



**COUNTY OF LAKE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Courthouse - 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, California 95453
TELEPHONE (707) 263-2368
FAX (707) 263-2207

Moke Simon
District 1

Jeff Smith
District 2

Jim Steele
District 3

Tina Scott
District 4

Rob Brown
District 5

September 19, 2017

The Honorable Andrew S. Blum
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

RE: Response to the 2016/2017 Grand Jury Final Report

Dear Judge Blum:

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933, the Board of Supervisors is submitting this response to the FY 2016/2017 Civil Grand Jury Final Report.

The Board's response is presented in the same sequence as the recommendations appear in the Final Report. We have provided a response to all items for which the report indicated a response was required by the Board of Supervisors. Responses from appointed and elected department heads are likewise attached, in so much as they were provided to the Board.

The Board of Supervisors greatly appreciates the efforts of the Civil Grand Jury to assist in improving the operations of County government.

OVERALL COMMENTS ON REPORT

The Board is aware of the considerable time commitment required to faithfully execute the duties of a member of the Civil Grand Jury. The Board commends the Civil Grand Jury for their efforts toward this year's report, and values the opportunity to reasonably respond.

RESPONSE TO CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

“\$50,000+ ABATEMENT REIMBURSEMENT IGNORED”

Response to Findings 1-6:

F1. The BOS and the Water Resources Department neglected to try to collect a \$55,906.07 debt owed to the County for over five years.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board agrees with County Counsel that there was no act of neglect in regard to collection of this debt. Use of standard collection practices was precluded by the unique circumstances of the subject event. Further, once a means of collection was made possible, the County immediately acted upon it.

F2. The Code Enforcement Department has a well-oiled process for handling abatements that occur on land.

AGREE with finding.

F3. The Department of Water Resources or Lakebed Management did not use all available processes for handling abatements that occur on water (Chapter 13 and Chapter 23).

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board agrees with County Counsel, there was and remains no specific process for addressing abatements that occur on water.

F4. The BOS has made no effort to determine how or why no one tried to collect the debt or provide any consequences to that person or entity.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: See F1 response hereinabove.

F5. The Grand Jury could find no reference to required insurance or bonds for contractors constructing docks, piers, etc. in the lake other than a State requirement for a \$15,000 bond to be a licensed contractor.

DISAGREE, in part, with finding.

Explanation: The Board appreciates the Grand Jury's difficulty in locating references to insurance. However, the Board disagrees with any implication that the County has no such requirements. Over the next 30 days, the County will ensure that all County employees and officials with contracting authority are both aware of and utilize the County's standard insurance requirements unless the circumstances of the contract dictate the need for increased requirements.

F6. Due to the fluid situation with the lake it may not be sufficient to use only one method of contact to reach the proper party.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board agrees with County Counsel that the intent of the phrase, "The fluid situation with the lake," is unclear, as is who is intended as the "proper party" described by this finding.

Response to Recommendations #1-5:

R1. The BOS, by the end of 2017, add requirements to Chapter 13 and 23 ordinances that contractors working on the lake have in place bonds and insurance to cover the potential claims based on the size of the project. (F1, F2, F5, F6)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The Board finds that insurance requirements for various types of agreements and processes already exist in County policy and/or County contracting requirements.

R2. Department of Water Resources officially adopt the Chapter 13 process for abatements in the lake within two months of completion of Recommendation 1. Provide training in the process to enforcement officials within two months of their adoption. (F2, F6)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The Board finds it is unnecessary to implement the above recommendation, as Code Enforcement staff are already familiar with Chapter 13 abatement processes. Please also see our response to R1.

R3. BOS determine who had the responsibility to initiate the collection activity and discipline that person or entity. (F4)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The Board agrees with County Counsel that the process had not reached a point where such collection activity was authorized or delegated to any person or entity.

R4. County Counsel determine, within two months, where in the ordinances the requirement for insurance needs to be added. (F5)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: See R1.

R5. BOS change the Chapter ordinance to require the use of two methods of delivery of the Notice to Abate for lake-related abatements to ensure it is included in Recommendation 1. (F6)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The Board finds Chapter 13 already adequately addresses methods of notice in abatement actions. Please also see our response to R1.

“TAXPAYERS POTENTIALLY LOSE MILLIONS ON REAL ESTATE INVESTMENTS”

Response to Findings F1-5, F1-7:

F1. Employees involved in these County owned properties are not familiar with all aspects of the properties.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The purpose of this finding is unclear.

