County uses a social model utilized in virtually every county statewide. In this model non-medical caregivers are hired and fired by the consumer of the services. This encourages the consumers' sense of "independence and control" according to testimony. This model focuses on ADL and the ability of IHSS consumers to function within their own homes.

7. Currently, there are no funds dedicated for providing training for care providers. The County encourages providers to seek training using the adult education programs for first aid. The following training is desirable: sensitivity training in working with the aged and disabled, wound care, safety concerns and use of physical aids such as wheel chairs and walkers.

8. IHSS program currently has two social workers that process referrals. There are nine social workers that conduct initial assessments to determine types of services needed and hours of services that may be provided based on state guidelines. These social workers also make required annual home visits to the consumers and re-assess the consumers' needs for services. According to testimony, the social worker's supervisor reviews each case once a year and client feedback is obtained once a year.

9. It is desirable to have a larger number of service providers than clients. At the time of the Grand Jury interview, IHSS had 2,461 service providers available to serve approximately 2,300 Solano County clients. Parents, children or spouses of the clients account for 987 of the service providers or 40.1%.

10. Throughout the State of California it was found that 66% of the individuals receiving IHSS services are female; 57% are ethnic minorities; 44% have a primary language other than English; 85% receive personal care services and 86% receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits. (*County Welfare Directors Association of California, January 2003*).

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1- With the growth of the older adult population in California, the funding for this program must grow correspondingly. (1)(3)

Recommendation #1 – Solano County Board of Supervisors pursue all avenues and sources of funding to support this important program.

Finding #2 - There are no funds allotted to train care providers. In addition to those areas previously reported, training is needed in the following: special-disease care, dietary needs, care for minor children, care for individuals with mental impairments, CPR, lifting basics, nutrition, universal precautions and mandated reporting. (2)(7)

Recommendation #2 – Solano County Board of Supervisors provide funds, and in addition arrange collaborations with community organizations to provide training to care providers.

Finding #3 – Social Workers are only required to visit the clients once per year. As a result, feedback from clients is normally obtained once per year. (8)

Recommendation #3 - Although it is not required by regulation, one home visit per quarter is recommended. Feedback from clients should be sought at least twice a year to provide a more timely assessment of client service.

V. Comments

The IHSS program provides valuable services to some of the most vulnerable citizens in our community, enabling them to remain safely in their own homes. The Grand Jury commends the division administrator and staff for the services and programs they provide to the aged and disabled community.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Board of Supervisors
- Solano County Health and Social Services

LAND PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

Biosolids 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report [One Grand Juror Recused]

I. Reason for Investigation

The Grand Jury received several citizen complaints concerning the possible hazards of dispersing biosolids on Solano County farmland.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Interviewed Staff of the Solano County Department of Environmental Management (DEM)
- Attended Solano County Board of Supervisors meeting September 23, 2003 where DEM presented proposals regarding biosolids
- Interviewed Department Head of DEM
- Interviewed complainants
- Interviewed the Agricultural Commissioner for Solano County
- Interviewed Rio Vista residents
- Interviewed representatives of a firm that disperses biosolids on the farmland
- Interviewed farmer/rancher who has used biosolids
- Visited fields which had biosolids applied the previous season
- Visited fields during biosolids application

The Grand Jury received and reviewed the following documents:

- US Environmental Protection Agency Regulations 40CFR Chapter 1, Subchapter O, Part 503 – Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge
- A Plain English Guide to the EPA Part 503 Biosolids Rule, September 1994
- State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2000-10-DWQ -- General Waste Discharge Requirements for the Discharge of Biosolids to Land for Use as a Soil Amendment in Agricultural, Silvicultural, Horticultural, and Land Reclamation Activities
- User's Manual for Water Quality Order No. 2000-10-DWQ – Applicability of the General Order and Statewide Program EIR to Biosolids Land Application Projects in California
- Solano County Code, Chapter 25
- Solano County Board of Supervisors Minutes
 - January 21, 2003 Special Meeting – Biosolids
 - January 30, 2003 Special Meeting – Biosolids

- February 5, 2003 Special Meeting – Biosolids
 - March 11, 2003 Regular Meeting
 - April 8, 2003 Regular Meeting
 - April 22, 2003 Regular Meeting
- Land Application of Biosolids: 2003 Year End Report by DEM to the Solano County Board of Supervisors January 13, 2004
 - Review of Solano County’s local Biosolids program by DEM presented to the Solano County Board of Supervisors August 27, 2002
 - Solano County’s Biosolids Program Powerpoint Presentation (undated)
 - 1999-2000 Riverside County Grand Jury Report – Sewage Biosolid Waste Management of the County
 - National Academy of Sciences Report—Biosolids Applied to Land: Advancing Standards and Practices (2002)
 - US Environmental Protection Agency Pamphlet –Biosolids Recycling: Beneficial Technology for a Better Environment June 1994
 - Solano County Department of Agriculture – 2002 Agriculture Overview June 2003
 - Synagro California Land Application Map, Corporate Information, Chino manure processing, Outreach Program and additional supportive documents.
 - Synagro 2003 Pre-Application Report, Post Application Report, Map showing Regional Water
 - Quality Control Board dividing line, Cumulative Metal Loading Records
 - Conditions Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs) for Trilogy at Rio Vista
 - California Association of Sanitation Agencies – Biosolids Fact Sheet
 - California Integrated Waste Management Board – Background Information for Board Meeting April 13-14, 2004

III. Background

1. Biosolids are the solid, semi-solid, or liquid residue resulting from the treatment process of domestic sewage in a wastewater treatment facility. Biosolids are classified by federal regulation into Class B which is the primary treated product of wastewater treatment facilities, and Class A which are further treated to reduce pathogens. The regulations specify the composition of each class. According to the California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA), Californians generate approximately 750,000 dry tons of sewage waste every year. Approximately 85 % of this sewage waste is Class B.

After treatment, this solid waste is disposed of in various ways: 54% is land applied, 16% is composted, 16% is disposed of in landfills, 7% is incinerated and the remainder is disposed of in dedicated surface disposal sites or stored (Data as of April 2004). Ocean dumping used to be common but was prohibited by the Clean Oceans Act of 1992. Disposal in land fill is discouraged by state

legislation (Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 commonly called AB 939) which requires 50% diversion of solid waste from land fills.

2. Local sanitation/utility districts pay the costs of disposal, which for land fill and land application are approximately the same. Other disposal options such as composting and pelletizing require large capital investments and are much more costly. Seventy-five percent of the biosolids spread in Solano County have come from the East Bay Municipal Utility District and from San Francisco County. The remainder came from four other bay area sanitary districts.

3. Agriculture is an important element of Solano County's economic health, with approximately 400 full-time farming operations. Approximately 65% of the acreage in Solano County is farm land. When purchasing homes in the County many CC and R's advise that property located in the vicinity of agricultural land will regularly be impacted by agricultural activities such as farm equipment on the roads, aerial crop dusting, agricultural burning and farm animals which are associated with odors and flies. Agricultural products contributed about \$200,000,000 to the Solano County economy in 2002. For the year 2003, a total of 8,298 dry tons (40,478 wet tons) of biosolids were spread on 1,540 farmland acres.

4. Biosolids allow the grower to avoid the use of chemical fertilizers and increase the productivity of grassland in Solano County which has marginal value for other crops. Biosolids application has been shown to increase yields of hay approximately 4-fold over an untreated, undisked fields, which in one example corresponded to about \$400 per acre. Costs of biosolids application are borne by the utility/sanitary district with no additional cost to the farmer. Equivalent chemical fertilizer costs would be approximately \$55-60/acre, which includes the application and disking costs.

5. Grand Jurors examined soil and plant growth in biosolids-treated and untreated areas at several locations. There was a noticeable visual difference in plant growth between treated areas and the adjacent buffers. In accordance with regulations, buffers are used as setbacks from roads, wells, creeks, buildings, etc. There did not appear to be significant leaching into the buffer as there was a distinct demarcation between treated areas and buffers.

