Responses to the
2008-2009
Yolo County Grand Jury
Final Report
Woodland Joint Unified School District (WJUSD)
August 20, 2009

Honorable Janet Gaard
Judge of the Yolo Superior Court
Department 15
1100 Main Street, Suite 300
Woodland CA, 95695

Re: Response to Yolo County Grand Jury Report by Board of Trustees
(Woodland Joint Unified School District)

Enclosed please find one original and five copies of the Board’s response to the Yolo County Grand Jury Report for filing today. Please return the filed-endorsed copies to our office.

Sincerely,

Noemi Morones
Executive Assistant
Superintendent’s Office
Woodland Joint Unified School District

Cc: Clerk of the Court

Board of Supervisors, Yolo County

Board of Trustees
Woodland Joint Unified School District
Response to Yolo County Grand Jury Report by
Board of Trustees of Woodland Joint Unified School District

I. Introduction

The Board of Trustees for the Woodland Joint Unified School District ("Board") hereby submits a response to the Yolo Grand Jury Report dated June 30, 2009. In the prior report dated June 30, 2008, it was stated that the Grand Jury recommended that the 2008-09 Grand Jury continue the investigation of the Woodland Joint Unified School District (WJUSD) including, but not limited to, compliance with the Brown Act. The following is a response to the findings and recommendations of the new report (June 30, 2009).

II. Response to findings

Finding F-1: Brown Act training has been conducted for all current Board members as recommended by the 2007-2008 Grand Jury

The District welcomes the acknowledgement regarding Brown Act training which was conducted on September 27, 2008 by Attorney Scot Yarnell from the law firm of Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo.

Finding F-2: The Board has initiated a program to ensure future Board members receive Brown Act training within six months of taking office, and current members receive refresher training every two years, but that requirement has not yet been incorporated into written Board Policy.

The newest Board Member, Mr. William Herms, was appointed to the Board on February 26, 2009. Training was scheduled for Mr. Herms, and held on July 23, 2009, thereby meeting the six month recommendation. New Superintendent Dr. Debra LaVoi, Associate Superintendents Mark Bonnett, Dr. Debra Calvin, and Mike Stevens, and Executive Assistant Marilyn Hisle also participated in that training.

The new requirements as noted in the finding were approved by the Board on May 28, 2009, as revised Board Policy 9240 Board Professional Development. See Appendix A.

Finding F-3: The WJUSD has placed itself in untenable and very costly position with regard to its current lease agreement on the Blue Shield property.

The Board will continue to study its options, given the current state of the economy and the impact of the state budget crisis on the District.

III. Response to Recommendations

Recommendation 09-01: The Board should continue its Brown Act training plan and incorporate training requirements into its written policy and procedures as soon as possible.
Response to Recommendation 09-01:

On May 28, 2009, the Board took action to approve Revised Board Policy 9240 Board Professional Development, which includes the recommended training for new and current Board members. See Appendix A.

Recommendation 09-02: It is imperative that the Board utilize the most effective and immediate funding mechanism to ensure that the property known as the Blue Shield building be purchased under the terms of Option 3 as described above.

Response to Recommendation 09-02:

The Board appreciates the in-depth analysis from the Grand Jury of the Blue Shield building lease. The Board will continue to study its options, including Option 3 as recommended. All avenues of action will be investigated, including the possibility of a General Obligation Bond. It is the intent of the Board to act in the best interests of the District.

Dated: 8/13/09

Rosario Ruiz-Dark
President, Board of Trustees
Woodland Joint Unified School District
August 18, 2009

The Honorable Janet Gaard  
Judge of the Yolo County Superior Court  
725 Court Street, Room 308  
Woodland, California 95695


Dear Judge Gaard,

The Yolo County Grand Jury visited the Yolo County Sheriff’s Department’s Monroe and Leinberger Detention Facilities on September 9, 2008. On or about June 29, 2009 we received a copy of their report. As requested by the Grand Jury’s report, I am responding to their findings and recommendations.

Finding F-3
The Grand Jury’s report cites that there is no written record of the Detention Division Policy & Procedures Manual (P&Ps) being reviewed.