F2. It is not entirely clear what insurance is in place for Holiday Harbor. Docks are treated differently by the insurance agency at various locations.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board agrees with the response of the County Administrative Officer (CAO). Holiday Harbor is insured for replacement value. Docks are excluded from insurance coverage unless the County requests such coverage.

F3. The County has \$7.2 million invested in two commercial properties (Holiday Harbor, Nice, The Castle) that produce little or no income and continue to be a drain on County finances.

AGREE with finding.

F4. Original plans for the Holiday Harbor property were too aggressive and expensive for the area.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The purpose of this finding is not clear.

F5. The Sheriff and County officials are allowing two boats with registrations at least two years out of date and no Quagga Mussel stickers to remain in Holiday Harbor. This is a clear violation of County and State laws.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board supports the findings of the CAO. Holiday Harbor was closed in 2016 for safety reasons. The remaining boats had current quagga mussel stickers at one time, but were later abandoned by their owners, and have not since been moved.

F1. Holiday Harbor berthing fees have not been paid for several years. The County has taken ownership of the abandoned vessels however they were left in the harbor and one has sunk.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: Refer to response F5, above.

F2. If the College leaves after five years in July 2018, plans for the property are uncertain and most likely will create more financial loss for local taxpayers. In June 2017 during the publication of this report the College abruptly loaded its equipment into a moving van and abandoned site.

AGREE with finding.

F3. The small enrollment in the College does not appear to justify the cost of maintaining the campus.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board agrees with the CAO's concern that the purpose of this finding is not clear. There is no correlation between college enrollment and County property maintenance.

F4. Some County officials seem to be unaware of the amount of money invested in The Castle.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The purpose of this finding is not clear.

F5. Considerable additional funds will be required to fully utilize the Castle property.

AGREE with finding.

The Castle property is only partially renovated.

F6. Parking at The Castle is inadequate for the County's current and intended future uses. It would be costly to put in additional parking, as well as make it ADA compliant.

AGREE with finding.

The Board concurs with the CAO's comment. Parking is limited, and may require expansion depending upon future use.

F7. The County should not be in the business of purchasing and developing real estate for commercial use. County officials are not qualified to plan commercial real estate developments.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board agrees with the CAO that the purpose of this finding is unclear. County staff are commonly involved in acquisition, management, and development of commercial real estate.

F8. The County and the communities where these properties are located have not benefitted from the purchase of these properties.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board concurs with the CAO's findings. Marymount California University graduated a number of Bachelor's and Master's level candidates, benefitting the County and the community, as a whole.

Response to Recommendations #1-6:

R1. The BOS not approve any additional real estate transactions for commercial development. (F1, F3, F12, F13)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The purpose of this recommendation is unclear.

R2. BOS identify a person responsible to dispose of Holiday Harbor within sixty days (F3, F4)

AGREE, has been implemented.

The property is being relisted for sale. However, the Board agrees with the CAO, even if successful, this process will take longer than sixty days.

R3. BOS direct the person responsible to list Holiday Harbor on the market "as is" immediately and take action to have the existing boats removed. (F3, F4, F6)

AGREE, has been implemented.

The Board supports the CAO's and Water Resources Director's intent to work to secure a contractor to remove the sunken boat.

R4. Sheriff enforce maritime law and County regulations at Holiday Harbor immediately. (F5)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: As previously stated, Holiday Harbor was closed in 2016 for safety reasons. The remaining boats had current quagga mussel stickers at one time, but were later abandoned by their owners, and have not since been moved.

R5. County collect past due berthing fees from boat owners of the abandoned vessels in Holiday Harbor. (F6)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The Board supports the findings of the CAO. Owners of the abandoned boats have been unresponsive to repeated efforts demanding they take necessary action with respect to their boats.

R6. BOS consider selling The Castle, or leasing the space to the State as the new courthouse and supporting offices, during fiscal year 2017-2018. (F7, F8, F10, F11, F12, F13).

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The Board supports the findings of the CAO. As of this writing, the Castle property is still tied up through the lease agreement with Marymount. The Castle cannot be repurposed until the parties come to terms. Nonetheless, there has been considerable interest in the Castle since it was announced that Marymount had departed.