6. In interviews with concerned citizens, the Grand Jury heard complaints from nearby residents about odors and concerns about possible windborne hazards, especially to asthma sufferers, from pathogens that may be present in the Class B biosolids. Complainants stated that biosolids spreading should be banned until such time as it can be proven safe. In addition, there were statements that the practice was of benefit to only a "handful" of people. An incident in 2001 in which biosolids spread near the City of Rio Vista resulted in an extremely unpleasant odor, generating a great deal of concern in the community about the practice. As a result of this concern a stakeholders group was formed which had a large impact on the formulation of new local regulations. They provided background information and data which were useful to the Grand Jury in our investigation.

7. Biosolids spreading is highly regulated at the federal, state and local level. The US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) regulations were published in 1993 as "Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge" in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 503. These regulations set standards for biosolids spreading operations, management practices, and pollution limits. The Part 503 rules require a sewage treatment plant to obtain a permit from USEPA for land application of biosolids, and to meet stringent treatment and testing requirements. USEPA also performs periodic inspections in Solano County to assure conformance to the rule by the biosolids generators and the biosolids applicators.

8. The California State Water Resources Control Board regulates biosolids application through its General Order 2000-10-DWQ, issued in August 2000 after an environmental review, health impact analysis, public review and comment. The regulation sets evaluation and monitoring standards, including a requirement for groundwater monitoring, an emergency spill response plan, erosion control plan, and exclusion periods before grazing is allowed after the use of Class B solids. In addition, the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) permit and inspect the sewage treatment facilities. Solano County is within the jurisdiction of two RWQCBs, the Central Valley Board and the San Francisco Bay Area Board.

9. In addition to the federal and state oversight, Solano County is one of the few counties in the state that also has an ordinance (Chapter 25 of the Solano County Code), passed in January 1997 and amended in March 1998, March 2002 and April 2003 that provides for local oversight and regulation of biosolids by the DEM. Under this ordinance, biosolids may be applied only between April 15th and October 15th to certain agricultural lands within a registered site after the applicator submits a pre-season Landspreading Notification Report and receives approval from DEM. DEM approval requires prior RWQCB concurrence and proof of notification of neighboring residences. DEM collects random samples of materials applied to the fields and responds to nuisance complaints and prepares an annual biosolids report to the Board of Supervisors.

10. Local biosolids regulations evolved over the last few years in response to citizen complaints and concerns. The regulations were passed after a significant amount of study and input from concerned citizens; local government officials; county environmental, health and agricultural officials; growers and ranchers; applicators and biosolids generators; and experts from USEPA, California RWQCBs, and the University of California. Public comment was heard during regular Board of Supervisors meetings, special Board of Supervisors meetings held in Rio Vista and numerous stakeholder meetings.

11. Current local regulations can be summarized as follows:

- a. A permit is required for each application site. Staging areas and land application sites must be at least 500 feet from water supply wells, ¼ mile from residences, two miles from city limits, 100 feet from public roads, 200 feet from surface waters, and 2,500 feet from any domestic surface water supply intake. There are fees for each permit issued and fees for Site Registration and Landspreading Notification. After the permit is issued, notification of spreading at a permitted site must be given ten working days prior to the initiation of land application. The applicator must also provide written notification to all residents adjacent to the site, publish a notice in the local newspaper(s) and notify the mayor or city manager of a planned application.
- b. There is a procedure for neighbors, or for residents of a city or urban center within two miles of an application site, to file a protest if they object to the proposed biosolids application.
- c. A DEM inspector must be on site during the application. Soil samples are taken before and after spreading and samples of the material being spread are collected for analysis, with the applicator being responsible for the costs of the analysis.

d. Trucks used to transport or apply biosolids shall not track mud or debris onto County or State roadways, and the applicator is responsible to repair road damage caused by the hauling of biosolids, to the satisfaction of the County Transportation Department.

e. That biosolids not be placed in a staging area more than six hours prior to application, that they be land applied before the end of the day, and incorporated into the soil within 24 hours of application unless prevented by inclement weather or winds (see below). Land spreading and incorporation is only allowed between 6:00 am and 6:00 pm and is not permitted on weekends or holidays.

f. Application during periods of rainfall, or to land that is water saturated or frozen is prohibited.

g. The applicator may not start receiving, land spreading or incorporating biosolids if wind speeds exceed 25 mph and, once started, shall cease if wind speed exceeds 25 mph for 90 minutes. Applicator provides wind speed monitoring devices including a windsock calibrated for a 25 mph wind, visible from a public road.

h. Grazing is restricted for 30 days after application and biosolids are not used on row crops because food crops may not be harvested within 14 to 38 months (depending on the type of crop) of biosolids application.

12. DEM provides an annual written report to the Board of Supervisors at the end of each biosolids land application period. This provides a summary of application sites and amounts applied, application sources and results of analytical tests performed on biosolids materials and soil samples. During 2003, a total of 114 on-site inspections were performed. These inspections included monitoring of the weather via portable weather stations and/or handheld weather devices, verification of setbacks, sample collection, documenting activities with digital cameras and completing daily inspection reports. A total of 308 hours were devoted by DEM personnel to site inspections.

VI. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 – The County has developed adequate regulations and monitoring procedures to maintain safety for residents near biosolids sites. (9)(10)(11)

Recommendation # 1 - DEM continue to enforce regulations and monitor biosolids application sites.

Finding #2 – There is no evidence that the spreading of biosolids under the conditions set by the County is unsafe or hazardous to health. (Refer to National Academy of Sciences Report—Biosolids Applied to Land: Advancing Standards and Practices, 2002)

Recommendation # 2 – DEM continue to meet with stakeholders to monitor any new scientific findings in this area.

Finding # 3 – A 2001 incident of biosolids application caused unacceptable odors. This situation has not been repeated since the new County regulations went in to effect in April 2003. (6)(9)(10)(11)(12)

Recommendation # 3 – DEM should continue to enforce regulations to ensure that biosolids applications do not cause any nuisances to nearby residents.

Finding # 4 – Citizens’ committees have taken an active role in helping to develop regulations that address their concerns about possible negative effects of biosolids applications in the county. There continues to be a level of apprehension about biosolids and dissatisfaction with the regulations. (6)

Recommendation # 4 -DEM should continue to monitor scientific research in this area and recommend updating regulations as needed. Stakeholders and other interested parties should continue to be involved in this process.

Finding # 5 – Solano County is one of the few California counties that regulate biosolids application. (9)(10)(11)

Recommendation # 5 - The County should continue this cutting-edge program to insure the health and welfare of all citizens while maintaining the agricultural viability of Solano County.

Finding # 6 - DEM and the applicator are documenting citizen complaints, taking concerns seriously and responding appropriately. (12)

Recommendation # 6 DEM continue to document and respond to complaints, and produce an annual report to the County Board of Supervisors.

Finding # 7 - Farmers/ranchers report economic benefits in terms of agricultural productivity as a result of biosolids applications. The general public gains from the ability to recycle waste rather than using up landfills. (1)(4)

Recommendation #7 - Use of biosolids in permitted locations should be allowed to continue as an economic benefit to the agricultural community and a benefit to the general public in terms of waste recycling.

IV. Comments

The Grand Jury recognizes the positive impact that the Stakeholders and citizens concerned about this issue have had on the development of the County biosolids regulations. Their continuing interest and willingness to contribute to the formulation of county-wide policy has placed Solano County in the forefront among California communities in addressing the land application of biosolids.

The Grand Jury concurs with the policy statement by the Solano County Board of Supervisors as stated in the 2002 Agricultural Overview: “Solano County is a desirable place to live because of its rural characteristics. The BOS has determined that the best use for agricultural/open space land is to preserve agricultural operations. Slight unavoidable inconveniences may arise from agricultural activities but are a small price to pay for the lifestyle we all enjoy.”

VII. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Department of Resource Management
- Solano County Department of Agriculture
- Solano County Board of Supervisors

Solano County Flood Control (Sweeney Creek) 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for investigation

The Grand Jury elected to continue the investigation into Solano County Flood Control policies and procedures initiated by the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 Grand Jury in relation to Sweeney Creek, as some of the unresolved issues were in the working stages of being resolved.