Response
Though there is no written record of such annual audit, we routinely review our P&Ps on a regular basis throughout the year. In addition, our entire Detention Division operations are audited by the State of California’s Corrections Standards Authority every two years. Our last CSA audit was conducted in 2008 and our P&Ps were determined to be in compliance with State regulations.

Finding F-4
The Grand Jury’s report cites that many of our policies are greater than five years old.

Response
The Sheriff’s Department is currently in the process of an update of our entire Detention Policy & Procedures manual. This project was implemented prior to our receiving the Grand Jury report, and as of the time of this writing, 60 P&Ps have already been updated. Our target date for completion is October of this year. Once this manual is completed, arrangements will be made for it to be printed and copies will be issued out to employees and key stakeholders. I am confident we will have the new manual issued to all involved employees by December of this year.

“Service Without Limitations”
Findings F-5 and F-6
The Grand Jury’s report cites that incorrect and/or inappropriate sections of governing regulations have been referenced in our existing P&Ps.

Response
Appropriate referencing sections will be reviewed and corrected during the current update.

Findings 09-04 and 09-07
The Grand Jury’s report finds that a P&P audit and a record for tracking such audit must be done annually.

Response
The Detention Division Commander will now be responsible to oversee an annual review of the manual and report his/her findings and recommendations to the Office of the Sheriff by April 1 of every year. Being that the new P&P manual will be effective in December of this year, the first annual report of review to the Sheriff will commence in 2011.

Findings 09-05 and 09-06
The Grand Jury’s report finds that incorrect and/or inappropriate sections of governing regulations have been referenced in our existing P&Ps.

Response
Appropriate referencing sections will be reviewed and corrected during the current update.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can answer any questions or provide additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Larry Cecchettini
Captain
Detention Division Commander
TO: The Honorable Janet Gaard  
Judge of the Yolo County Superior Court

FROM: E. G. Prieto, Sheriff-Coroner

SUBJECT: Response to the 2008-2009 Grand Jury Report

DATE: August 25, 2009

Background:  
The Yolo County Grand Jury visited the Yolo County Sheriff’s Department’s Monroe and Leinberger Detention Facilities on September 9, 2008. On or about June 29, 2009 we received a copy of their report. I am responding to their findings and recommendations.

Findings:
1. Areas visited by the grand jury were found to be clean and well maintained.
2. The jail does not meet the confinement needs of the county.
3. A majority (87.6%) of policies and procedures have no record that the required annual audit has ever been conducted.
4. A majority (82.5%) of policy and procedures are greater than five years old. There is a very high likelihood that policies, procedures, references or other factors have changed during that period, and have not been updated in the P & Ps.
5. Numerous policies and procedures incorrectly reference Title 15 as part of the California Administrative Code rather than California Code of Regulations.
6. A significant percentage of the P & Ps spot-checked reference incorrect and/or inappropriate sections of government regulations.

Recommendation:
09-03 Make jail expansion a top priority in the county’s budget.

Response:
The Sheriff’s Department agrees with the findings and recommendations of the report.

Recommendation:
09-04 Review and audit policies and procedures at least annually as required by S.O. No. A-600.

“Service Without Limitations”
Response:
Though there is no written record of such annual audit, we routinely review our P&Ps on a regular basis throughout the year. In addition, our entire Detention Division operations are audited by the State of California’s Corrections Standards Authority every two years. Our last CSA audit was conducted in 2008 and our P&Ps were determined to be in compliance with State regulations.

The Sheriff’s Department is currently in the process of an update of our entire Detention Policy & Procedures Manual. This project was implemented prior to our receiving the Grand Jury report, and as of the time of this writing, 60 P & Ps have already been updated. Our target date for completion is October of this year. When the manual is completed, arrangements will be made for it to be printed and copies will be issued out to employees and key stakeholders. I am confident we will have the new manual issued to all involved employees by December of this year.

Recommendation:
09-05 Determine the correct references for policies and procedures that currently reference California Penal Code, Section 4000 (approximately 70). Where possible, California Code of Regulations, Title 15 should be the primary reference.