“200 + COUNTY PROPERTIES NEED MANAGEMENT TO ENSURE MAXIMUM INSURANCE COVERAGE AND MINIMUM PREMIUM COST”

Response to Findings 1-12:

F1. After multiple interviews with various county officials and staff members, the Grand Jury has been unable to resolve the discrepancies or get answers to our questions. The only conclusion we can reach is that nobody really knows or cares.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The purpose of this finding is unclear.

F2. The Grand Jury's conclusion is that in some cases the County is under insured and in other cases over insured. The County's premiums (costs) appear to be either too high or too low, it is anybody's guess. It appears that the County has relinquished oversight of insured properties to CSAC-EIA and Alliant Insurance Services, Inc.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board finds all properties are appropriately insured. Properties are appraised by a licensed, professional appraiser, and insurance coverage and premiums are based upon replacement value.

F3. Keeping track of County owned properties is not a high priority. The Grand Jury could find no central point of control to answer all the issues with regard to property coverage.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board supports the CAO's and Public Services Director's finding that the responsible departments balance numerous priorities including keeping track of properties.

F4. Employees involved in County owned properties are not familiar with all aspects of the properties.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The purpose of this finding is unclear.

F5. Insurance coverage for County owned properties is not consistent. Similar items are not always included.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: See F2, above.

F6. Insured values placed on listed properties are not consistent.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: See F2, above.

F7. Docks, piers and gazebos are treated differently by the insurance agency at various locations.

AGREE with finding.

Docks, piers and gazebos are excluded from insurance unless the County requests such coverage.

F8. County employees are unable to explain the discrepancies in insurance values and coverage.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board finds all properties are appropriately insured. Properties are appraised by a licensed, professional appraiser, and insurance coverage and premiums are based upon replacement value.

F9. County reviews of the insurance coverage on County owned properties are rare and uncoordinated.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: Refer to F8, above.

F10. The Grand Jury was informed that replacement value coverage is guaranteed for all County properties. However, the Grand Jury found damage that was not covered such as the Holiday Harbor docks.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: See F7, above.

F11. It is possible insurance premiums would change if items on the schedule and property values were consistent.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: refer to F8, above.

F12. The "Master" schedule of insured properties prepared by Alliant shows significant variations with the schedule of insured properties submitted by CAO and Risk Management.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board finds the County Administrative Office and Risk Management each provided a copy of the schedule of properties generated by Alliant. The Board further agrees it is possible that these copies were different versions depending on the dates they were generated. The list provided by Public Services was not a schedule of properties. It was a list used by the department for maintenance purposes.

Response to Recommendations #1-6:

R1. By September 2017, establish a centralized Property Management Office (PMO). This person should be experienced in insurance and real estate terms and practices. This person

will be responsible for ensuring that the master property schedule is accurate with regard to items listed and the appropriate value to ensure insurance coverage. This position would also coordinate and track all decisions regarding real property purchases, uses, enhancements, disposals, and insurance claim initiations. In addition, this position would evaluate property utilization and make recommendations to the BOS regarding actions that would improve utilization. To ensure that all interested parties are represented, establish a Property Management Committee (PMC) led by the PMO and including representation from Risk Management, the Chief Administrative Office, and Public Services department. (F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F7, F8, F9, F10, F11, F12)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The County does not have the financial resources to establish and staff a centralized PMO.

R2. Perform an audit of properties every two years. (F3, F5, F6, F9, F12)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The Board finds Alliant audits properties as part of their normative process.

R3. Correct Property Schedule inconsistencies. Complete by January 2018. (F5, F6, F7, F8, F9, F12)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The schedule of County properties accurately reflects those covered by insurance.

R4. Perform an investigation into why the Holiday Harbor RV Park and Marina docks were not replaced by insurance, even though the marina is on the insurance company's appraised list. Determine who was responsible. Complete this task by January 2018. (F7, F8, F10)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Docks are excluded from insurance unless the County requests such coverage.

R5. Add the Clarks Island Pedestrian Bridge to the Lake County Property Schedule. Complete by January 2018. (F12)

AGREE, will be implemented by January 2018.

R6. Add the large County and Park signs as well as the clocks to the Lake County Property Schedule. Complete by January 2018. (F12)

AGREE, will be implemented by January 2018.

“HAS ANYBODY SEEN A TAX SALE RECENTLY”

Response to Findings 1 and 2:

F1. Since the County has not exercised its authority to hold a tax lien sale since 2013, it has hampered the ability of the municipalities to have all monies available for their operations.