II. Procedures

The Grand Jury:

- Reviewed 2001-2002 Grand Jury Report and Responses
- Reviewed 2002-2003 Grand Jury Report and Responses
- Attended Solano County Water Agency Board of Directors' meetings
- Attended flood control advisory committee meetings
- Attended Sweeney Creek Watershed presentation
- Toured Sweeney Creek areas subject to flooding
- Toured Sweeney Creek when crews were cleaning/clearing channel

Interviewed staff members of:

- Solano County Water Agency (SCWA)
- Solano County Department of Transportation work areas

III. Background

1. Flooding within the County is a recurring problem. This issue should be of continuing concern to the County Board of Supervisors, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and various Solano County department heads including SWCA, Department of Transportation, Department of Environmental Management and Office of Emergency Services.

2. During 2003, SCWA successfully obtained easements from land owners along Sweeney Creek and the following items were accomplished:

- The creek was cleared of dead trees, vegetation and four debris dams between Putah South Canal and Interstate 505 (I-505)
- A culvert was installed approximately 400 yards south of Putah Canal not without the planned flap gate
- Sediment and dirt was removed between Hartley bridge and I505.

3. The items accomplished on this section of Sweeney Creek greatly reduced flooding. However SCWA was not able to completely clean the creek between I-505 and the weir that takes water to the Kilkenney canal due to time constraints (May 15 – October 15). This portion is scheduled to be completed this year (2004) and will greatly reduce flooding. There is one minor problem, one Elderberry bush in the creek on Caltrans easement of the creek must be mitigated. Also one area of concern is "Arundo" a false bamboo weed that is extremely invasive and can create natural dams which cause flooding, this weed must be contained. Additionally, flooding in the Heather Lane area is caused by the drainage ditch along the side of Putah South Canal, this issue is being evaluated for correction. SWCA is currently accomplishing a watershed study of

this area. If this study is implemented, flooding would be greatly reduced in the north area of Solano County.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1: Flooding continues to be a problem in Solano County.

Recommendation #1: Solano County board of Supervisors, SCWA Board of Directors, and other effected agencies must continue to work to relieve the problem of flooding throughout the county for the health, safety and welfare of county residents.

Finding #2: Work accomplished on this portion of Sweeney Creek greatly reduced flooding in the area of Allendale and I-505.

Recommendation #2: Work that was not accomplished between Sweeney Creek from I505 to the Weir must be completed. SCWA should meet with local land owners to discuss problem areas and re-evaluate this area yearly to ensure the creek is maintained, and flooding is reduced to the minimum.

Finding #3: Elderberry bush in the creek may support an endangered insect species. This plant should be removed in accordance with environmental rules as it impedes the flow of water in the creek.

Recommendation #3: Caltrans and SCWA partner with the resource conservation district to develop a plan to grow endangered plant species for mitigation of removed plants.

Finding #4: Arundo” a false bamboo weed that is extremely evasive and can create a natural dam causing flooding,

Recommendation #4: Caltrans and SCWA partner with the resource conservation district to develop an eradication plan.

Finding #5: The culvert installed south of Putah Canal has a “backwash” when Sweeney creek is full causing slight flooding. A flap gate was not placed on culvert when installed.

Recommendation #5: Install a flap gate.

V. Comments

SCWA and county transportation crews should be commended for the work that was accomplished. Flooding in this portion of the creek has been reduced. The dialogue between local land owners and SCWA has greatly improved, and the results of their efforts should be an example for the entire county to follow.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Water Agency
- California Department of Transportation
- Department of Environmental Management
- Solano Resource Conservation District

TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Americans with Disabilities Acts Compliance 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason For Investigation

The Grand Jury elected to review the progress of Solano County in implementing the Americans with Disabilities Acts (ADA) mandated requirements in County owned and leased facilities.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Held a series of meetings and interviews with staff of the Solano County Division of Architectural Services, the Director of the Solano County Department of General Services, the Solano County Parks Manager and the ADA Compliance Coordinator (Department of Human Resources)
- Inspected several County buildings to observe progress toward bringing facilities into compliance with ADA
- Reviewed a series of reports and documents on ADA implementation supplied by the Division of Architectural Services

III. Background

1. The following background statement is excerpted from a report to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury by the County Architect:

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was signed into law in 1990, with the State of California passing similar legislation in 1992. In its essence, The Americans with Disabilities Act is civil rights legislation that is intended to provide persons with disabilities with accommodations and access equal to, or similar to, that available to the general public. The fundamental goal of ADA is to provide access to programs and services that are publicly available for persons living with disabilities. ADA defines an "individual with disability" as a person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities (e.g. seeing, hearing, speaking, walking, breathing, performing manual tasks, learning caring for oneself or working).

Consistent with that goal, Title II of ADA requires that local governments including Counties, provide access for persons living with disabilities to all programs, services and activities provided by local governments. The County can either make reasonable modifications to policies, practices and procedures (such as providing assistance to persons with disabilities in completing forms to apply for services), remove architectural barriers (such as lowering a counter so the person with a disability can complete the form independently), or utilize a combination of programmatic and architectural adjustments in order to achieve ADA compliance.

2. Since the enactment of the ADA, new County structures must be built to ADA standards. Therefore, a great many existing deficiencies will be eliminated when County agencies move from older ADA substandard buildings into the new Solano County Government Center and the probation building, both of which are being built in conformity with ADA standards. Existing buildings still in use must be brought up to ADA standards if there is a use change. Individual fixtures must be brought up to standard if they are replaced. Currently, existing buildings are exempt from upgrades as long as they meet construction codes at the time of their construction and there have been no use changes.

3. County officials concede that too little headway was made for the first ten years following ADA's inception. There is a new County ADA Transition Plan, which began in July 2003 and spans five years, and which aims to demonstrate the County's recommitment. A summary version presented to the Grand Jury on April 2, 2004 shows 13 projects completed in 2003-2004. Most have to do with accessibility, movement, parking, rest rooms and signage, with a cost of \$558,065. A Year One Priority List is apparently more of a projection and is less precise than the summary version. Neither of them provides a Year One list of total approved planning projections together with the current status of each. Several requests by the Grand Jury for such an update on the progress of plan activities have been made to staff this year. However, two months before the end of Year One (June 30, 2004) of the Transition Plan, the requested comprehensive schedule of those improvements planned for, begun, and completed has not been provided.

4. Staff also reported that progress is discussed at regular quarterly ADA status meetings. However, no minutes are taken. Only notes of things to do are recorded by the affected staff.

IV. Findings And Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph numbers

Finding #1 – There are several facilities leased by the County that at present are not in full compliance with the ADA. The Grand Jury notes that County staff is in the process of negotiating with various landlords to bring these properties into full ADA compliance as leases expire. (1)(2)

Recommendation #1- Solano County require landlords to comply with ADA in order to continue to lease to the County. In addition, appropriate County legal authorities and subsequent Grand Juries conduct detailed review of the leasing process and appropriateness of leases. (It is not clear to this Grand Jury why leases for ADA non-compliant property have been negotiated and renegotiated for nearly fifteen years. We believe a six-month to one-year lead-time would be more than adequate to achieve conformity with ADA standards or for the County to find alternate properties.)

Finding #2 – Mandated signage indicating specific ADA accommodations are precisely set forth in the ADA regulations as to color, dimensions and location. The Grand Jury finds that proper signage is by no means universal in County facilities. This is an especially high priority in the oldest buildings where there is the greatest number of ADA deficiencies. Signage is relatively inexpensive. Officials report that funds have been identified, and that Board of Supervisors' approval will be sought in the near future. These officials stated that the work will be completed by July 2004. (1)(2)

Recommendation #2 – Solano County Board of Supervisors ensure that this important and very visible component of the ADA be accomplished as promised.

Finding #3 – Completion of 13 ADA projects costing \$558,065.00 during Year One seems to be a good-faith achievement. Quarterly update meetings which refine timelines, resources and which

assign personal responsibility are good management tools. However, many instances could arise where the presentation of precise documentation, more explicit than was shown to the Grand Jury, may well be needed. (3)(4)

Recommendation #3- The Department of General Services maintain and be prepared to submit to future Grand Juries and other interested parties, quarterly update reports of meetings indicating progress toward achieving the annual goals.

V. Comments

The 2003-2004 Grand Jury chose County-operated buildings for its ADA review. It was noted that other public facilities operated by municipalities, special districts and school districts are likewise mandated to meet State and Federal ADA requirements.