09-06 Verify references for all remaining policies and procedures to ensure the manual (and therefore the facility) comply with governing statutes and corrections standards. Where possible, California Code of Regulations, Title 15 should be the primary reference.

Response:
Appropriate referencing sections will be reviewed, verified, and corrected during the Policy and Procedure Manual update.

Recommendation:
09-07 Track completion of the above recommendations and initiate procedures to ensure the Policy and Procedure Manual is being reviewed and audited as required.

Response:
The Detention Division Commander will be responsible to oversee an annual review of the manual and report his/her findings and recommendations to the Office of the Sheriff by April 1 of every year. The first annual report of review to the Sheriff will commence in April of 2011.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or if I can answer any questions or provide additional information.

Sincerely,

E. G. PRIETO
SHERIFF-CORONER
August 5, 2009

The Honorable Steven Basha
Judge of the Superior Court
725 Court Street
Woodland, CA 95695

RE: 2008-09 Grand Jury Final Report

Dear Judge Basha:

The following is the response to the 2008-09 Grand Jury Final Report from the Yolo County Board of Supervisors and the County Administrator.

For purposes of readability we have included the Grand Jury’s recommendations in italics.

09-03 “Make jail expansion a top priority in the county’s budget.”

This recommendation will continue to be a priority in the county’s budget; however, jail expansion will only be possible if sufficient state and/or federal funding become available in the future.

The cost of expanding the current jail is estimated at $42 million, several times the funding currently available from the county. In an attempt to leverage available funds, in 2008-09 the county applied to the state and was tentatively awarded $30 million to expand the existing jail facility. However, because the county was unable to resolve issues with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation in finding an acceptable site for a proposed re-entry facility, the $30 million for jail expansion became unavailable. The county is continuing to work with the state to identify alternative re-entry sites outside of Yolo County. If this effort is successful, the $30 million award could be made available again. Although jail expansion continues to be a priority for the Board of Supervisors, current funding shortfalls limit the county’s ability to expand the existing jail in the near future.
Additional Comments

The Board of Supervisors and County Administrator acknowledge the hard work and community service of the Grand Jury. Please feel free to contact me at any time should you need the assistance of my office.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Sharon Jensen
County Administrator

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors
    County Counsel
Dunnigan Fire Protection District
November 19, 2009

Honorable Janet Gaard
Judge of the Superior Court, Department 15
1100 Main Street, Suite 300
Woodland, CA 95695

RE: 2008-09 Grand Jury Final Report

Dear Judge Gaard,

The following is our response to the 2008-2009 Yolo County Grand Jury Final Report specifically addressing the Dunnigan Fire Protection District Review Findings F-1 through F-3, and Recommendations 09-08 through 09-10 on page 19.

We agree with all three findings; F-1, F-2, and F-3. For purposes of readability we have included the Grand Jury’s recommendation in italics with our responses following.

**09-08:** “DFPD continue to maintain adequate staffing and equipment.”

This recommendation has been implemented.

We are committed to providing at least one paid full time firemen to be active at the fire station ready to support the volunteers in responding to emergency calls. We also actively pursue grant opportunities to acquire new equipment, and have established an impact fee mechanism to help meet the equipment and facility needs of future growth.

**09-09:** “DFPD governing commission should pursue its 20-year plan.”

This recommendation has been implemented.

We have constructed a 20- year plan that addresses new growth, the facility, equipment and staffing needs that will be required to meet the new growth. We plan on taking any and all opportunities that may present themselves during the development stage of planning new communities to ensure the district needs are considered and met.
09-10: “*Given the number of calls involving a need for emergency medical treatment, all firefighters should receive EMT certification.*”

**This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable.**

Although we understand the need for this recommendation, this recommendation cannot possibly be implemented. We strive to get as many volunteer firemen EMT certified as possible, but if this were a requirement for all volunteers our District we would lose a large portion of our roster. We actively provide training opportunities, including medical aid training, for all who wish to undertake the training and will consider ways to promote the EMT certification as much as possible. As a final note, we do require any paid firemen to be EMT certified as a condition of employment.

Respectfully yours,

The Dunnigan Fire District Board of Commissioners