AGREE with finding.

F2. The proposed sale of 141 tax-defaulted properties is only three percent of the total available properties eligible for tax sale.

AGREE with finding.

Response to Recommendation 1:

R1. The County conduct a tax lien sale on an annual basis including properties from the cities of Clearlake and Lakeport (F1).

AGREE with finding, has been implemented. The Board encourages the Treasurer-Tax Collector to take all steps required to conduct annual tax sales.

“INADEQUATE STAFFING OF COUNTY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH [BH]”

Response to Findings 1-12:

F1. The County Budget for operation of BH is approximately \$65,000, the significant balance of the overall funding comes primarily from California State funding (and some federal funding via grant blocks) generated by invoicing of approved services.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The annual direct County General Fund contribution to BH is \$61,112.00. The total County Behavioral Health budget for 2016-17 was \$13,431,617, predominantly from State and Federal funds.

F2. The requirement of medication dosage preparation has impeded the most senior nurse available in BH from fulfilling other critically needed nursing services. [Example excluded]

NEUTRAL, requires further analysis.

Explanation: The Board affirms Administrator Metcalf's intention to explore potential positive and negative impacts to the Department by the end of fiscal year 2017-18.

F3. Efforts to hire and retain skilled nurses for BH have been unsuccessful. [Example excluded]

AGREE, will be implemented during fiscal year 2017-18.

F4. Filling open personnel requisitions would allow many more services to be completed and properly billed to allow state and federal funding to reach this department. This would readily result in even more services/broader expansion of those served which would benefit the county residents in need of such services.

AGREE with finding.

F5. Searches for nursing staff are generally made using common methods along the simplest lines. Little or no unusual or innovative concepts to differentiate Lake County from the thousands of other nationwide nursing positions have been developed.

AGREE with finding.

The Board agrees with Administrator Metcalf, an appropriate response will be implemented prior to the end of fiscal year 2017-18. The Board affirms Administrator Metcalf's intent to explore targeted outreach and use of recruitment websites such as "Indeed.com."

F6. The latest organizational/management changes at the Department of BH are focused primarily on financial efficiency instead of client care.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The purpose of this finding is unclear. The Board agrees with Administrator Metcalf and the CAO that BH is appropriately focused on improved client care and financial efficiency.

F7. An Umbrella Agency, consisting of Department of Social Services, Department of Behavioral Health Services, and other possible departments has been proposed to the BOS.

AGREE with finding.

F8. An "Interim Director of Behavioral Health was installed in December 2016 per Title 9, Article 8, Subsection 620. This was altered to "Acting Director and Behavioral Health Administrator in Late March 2017 which is intended to be a long-term position requiring annual re-approval of the "Interim" status by the State Department of Health.

AGREE with finding.

F9. The proposal to the BOS for consideration of an Umbrella Agency was made with a limited survey of several other California counties of similar size to the County who are currently using such an agency. It contained largely positive/supportive findings. [Example excluded]

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The County explored the feasibility of implementing a Health and Human Services Agency during FY 2015-2016. In spite of many positive reasons to consider such a structure, it was determined infeasible, under present conditions.

F10. No other gathering of supportive information was given to the BOS, specifically in cases where the Umbrella Agency concept was adopted then subsequently greatly altered or abandoned. [Example excluded]

DISAGREE with finding. Please refer to F9, above.

F11. Current plans to create such an umbrella agency are tabled due to financial limitations. There may be a two to three year delay before any substantive action is taken.

AGREE with finding.

F12. It was stated that there are to be “open hearings” on formation of such an agency prior to in going to the BOS for final consideration.

DISAGREE with finding.

There is no further movement toward implementation of the Health and Human Services Agency as it was determined infeasible. In the event there is movement in this direction, it will be decided by the Board in public.

Response to Recommendations 1-6:

R1. Use two teams of two people each to prepare medication dosages. (F2, F4)

AGREE, will be implemented during fiscal year 2017-18.

R2. Broaden and improve nursing recruitment methods. (F3, F5)

AGREE, will be implemented by December 2017.

R3. Perform a formal full BOS review of goals, accomplishments, progress yearly for the “Acting Director of Behavioral Health” position prior to the requests for re-certification from the State Health Department of the “Interim Director” approval. (F6, F8)

AGREE, already part of normative process.

R4. Undertake a comprehensive study of the pros and cons of creating an umbrella agency to present to the BOS. (F9, F10)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: As previously stated, this has been determined infeasible under present conditions. Also refer to responses F9, F10, and F12.