Cities, special districts and school districts located in Solano County should review all of their facilities to make certain that they meet ADA standards. Future Solano County Grand Juries, beginning with 2004-2005, should conduct ADA reviews of these facilities.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Board of Supervisors
- Solano County General Services
- Solano County Human Resources
- The cities of Solano County
- The special districts of Solano County (courtesy copy)
- The school districts of Solano County (courtesy copy)
- Solano County District Attorney
- Solano County County Counsel

**SOLANO COUNTY HALL OF JUSTICE
SOUTH WING FLOOD DAMAGE
2003 - 2004 Grand Jury Report**

I. Reason for Investigation

The Grand Jury elected to review the Solano County flood control procedures for the Hall of Justice South Wing, after being apprised of the flood damage that occurred in December 2002.

II. Procedures

The Grand Jury

Interviewed:

- Solano County General Service Department staff members
- City of Fairfield Public Works Department staff members

Reviewed:

- Solano County Grand Jury Final Report, 2002-2003
- Aerial photograph City of Fairfield, drainage canal systems on Clay Street
- City of Fairfield Public Works Department correspondence
- Clay Street Channel Desilting and Maintenance Project
- State of California, Department of Fish and Game and City of Fairfield Routine Maintenance Agreement
- City of Fairfield Public Works Department's maintenance records of storm drainage, crew, equipment and hours
- Solano County correspondence regarding Water Damage Claim against the City of Fairfield

Toured:

- Solano County Hall of Justice South Wing, interior/exterior

III. Background

1. The 2002-2003 Grand Jury found that flooding occurred in the Solano County Hall of Justice South Wing.

2. The 2003-2004 Grand Jury was apprised of the December 2002, flood damage and asked a General Services Department staff member what policy and procedures are in place to protect sensitive material and equipment. The staff member stated that sensitive material is filed above flood level to lessen the possibility of damage/loss.

3. During the discussions on the flooding issue, the staff members indicated that a written agreement between the County and the City of Fairfield on flood control responsibilities is needed. It was also mentioned that the County sent a letter to the City of Fairfield regarding this matter. The Grand Jury requested a copy of that letter. In actual fact, this letter was a flood damage claim which the County had sent to the City. The City of Fairfield rejected this claim.

4. The Grand Jury met with the City of Fairfield Public Works Department to address the December 2002 flooding issue. A Department staff member stated the City of Fairfield could not be responsible for damages since the creek banks adjacent to the Hall of Justice South Wing did not overflow. Since the County and City viewpoints differ on this issue and without visible evidence, definitive conclusions could not be reached. A Fairfield City staff member stated a written agreement between the City and the County is not necessary and would be redundant inasmuch as responsibilities are already clearly defined.

5. A City Fairfield Public Works Department staff member gave the Grand Jury a brief insight on the restrictions imposed on the Department in maintaining the drainage systems, creeks and channels.

- a. The Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Regional Water Quality Control Board policies and procedures in some ways hamper the efforts of the City's Public Works Department. However, they do not totally hamper the City's Department from meeting responsibilities and compliance with established Federal and State codes. However, the City of Fairfield feels that their three-person team adequately maintain the drainage system.
- b. To deal with the many complex aspects of maintaining the drainage systems, the City of Fairfield, on March 8, 2004, signed an agreement with LSA Associates, Inc., Pt. Richmond, CA to provide consulting services associated with the Clay Street Channel Desilting/Maintenance Project.

6. On February 26, 2004, the Grand Jury toured the Hall of Justice South Wing to see if the January 2004 heavy rains caused any flooding or damage. There was no flooding or damage. It was noted, however, semi-permanent barricades had replaced the makeshift ones that were previously installed at several entrances. These barricades greatly impede safe exit from the building, especially for the disabled. Also, safety exit instructions were not posted.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 - Even though very significant improvements in flood control have been made, a combination of heavy rains, high tides and strong winds, plus other factors could overwhelm the present flood control system that protects the Hall of Justice. (1)(3)(4)

Recommendation #1 - The County and the City of Fairfield must be aware of the possibility that the drainage systems, upgraded pumps and backup systems may not be adequate to control flooding. To prepare for all possibilities, alternative methods to control flooding should continuously be explored and the systems upgraded accordingly.

Recommendation #1a - A written agreement between Solano County and the City of Fairfield outlining flood control guidelines must be established. These guidelines can only serve to enhance the system while reducing unforeseen problems.

Recommendation #1b - During periods of heavy rains it is recommended that the seated Grand Jury tour the Hall of Justice South Wing to ensure appropriate measures are taken to address any abnormal situations caused by flooding.

Finding #2 – The Hall of Justice structure, equipment and materials have been damaged by flooding. (2)

Recommendation #2 - Regardless of how infrequently flooding occurs, the County must draft policies and procedures to prevent damage to structures, material and equipment from potential water damage.

Finding #3 – Barricades were found that block entrances to the Hall of Justice which violate City, State and Federal safety codes. (6)

Recommendation #3 - The County should find and institute alternative methods to control flooding that do not violate established safety codes.

Recommendation #3a - Any method the County uses that entails blockage of exits must accommodate established safety procedures for the disabled.

V. Comments

None

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County General Services Department
- Solano County - County Counsel
- City of Fairfield Public Works Department
- City of Fairfield City Attorney
- City of Fairfield City Council
- Solano County Board of Supervisors

Courtesy Copies

- California Department of Fish and Game
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Vallejo Veterans Memorial Building 2003 - 2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason for Investigation

The Grand Jury elected to investigate the near-total deterioration over nearly four decades of the Vallejo Veterans' Memorial Hall and the lack of progress made in meeting remedial maintenance or replacement requirements.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury

Reviewed:

- Solano County Superior Court Interlocutory Judgment of *Ozzie Boler et al vs. Board of Supervisors, Solano County et al*, case no. L 006307.
- A facility condition assessment by the 3D International Architectural/Engineering firm in 2000 and forwarded to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury by the Solano County General Services Department.

Interviewed:

- Solano County Department of General Services staff.
- Past Commander, American Legion (AL) Post 603
- Past Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) Post 1123
- Counsel for Veteran plaintiffs in *Ozzie Boler, et al*
- County Supervisor

Contacted:

- Solano County Counsel

Visited and inspected:

- The Vallejo Veterans Memorial Hall at 444 Alabama St, Vallejo, CA.

III. Background

1. When the Vallejo Veterans Memorial Hall was completed in 1930 it was a three story building with a classic facade and an elegant interior. It was a recognized showpiece in the City of Vallejo. It was used with pride by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Submarine Veterans of Vallejo, other veterans' groups and by a number of civic organizations for various functions.

2. Through 1977 the Vallejo Veterans' Welfare Commission (VVWC) oversaw management through leases from the County. But in the latter years of that period revenues declined and custodial services deteriorated. Some veterans claim that sufficient funds were generated by the VVWC facility but were not plowed back in for maintenance. In 1977 due to the insolvency of the VVWC, the County assumed management. Maintenance continued to slip and as a consequence it became more difficult to retain groups which had been paying to use the hall. Deterioration spiraled downward. In the

early 1990's much of the building was closed down due to the confirmation of widespread asbestos contamination. A low point came when a group of veterans together with their legal counsel were denied entrance for a walk through of their own building because, according to the maintenance supervisor, they would require "moon suits" for their safety against the asbestos, and no such protective gear was available. Since that time only the first floor, essentially the basement, of the Memorial Hall has been open to and in use by Vallejo veterans. Soon thereafter, the VFW moved out of the Memorial Hall into a nearby AL facility which was privately owned, and later into a club which VFW members rented privately. A VFW commander cited these reasons for moving from the Veterans' Memorial Hall: dirty bathrooms, unclean cooking facilities, rats present, "look of the building was a disgrace" and veterans feared for their safety in that neighborhood.

3. In 1996 a pro-bono attorney filed a lawsuit (*Ozzie Boler, et al*) on behalf of four veterans' groups: Manuel Quezon Post 603 of the American Legion; Disabled American Veterans Chapter 21; Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 1123; and U.S. Submarine Veterans, Inc, Mare Island Base. It argued that the County had failed to maintain the building as it was required to do. In 1998 the Superior Court of Solano County found in a non-trial interlocutory judgment that the County must make repairs or dedicate alternative space.