R5. Hold a series of open hearings within the next year before making any decisions on an umbrella agency. (F6, F12)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Refer to responses F9, F10, F12, and R4. The Board is satisfied by the efforts undertaken by staff to explore feasibility, and supports their determination not to move forward with a Health and Human Services umbrella agency at this time.

R6. Any decision to consolidate various agencies under an umbrella agency be given serious consideration of both positive financial/cost benefits as well as potential negative non-financial results. (F9, F10, F13) [Example excluded]

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Please refer to immediately prior response, R5, as well as F9, F10, F12, and R4.

“WHY DO WE PAY THOSE #*!@ RATES?”

Response to Findings 1-9:

F1. It is not possible for the Grand Jury to report on all water systems in Lake County because some of these are privately owned.

AGREE with finding.

F2. The Lake County Special Districts Department is doing a commendable job of managing the ten companies under their control.

AGREE with finding.

F3. Water rates in Lake County vary greatly between water districts and privately held companies.

AGREE with finding.

F4. Recent wildfires have had a major impact on water and sewer districts in the areas where the fires destroyed homes and water and sewer system infrastructure. These systems will have to be restored.

AGREE with finding.

F5. State and Federal grants and loans are helping with the financing of the restoration of water systems in the fire zones, but other financing is still under consideration and being applied for by Lake County. The writing of grants takes a special expertise to ensure that the grant is accepted, as of 2016 there is not a designated grant writer in Lake County.

AGREE with finding.

F6. The Cobb Mountain Water District (CMWD) is doing a commendable job restoring water systems in the Cobb area.

AGREE with finding.

F7. Consolidation of water systems generally saves the customers money and improves water quality.

AGREE with finding.

F8. Not all water systems in Lake County are under government control and their water can be from dubious sources such as drawing water from streams, creeks, and ponds without proper treatment.

This finding is outside of the scope of the Board of Supervisors.

F9. The pipeline to the Geysers Geothermal field is a very efficient way to dispose of and use waste water in Lake County.

AGREE with finding.

Response to Recommendations 1-5:

R1. Lake County should pursue every available resource to rebuild the damaged and destroyed water systems as quickly as possible. (F4, F5, F7)

AGREE, has been implemented.

See Administrator Coppinger's response for detail regarding ongoing efforts.

R2. The public needs to be informed about the factors that determine water rates in the different water systems so that they will not feel that these are arbitrary or unfair. (F2, F6)

AGREE, part of normative process.

R3. Lake County should streamline the rebuilding process for those affected by fire so the property tax base can be increased. (F4, F5)

AGREE with finding.

R4. Lake County should continue to consolidate water systems in order to provide better water quality and possibly lower rates to customers. (F7)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The Board appreciates the intent of this recommendation, and both agrees and consistently strives to promote the general interest of this recommendation, which is providing high quality water to residents of Lake County. Consolidation is not within the immediate authority of this Board.

R5. Lake County needs to have a grant writer knowledgeable in the process of applying for State and Federal grants. (F4, F5)

AGREE, part of normative process.

“LAKE COUNTY NOT FULLY PREPARED FOR ZIKA VIRUS”

Response to Findings 1-5:

F1. It is possible that the mosquitoes that transmit Zika virus will become established in the County in the future. When this happens, Zika virus could become a serious problem in Lake County.

AGREE with finding.

F2. [Lake County Vector Control, LCVC] is effectively fighting [West Nile Virus, WNV] in the County.

AGREE with finding.

F3. LCVC is effectively communicating with the public with regard to WNV.

AGREE with finding.

F4. LCVC public information about the Zika virus is insufficient.

DISAGREE with the finding.

The Board entrusts Lake County's Health Services Director, Denise Pomeroy, and her staff, to share Public Health information on the basis of actual level of threat, as appropriate.

Zika virus was topical during 2016-17, and a wealth of public information was available. The Board supports Health Services in not duplicating resources available through other channels. Additionally, the Board continues to encourage Health Services to help the public find appropriate and timely information in the event of a significant threat.

F5. Pesticides used in vector control can harm honeybees, beneficial insects and other wildlife unless care is taken to avoid collateral damage. Alternative methods are available including mosquito fish that are being used by LCVC.

NEUTRAL.

Explanation: LCVC is not within the scope of the Board.