4. In the ensuing years of mediation, efforts to find other suitable space have been made by County officials and veterans together to locate acceptable rental locations in Vallejo. The former Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) club on Mare Island has attractive physical possibilities, but there are serious complications with availability. Another solution could be the construction of a new facility as part of a proposed County complex upgrade on Tuolumne Street in Vallejo. But whether the overall project will actually be built any time soon is uncertain. Other proposals, which include the Solano County Fairgrounds, the tentative availability of the Vallejo JFK Library and vacant downtown buildings have failed to measure up. A major difficulty is that the veterans are entitled to and actively seek, "dedicated" alternative space as opposed to a simple rental which could easily be revoked at some future date leaving the veterans with nothing. And there is a strong sense by the veterans that the space should be honorable and worthy.

5. The other alternative is to restore the existing Veterans Memorial Hall. The 3D International assessment puts the replacement cost of the building at \$5,870,000. The cost for renovation, which is supported by exhaustive detail, is summed up at \$4,488,128. And that does not include required Americans with Disabilities Act improvements, seismic retrofit, and additional parking. The assessment states, "We do not believe there is a halfway renovation project which would result in a safe, code-conforming building. The antiquated utilities could not be replaced, nor the life safety and access changes made, without complete abatement and renovation of the interior of the building." In other words, the interior of the building would have to be ripped out.

6. Notes from a casual walk through of the Veterans' Memorial Hall in December 2003 by the 2003-2004 Grand Jury show the following: 1. Exterior: some window panes boarded over, facade needs paint, some metal rusted and general run down appearance. 2. First floor/basement: dreary, sign over kitchen sink "do not use, faucet is leaking," window boarded up and bathrooms serviceable but old. 3. Second floor/foyer: elevator permanently out of operation. 4. Second floor, kitchen/bar: locked, dark, gloomy; broken utensils and equipment visible. 5. Second floor, general meeting rooms: abandoned in ruins, broken/torn furniture scattered about, broken glass on floor and chandeliers with no bulbs or with naked bulbs askew. 6. Third floor, main ball room: overhead paneling ripped and drooping down in sheets, littered and filthy floor, some window panes boarded up, dead bird on floor and a hand-held fire extinguisher not inspected in past three years.

7. Veterans generally agree that their needs include space for two concurrent meetings, a kitchen, office and storage space, accessibility to public transportation, and parking. A governing use factor stems from the Court's interlocutory judgment that, "The County can permit the use of such building for other purposes so long as such use does not interfere with the ordinary and accustomed use of such building by the veterans' association." In the past, there has been a reported reluctance by some veterans to share the building. However, the Court ruling, remunerative sharing of facilities by other veterans' halls in the County and the long history of civic events at the existing Vallejo Veterans' Hall all point to a wider use.

8. The veterans themselves have not always presented a unified front in their long drive for relief. Only four groups took part in the lawsuit. Others which did not, but which are mentioned in various supporting documents, include another American Legion post, a Filipino War Veterans' and Families and Friends group and a Vietnam Veterans' group. There are legitimate interests which separate all these groups, ranging from quests for differing benefits, the place, time and nature of their service and their actual need for a facility. Nevertheless, the County needs a single body representing all Vallejo Veterans as a point of contact for decisive negotiations. A 1997 Vallejo Veterans' Building Association Constitution took a step in that direction by asserting that it is "established...for the benefit of all veterans."

9. Documents revealed a potpourri of suggestions toward solving this issue.

Procedural:

- Reenergize the Vallejo Veterans' Building Association.
- Establish a procedure to keep that Association and other interested parties abreast of developments and to collect feedback
- Reactivate or establish anew a management/oversight structure to govern the use of the building
- Establish policies and procedures for use of the building by other agencies and organizations.

Funding:

- Establish a process whereby all rents received will revert to the building fund
- Prioritize use activities so that veterans' affairs will come first, revenue generating activities second, and public use third.
- Seek grants from all user oriented sources, and if the decision is to refurbish the existing Memorial Hall, then it should be, if it is not already, put on the National Register of Historic Buildings which does have funds available.
- Recruit volunteer labor.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 - The Superior Court interlocutory judgment of 1998 requires, in essence, that repairs be made to the existing facility or that alternative dedicated facilities be provided for the veterans. No solid headway has been made in six years. (2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7)(8)

Recommendation #1 - That all concerned muster their will and Solano County finally adopt a plan which is mutually agreeable to the interested parties, is backed by committed funds and is time-specific to achieve a dedicated Vallejo veterans' facility.

Finding # 2 - The Court judged that the County “can permit the use of such building for other purposes so long as such use does not interfere with the ordinary and accustomed use of such building by the veterans’ associations.” Fiscal benefits, precedents in the existing Memorial Hall and practices in other veterans’ centers support such a policy. (1)(2)(7)(9)

Recommendation #2 - That “house rules” for a new or refurbished facility provide for multiple use, so long as the veterans’ ordinary and accustomed uses have first priority.

V. Comments

Evidence shows that the interested agencies were striving for a fair solution before this Grand Jury investigation ever began. The General Services Administration staff appeared sympathetic to veterans and cooperative in search of a solution. Veterans’ groups seemed ready to accept reasonable compromise. More than once in the course of this investigation, a group has credited another with “good faith.”

The collective mood for a fair solution is high. But each new proposal collides with a seemingly insurmountable barrier, such as cost, timeliness, availability or suitability. What is needed now is a proactive collective will to override difficulties, commit resources and make it happen.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Board of Supervisors
- Solano County Administrator
- Solano County Department of General Services
- Solano County County Counsel

Courtesy Copy

- Veterans Association

SPECIAL DISTRICTS

Greater Vallejo Recreation District 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason For Investigation

The Greater Vallejo Recreation District (GVRD) response to the 2002-2003 Solano County Grand Jury Final Report regarding their operation and policies relating to the November 2000 ballot initiative to establish an additional special assessment to support the GVRD was vague and non-explanatory. Therefore, based on the 2002-2003 Grand Jury recommendations, the 2003-2004 Grand Jury decided to initiate an investigation based on the apparent non-compliance to the 2002-2003 Grand Jury Final Report.

II. Procedure

Reviewed:

- 2002-2003 Solano County Grand Jury Final Report
- GVRD operating policies and procedures
- 1998 through 2001 audits
- GVRD formation history
- Solano County Local Agency Formation Commission Procedures (LAFCO)

Interviewed:

- City of Vallejo Mayor
- LAFCO Executive Officer
- GVRD Board of Directors Chairperson
- Solano County Board of Supervisors

III. Background

1. On August 21, 2003, GVRD responded to the 2002-2003 Grand Jury Final Report. Their response stated that the Board of Directors “were taking steps to implement the recommendations applicable to the District as set forth in the Grand Jury’s Report”.

2. On September 19, 2003, the 2003-2004 Grand Jury requested more detail on what and how the recommendations were to be implemented.

3. On November 4, 2003 the 2003-2004 Grand Jury notified the GVRD of their non-compliance of not responding to the September 19, 2003 letter.

4. On November 11, 2003, GVRD responded to the September 19, 2003 Grand Jury letter with a detailed response.

5. On November 21, 2003, the 2003-2004 Grand Jury requested additional information, including copies of audits from 1998 through 2001, district formation information and policy and procedures that govern the board and general manager.

6. On December 4, 2003, the GVRD responded to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury letter dated November 21, 2003. Additional information regarding the audits was requested on December 5, 2003.

7. On January 4, 2004, GVRD provided the additional information regarding audits.

8. On January 22, 2004, the Grand Jury interviewed the City of Vallejo Mayor to discuss the feasibility of putting the services provided by the GVRD under the direct authority of the City of Vallejo.

9. On February 2, 2004, the Grand Jury interviewed the Executive Director of LAFCO to discuss the procedures to dissolve a special district.

10. On February 12, 2004, the Grand Jury interviewed the GVRD Board Chairperson to discuss the actions taken by the board which addressed the findings of the 2002 – 2003 Grand Jury Final Report.

11. On February 13 and 19, 2004, the Grand Jury interviewed members of the Solano County Board of Supervisors to discuss issues relating to the most efficient and effective methods to provide park and recreation services to residents within the GVRD defined area.

12. The GVRD was formed under the State of California Government Code §16271 [d] in 1944. At that time, Vallejo was a much smaller city and it was determined that the best method to provide Parks and Recreation needs in the Vallejo area was by way of a special district. Therefore, special tax assessments were imposed on those in the defined district area which included Vallejo residents and those who resided in unincorporated areas.

13. Sixty years have passed since the inception of the GVRD. Now, over ninety percent of the users of the district are residents of the City of Vallejo and almost all of the original unincorporated area of the district has been annexed by the City of Vallejo.

14. When the service area of a district changes, LAFCO guidelines provide procedures (56056) to determine the appropriate action to deal with the change. When the district area becomes entirely within the boundaries of a city, a merger (57104) may take place which eliminates the district and gives authority to the city. If 70% or more of the district area is within the city, a subsidiary district (57105) may be established which may also be administered by the city.

IV. Findings And Recommendations

Each paragraph is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 - GVRD's response to the 2002-2003 Final Report was vague, lacking details relating to the findings and recommendations. (1)

Recommendation #1- As stated in the Grand Jury Final Report, the responding agency must state one of four actions taken:

1. What has been implemented with summary of action?
2. What has not been implemented, but will be and with a plan?
3. Recommendations require additional study, which will not exceed six months.

4. If recommendation(s) will not be implemented with explanation. GVRD should respond accordingly as ignoring this legal requirement shows a disregard for the law and the Grand Jury and results in an unproductive use of the Grand Jury time. (1)(2)(3)

Finding #2 - The GVRD finally acknowledged the findings of the 2002 – 2003 Grand Jury Final Report and satisfactorily implemented policy and procedures and addressed the recommendations of the 2002-2003 Grand Jury Final Report. (4)

Recommendation #2 – Responses to Grand Jury reports must be made in a timely manner in accordance with the law.

Finding #3 - Audits for 1998 through 2002 were performed by the same independent auditor. There were various miscellaneous administrative financial deficiencies listed each year, sometimes for consecutive years with no apparent action to make corrections. (5)(6)(7)

Recommendation #3 - The GVRD Board and senior management should review the findings and recommendations of the auditor and when possible, implement as recommended. The Board should consider using different auditors or the services of the County of Solano.

Finding #4 - The GVRD was established by a vote of the people and legally authorized on June 14, 1944 and placed under authority of an advisory board. On December 23, 1958 the Solano County Board of Supervisors became the supervising authority to which the existing Board of Directors is responsible. The Board consists of three members appointed by the Mayor of Vallejo and two members recommended by supervisors from Districts 1 and 2 and approved by the Board of Supervisors.

During the time of the formation of the GVRD, population growth in unincorporated areas was growing dramatically, which spurred the development of parks, recreation, fire, water and other type districts as cities were much smaller and unable to provide such services. But, as city boundaries expanded, so did their ability to provide services. However, as city boundaries began to expand, they became able to provide additional services and the need for a district within a city began to decrease, especially when the majority of constituents serviced were within the sphere of influence of the city. Comparative cities within Solano County providing similar services are Benicia, Fairfield and Vacaville.

Further exploration of districts within cities finds redundant costs in areas such as legal services, payroll, purchasing, human resources, equipment and maintenance. (12)(13)(14)

Recommendation #4 - During the time when the GVRD was developed (1944), it was established as the best method to provide parks and recreational needs in the Vallejo area by way of a special district. However, almost 60 years have passed and much has changed. Therefore, the 2003-2004 Grand Jury recommends that the City of Vallejo and the GVRD jointly determine the most efficient and effective method to deliver parks and recreation services to citizens in the current GVRD area. This determination and any action that may change the GVRD are within the guidelines set forth by LAFCO.

When conducting this evaluation, the following LAFCO criteria should be considered:

1. Does the district tailor its services better than a city?
2. Does the district link its costs to benefits better than a city?
3. Is the district more responsive to its constituents than a city?

4. Are there inefficiencies or redundancies?
5. Is a district more accountable than a city?
6. What are the funding mechanisms and would a change reduce existing services?
7. Refer to LAFCO's District Mergers and Establishment of Subsidiary District Procedures Guide

It is understood that this will require a major effort on the part of all affected agencies.

Finding #5 – Failure to respond in a timely manner to the Grand Jury is not acceptable. (3)

Recommendation #5 - Within the required guidelines of responding to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury Final Report, all agencies provide the 2004-2005 Grand Jury with a report of their findings with a schedule of implementation where applicable.

V. Comment

The 2003-2004 Grand Jury recommends that the 2004-2005 Grand Jury and all successive Grand Juries follow-up on the investigation of the prior Grand Jury until all of these issues are resolved.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Board of Supervisors
- City of Vallejo
- Greater Vallejo Recreation District
- Local Agency Formation Commission

HIDDENBROOKE SUBDIVISION

2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason For Investigation

The Grand Jury received citizen complaints regarding the management, record keeping and allocation of the Community Facilities District Funds by the City of Vallejo as they relate to the Hiddenbrooke Subdivision located in the City of Vallejo.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Reviewed all correspondence provided by the complainants
- Reviewed all correspondence provided by the City of Vallejo
- Interviewed complainants
- Interviewed Greater Vallejo Recreation District (GVRD) Interim General Manager and the Park Planner

III. Background

1. The Hiddenbrooke Subdivision was approved by the Vallejo City Council on September 15, 1987 by way of a "Specific Plan" which presents the setting, plans, standards and procedures for the development.

2. The area is approximately 1,339 acres to be developed into a recreation-oriented residential community and the Specific Plan was prepared in compliance with State law and consistent with Vallejo General Plan policies. A maximum of 1,551 residential units were planned to be oriented around a championship eighteen-hole golf course which is already completed.

3. Other current and planned amenities include a golf clubhouse, a driving range, a swim and fitness center, a fire station, a school and a developed park site.

4. The park, as described in the Hiddenbrooke Specific Plan, is to be an active use park that will be 6-8 acres on a 16-18 acre site which will also accommodate a school. The GVRD is to construct and maintain the park and the Vallejo City Unified School District is to construct the school. However, at the time of this report (May 1, 2004), the school district had no plans to construct the school and since the school has planning priority of the site, the GVRD can not proceed with plans for the park.

5. The project is to be completed in four phases, three of which are completed. Phase I contains up to 773 residential units and the completion of the golf course. Phase II contains up to 624 residential units, a swimming, tennis and fitness center. Phase III contains up to 84 residential units and a restaurant. Phase IV contains 70 residential units, a school and a park.

6. Financing for the project's construction and maintenance generally took four forms: private funds, maintenance district funds, Mello-Roos funds, and development fees and revenues. The Hiddenbrooke Specific Plan provides a Financing Table showing how each facility or use will be financed and who has the responsibility. The City of Vallejo is responsible for the collection and management of fees received from homeowners. The Specific Plan states that the park will be developed by using Mello-

Roos funds. On April 19, 2004, the Grand Jury requested a full accounting of the Mello-Roos funds set aside for the park.

The Grand Jury decided to focus on the funds collected to construct and maintain the park which is to be developed during Phase IV which had begun at the time of this report.

IV. Findings And Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background paragraph number

Finding #1 – The Vallejo City Unified School District has serious financial problems which will likely delay any decision to proceed with the school and park. Until the school district’s financial problems are brought under control, it appears that no progress can be made on the school site or park. (4)

Recommendation #1 – None.

Finding #2 - Construction of the park, as identified in the Hiddenbrooke Specific Plan, is to be 100%-funded by Mello-Roos funds. GVRD reports that they have been informed by the City of Vallejo that there are no Mello-Roos funds available for this project. (6)

Recommendation #2 – At the time of this report (May 1, 2004), the City of Vallejo had requested an extension of response time relating to the Grand Jury’s request for the status of Mello-Roos funds as designated for the construction of the park. Therefore, no recommendation can be made as to finding #2.

Finding #3 - In a letter to the Grand Jury from the complainants dated March 4, 2003, it was stated that a letter to the City of Vallejo from the complainants for records of the Hiddenbrooke Community Facilities District Fund provided information with no details of expenditures and allocation of funds for the Hiddenbrooke Subdivision. (6)

Recommendation #3 – The City of Vallejo and the GVRD should meet with the representatives of the Hiddenbrooke Subdivision to provide details of fees collected and expenditures as specified in the Hiddenbrooke Specific Plan. If fees and expenditures do not meet the guidelines of the Plan, the City and the GVRD should provide to the residents a complete explanation as to any and all alterations to the Specific Plan guidelines.

V. Comments

It is recommended that the seated Grand Jury interview a newly appointed or assigned Vallejo City Unified School District Superintendent to update him/her regarding of the current situation. It is also recommended that the same Grand Jury interview the new GVRD general manager and that he/she be required to keep Hiddenbrooke residents apprised as to the progress of the park. While many of the amenities adopted in the Hiddenbrooke Specific Plan almost seventeen years ago have been completed, the residents of the Hiddenbrooke subdivision have been and continue to be assessed for amenities which have yet to be completed. The City of Vallejo, the GVRD and Vallejo City Unified School District must follow the requirements set forth by the City Council-adopted Specific Plan.

The Grand Jury recommends that the 2004-2005 Grand Jury and all successive Grand Juries review the progress made by the City of Vallejo, the GVRD and Vallejo City Unified School District as to the completion of the Hiddenbrooke Specific Plan.

VI. Affected Agencies

- City of Vallejo
- Greater Vallejo Recreation District
- Vallejo City Unified School District

CITY OF SUISUN CITY – LAWLER RANCH PARK 2003-2004 GRAND JURY REPORT

I. Reason For Investigation

This year's Grand Jury investigated the actions of the City of Suisun City at the recommendation of the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 Grand Juries to follow-up on the status of the ten-acre park in Lawler Ranch. That investigation was due to a citizen complaint that park fees collected from the Lawler Ranch homeowners through the developer were not being used to develop the ten-acre park which was part of the sale contract when the property was purchased.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Reviewed all information from the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 Solano County Grand Juries' Final Reports
- Requested additional information from the City of Suisun City
- Interviewed the Mayor and City Manager of the City of Suisun City

III. Background

1. In response to the 2001-2002 Grand Jury Final Report, the City of Suisun City acknowledged using fees for park development but did not make it known that the developer constructed a small park while the City constructed a five-acre park. The ten-acre Lawler Ranch Park is still not developed while the residents have been paying annual fees to the Park Development Fund Maintenance Advisory District. The purchase contract signed by the original buyers of Lawler Ranch properties in 1987 indicated that those development fees would be used for all three parks.

2. A meeting of the City of Suisun City Recreation Commission held on March 20, 2002 reported that design plans for the ten-acre park would be completed by the end of summer 2002. Upon completion of said plans, residents of Lawler Ranch would be notified of a meeting to review the plans.

3. At the end of summer 2002, the Grand Jury made a request to receive an update of the status of the ten-acre park. The park topic was on the October 2, 2002 Recreation Commission meetings agenda, attended by members of the 2002-2003 Grand Jury. However, no design plans were presented and no substantiate discussion occurred.

4. Pursuant to California Penal Code §933.05, the affected agency is to respond to the Grand Jury Final Report no later than 60 days after issuance. The City of Suisun City did not respond to the 2002-2003 Grand Jury Final Report within the 60 day requirement. The 2003-2004 Grand Jury issued a letter dated November 4, 2003 requesting the required response. The City of Suisun City responded on November 20, 2003. The City Manager reported that the ten-acre park had been put on a fast track schedule for completion. An oversight committee was established to include Lawler Ranch residents to oversee the 10-acre park development and a project schedule had been established. The City Manager stated that park fees for new development are allocated for facilities ranging from pocket and neighborhood parks in or close to the development to city-wide park and recreation facilities such as the Lambrecht Sports Complex or the Heritage Community Park. Therefore, funds collected from Lawler Ranch residents were available for all such projects.

5. The Grand Jury met with the Mayor and City Manager of Suisun City on January 22, 2004 to discuss the progress of the park. It was reported that bids for landscape services would be awarded at the February 2004 City Council meeting. Depending on the length of time necessary to secure public input, the proposed park would be completed between March and September of 2005. Due to the diminishing appropriations in General Fund Maintenance Budgets, the total development of the park may be done in phases. The first phase will be three to five acres. The remaining acreage will be developed as funds become available.

IV. Findings And Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background number

Finding #1 - The City of Suisun City told the Grand Jury and residents of Lawler Ranch that preparation of reporting plans for the ten-acre park would begin during the summer of 2002. However, there was no substantive action taken until November of 2003 or 20 months since the beginning of this investigation by the 2001-2002 Grand Jury. (1)(2)

Recommendation #1 - The City of Suisun City should carefully examine their project priorities prior to making public announcements.

Finding #2 - The City of Suisun City did not respond to the 2002-2003 Grand Jury Final Report within the time period prescribed by California Law. The City of Suisun City is required to respond to the Grand Jury within 60 days from the issuance of their Final Report. Ignoring the legal requirement of a response shows a disregard for the law and the Grand Jury and results in an unproductive use of Grand Jury time. (4)

Recommendation #2 - The Mayor and City Council must assure that responses to the Grand Jury are made in accordance with California Law.

Finding #3 – The City of Suisun City has developed a timeline for the project. (5)

Recommendation #3 – The City of Suisun City advise Lawler Ranch residents of public meetings and progress of the project, and on provide in a timely manner agendas that relate to Lawler Ranch Park to the Grand Jury.

V. Comments

The 2003-2004 Grand Jury recommends that the 2004-2005 Grand Jury review progress to ensure that the proposed ten-acre Lawler Ranch Park is completed pursuant to the schedule submitted by the City of Suisun City.

VI. Affected Agencies

- City of Suisun City

In addition to the reports by the Special Districts Committee of the 2003-2004 Solano County Grand Jury, the following citizen complaints were received and acted upon.

Nature of Complaint	Action Taken by Grand Jury	Resolution
Animal neglect and misconduct by the SPCA	Reviewed complaint	SPCA facility closed at time of review – case closed.

HOMELAND SECURITY AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

Emergency Services County & Cities Of Solano 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report

I. Reason For Investigation

This year's Grand Jury elected to review the Emergency Operating Centers and Procedures of agencies within Solano County and how Homeland Security mandates have been incorporated into Emergency Operating Plans.

II. Procedure

The Grand Jury:

- Reviewed all information from the 2002-2003 Solano County Grand Jury Final Report
- Interviewed Solano County Administrator, Emergency Services Manager and Emergency Medical Services Administrator
- Interviewed the City of Benicia City Manager and Police Chief
- Interviewed the City of Dixon City Manager and Police Chief
- Interviewed the City of Fairfield City Manager, Police Chief, Police Lieutenant and Fire Chief
- Interviewed the City of Rio Vista Acting City Manager/Fire Chief
- Interviewed the City of Suisun City Police Chief
- Interviewed the City of Vacaville City Manager and Police Chief
- Interviewed the City of Vallejo City Manager, Police Chief and Fire Chief
- Interviewed personnel of certain Federal and State agencies with an interface with Solano County and Solano County cities
- Interviewed personnel of certain private companies that have a security interface with Solano County and Solano County cities
- Attended and observed Solano County Multi-Agency Disaster Drill – November 12, 2003

III. Background

1. As set by State law, each City, Special District and County is required to develop an Emergency Operating Plan. To standardize the plan, United States Code (USC) §8607 requires all agencies to operate under the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS).

2. Each city is generally the first responder to disaster, terrorism, search and rescue, floods and other major emergencies within its jurisdiction. The City Manager, or his/her designee, has authority over the incident and determines what response is necessary to secure the safety of that community.

3. If the incident authority determines that the situation is beyond the capabilities of his/her city, mutual aid is requested of other cities and the County.

4. If the incident should encompass a large portion of the county as reported by the first responder, the County Emergency Operation Center (EOC) is activated by the Emergency Services Manager who assumes management and coordination of the incident. This includes equipment, materials, supplies and personnel.

5. Solano County is responsible for the coordination of medical services and response, multi-agency drills and training.

6. Homeland security has been added to the responsibilities of each city and the County. Working with units within the U. S. Department of Homeland Security, each agency is incorporating the many mandates that are being passed down to be included into current operating procedures and emergency response. This also includes working with the private sector (e.g. ports, chemical facilities, etc.).

7. Although Travis Air Force Base (TAFB) is responsible to the United States Government, Solano County and cities include TAFB in their emergency planning and exercises. It is understood that the County and cities have no authority over the base in the event of an emergency, but TAFB does have the ability to provide some response when authorized to proceed by the appropriate Federal Department. TAFB does have a program called U.S. Air Force Eagle Eyes that uses local residents on the anti-terrorism team by providing the information needed to recognize and report suspicious behavior.

IV. Findings And Recommendations

Each finding is referenced to the background reference number

Finding #1 – There is an Emergency Operating Plan for the County and each city. However, the plans vary and there seems to be no consistency among the county and cities regarding the training relating to Emergency Operating Procedures and new mandates from U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (1)(2)(6)

Recommendation #1 – To ensure that each agency is in compliance with California and U.S. emergency requirements, one agency should take the lead to insure that the appropriate training, exercises and guidelines are established and implemented. Due to the fact that the County has a dedicated employee for Emergency Services, it is logical that the County Office of Emergency Services take the lead in this endeavor. Currently, agencies meet to discuss response and mutual aid. It is recommended that the review of agency operational plans and procedures be presented at these meetings to ensure each agency is within State and U.S. standards.

Finding #2 - Within some agencies, there seems to be confusion about who would activate the EOC and who has authority to make appropriate and crucial decisions relating to the necessary response, material, supplies and the request for mutual aid. (2)

Recommendation #2 – The County Administrator (CAO) and each City Manager should review and define their respective emergency administrative roles and clearly communicate these responsibilities to members of the EOC team.

Finding #3 - If an emergency incident should escalate beyond the agency's capacity and the need to request mutual aid from another agency should be necessary, the current communication systems would hamper responsibilities, as each agency's communication system operates independently with no coordination and little interoperability among police, fire and medical agencies. This finding was part of the 2002-2003 Solano County Grand Jury Report. It appears that no progress has taken place to rectify this problem. (3)(4)

Recommendation #3 – The U. S. Department of Homeland Security has made it clear that funding is available for a variety of needs at the local level, but the process to determine those needs is slow and difficult. As a temporary solution to the County-wide communication system, the county estimates that \$3,000,000 would provide a system that would link agencies appropriately when significant multi-response is required. Rather than each city or the county pursuing the available funds, all agencies should jointly ascertain what U. S. Department of Homeland Security is requiring and whether those needs can be met for this project. With the County Office of Emergency Services acting as the lead agency, they could develop a grant application that represents all of the agencies in Solano County.

Finding #4 - Dixon, Rio Vista and Benicia do not have hospital facilities and those that exist in Solano County have inadequate beds to accommodate a major incident. There is no trauma center or decontamination facility in the entire County. A system called Reddinet links all medical facilities in the County with the County EOC, and provides an instant count of available beds and facilities. Currently, medical facilities located in Solano County depend on trauma centers located in Contra Costa and Napa Counties. In a major event, most likely, these facilities would not be available. The escalating growth of Solano County necessitates the exploration of facilities to provide for the safety of its residents. (5)

Recommendation #4 – The Solano County Board of Supervisors review this issue and make it part of Solano County’s future planning goals no later than 2005-2006. Solano County funding should include continuance of the Reddinet service.

Finding #5 – There is no certified Hazardous Material (HazMat) Response Team in the County. Although fire and police personnel are trained to make a first on-site assessment, actual cleanup must be performed by qualified personnel. Currently the services of Napa County and the City of Sacramento are being used, but in the case of a major event, those services may not be available. It is realized that the cost to establish a HazMat Team is large (\$2,000,000 plus), and the annual operating cost is estimated at \$350,000. But a joint effort by all the cities, districts and County may make this affordable. (4)

Recommendation #5 – The County Office of Emergency Services take the lead in a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a County HazMat Team.

Finding #6 - A County Mobile Command Center has been acquired by a grant approved through U.S. Department of Homeland Security. This unit can be moved to an incident and become the Command Center for the responsible agency. It provides the capability to develop one communication frequency so all responding agencies have the capability of communicating and is equipped with backup power. (4)

Recommendation #6 - Solano County ensure that training in the mobile command center be required for all emergency command personnel within the County. The County is to be commended for acquiring this state-of-the-art unit.

Finding #7 - Some of the agencies do not have dedicated space for a local EOC. In some cases the area is being used for other purposes and must be transformed in an emergency, which may in turn, hamper the response time. (1)

Recommendation #7 - Every effort should be made to provide dedicated space for an EOC. If space is unavailable, a dedicated area should consist of all necessary equipment and supplies to transform the area as soon as possible. Each local EOC needs to have back up power.

Finding #8 - Solano County has an automatic phone warning system for the entire County. Residents of an affected area can be warned by an automatic phone call with recorded instructions as to the situation. Local radio stations and television are also used to inform the public. (4)

Recommendation #8 – Agencies which have this valuable service should publicize this to their citizens.

Finding #9 - Solano County Department of Health and Social Services is responsible for implementing State Medical Standards and Medical Response Procedures. However, it is unclear how the Department interacts with the Office of Emergency Services or its role in the EOC. (5)

Recommendation #9 - The Solano County Chief Administrative Officer should define the role during emergencies of the Department of Health and Social Services during an emergency, including placement in the Solano County Emergency Operations Organization Chart with assigned duties and responsibilities.

Finding #10 - A Solano County Multi-Agency Disaster Drill took place on November 13, 2003. The purpose was to test and train the appropriate personnel of law enforcement, fire service, emergency medical services, County Office of Emergency Services, Solano County Emergency Medical Services Agencies and the Public Health Department to respond to a terrorist event involving mass casualties and significant destruction or the potential thereof. This was the first such drill in Solano County. The drill revealed an overall lack of communication and leadership. Objectives of the drill were only partially achieved or not achieved at all. The results of this drill emphasize the need for a central authority to coordinate a disaster event that involves mutual aid. (5)

Recommendation #10 - The County Administrative Officer should take the lead and determine the necessary action to resolve the non-achieved objectives of this exercise.

Finding #11 - Agencies tend to be territorial and focus on their own needs when planning for community services which may create obstacles when trying to develop mutual aid throughout the County that will benefit all citizens in a time of crisis. The terrorist actions of September 11, 2001 created a need for reassessment of the procedures to safeguard our population. The formation of the U. S. Department of Homeland Security brought together 42 agencies under one department requiring a major coordination effort, not only with U. S. Department of Homeland Security but with states, counties and cities so that information and responses can occur both up and down the organizational chart. (6)

Recommendation #11 – Elected County officials, county administrators and City Managers need to reassess the methods by which Emergency Operating Systems are developed and implemented to break down territorial lines and to ensure that the emergency service needs are being met. Just as many Federal government departments were combined under U.S. Department of Homeland Security to establish the most efficient and effective way to respond to various incidents, so should state, counties and cities review existing emergency response structures. To make this happen, elected officials should take the initial step to form a County-wide committee that would include representatives from the State Senate and Assembly offices, County Board of Supervisors and City Councils. At this level, an assessment of County needs should take place and appropriate direction given to responsible County and City staff to develop a seamless Emergency Operating Plan throughout the County.

V. Comments

It is apparent that with the additional responsibilities of U.S. Department of Homeland Security being added to the county and cities, their Emergency Operation workload has increased. Some of those mandates require funding which has not made its way from the Federal Government, putting additional strain on local budgets and staff. If each agency works independently, the power of combined resources will be lost and their efforts hampered unnecessarily. There is no better time for all agencies to join their talents, experience and financial resources to provide the most efficient and effective emergency operational response for all the residents of Solano County.

VI. Affected Agencies

- Solano County Board of Supervisors
- Solano County Chief Administrative Officer
- Solano County Sheriff Department
- Solano County Emergency Services Manager
- Solano County Emergency Medical Services Administrator
- City of Benicia City Manager
- City of Benicia Police Chief
- City of Dixon
- City of Dixon City Manager
- City of Dixon Police Chief
- City of Fairfield City Manager
- City of Fairfield Police Chief
- City of Fairfield Fire Chief
- City of Suisun City
- City of Suisun City Police Chief
- City of Rio Vista
- City of Rio Vista City Manager
- City of Rio Vista Police Chief
- City of Vacaville
- City of Vacaville City Manager
- City of Vacaville Police Chief
- City of Vallejo
- City of Vallejo City Manager
- City of Vallejo Police Chief
- City of Vallejo Fire Chief

Courtesy Copies

- State Senator, 2nd District
- State Senator, 4th District
- State Assembly, 8th District
- State Assembly, 7th District