Response to Recommendations 1-5:

R1. County and LCVC should draft a plan, within one year, to fight the Zika-infected mosquito. The plan should include measures to protect beneficial insects and wildlife. (F1, F5)

AGREE in principle.

LCVCD is the agency that is knowledgeable and responsible for vector control activities and development of a local plan to specifically fight mosquitos capable of transmitting Zika virus.

Lake County Health Services is responsible for human disease surveillance. It does not have expertise in vector control methods, including those designed to protect beneficial insects and wildlife.

R2. County and LCVC should develop an effective public education campaign to fight the Zika mosquito and the virus that involves all available media, including internet, newspaper, TV and radio within 18 months. (F1, F3, F4)

AGREE, will be implemented to the extent resources allow.

R3. LCVC should work closely with the County Public Health Department to fight Zika-infected mosquito and the virus. (F1, F3, F4)

AGREE, has been implemented.

R4. LCVC website should have more information on the Zika-infected mosquito and the virus. (F4)

AGREE, in principle.

The Board agrees with Health Services' suggestion that a public information campaign through multiple modalities is needed to address concerns that Lake County-relevant Zika information is more broadly available. This will be implemented, as resources allow.

The Board finds the degree of detail presently on the LCVC website is appropriate.

R5. LCVC should educate property owners about predators that prey on mosquitoes. For example, providing mosquito eating fish and encouraging homeowners to put up bat boxes. (F4, F5)

NEUTRAL.

Explanation: LCVC is not within the scope of the Board.

“HOW HIGH WILL THE WATERS RISE?”

Response to Findings 1-5:

F1. Cooperation between Lake and Yolo counties is essential to deal with the dredging of the Riffle and to control flooding in Lake County.

AGREE with finding.

F2. The public has many misconceptions about the release of water from Clear Lake to Yolo County.

NEUTRAL.

The point of this finding is not clear. As the Grand Jury report notes, release is regulated per Decree.

F3. Property owners have often been remiss in keeping debris out of the lake, including piers and old seawalls, etc.

AGREE with finding.

F4. The Rumsey scale has caused some problems for property owners because insurance companies use sea level measurements to assess property damage.

NEUTRAL.

F5. The environment and economic impact of dredging the Riffle have not been fully studied and evaluated.

AGREE with finding, in that further study could be undertaken.

Response to Recommendations 1-5:

R1. Lake and Yolo Counties continue to work together to solve flooding problems in Clear Lake. (F1, F2)

AGREE, has been implemented.

R2. Lake and Yolo Counties work together to excavate the Grigsby Riffle to legal limits within two years. (F1, F2)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: This is beyond the immediate authority of the Lake County Board of Supervisors, but the Board is appreciative of Yolo County's general partnership, and supportive of appropriately exploring any and all measures to ensure proper lake levels.

R3. The Department of Water Resources educate property owners before November 2017, about problems with debris that will block the dam. (F3)

AGREE, will be implemented by November 2017, per Water Resources Department Director Philip B. Moy.

R4. The County/Board of Supervisors consider using sea level measurements along with the Rumsey scale when measuring the level of the lake. (F4)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: A conversion table is available at the bottom of the webpage linked here: <http://www.co.lake.ca.us/government/directory/waterresources/clearlake.htm>

R5. Lake and Yolo Counties contract for a study of the environmental and economic impacts of dredging the Riffle. Report to be completed by June, 2018. (F5)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: See R2, above.

R6. The environmental and economic impact study investigate not only traditional, but also unconventional solutions to solve the flooding problem of Clear Lake. (F4, F5)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: The Board is generally supportive of using the best available approach to solve problems, whether it is traditional or unconventional. However, it is not entirely clear what this recommendation is proposing.

“HILL STREET BLUES”

The Sheriff's response is attached.

“JUVENILE HALL”

Response to Findings 1-3:

F1. Due to the urgency of maintaining a proper facility for the youths, the contract was not given a thorough review and scrutiny before it was implemented.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board agrees with Chief Probation Officer (CPO) Rob Howe that appropriate review and scrutiny were undertaken, and agrees that there are issues that will be worked out over time.

F2. Formal quarterly meetings/reports were not held/issued for the first year of the contract.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board finds that while a formal reporting procedure was not established at the outset, frequent meetings were held in the first year of the contract between The Lake County Probation Department and Mendocino County. Per CPO Howe, a reporting procedure is now in place.

F3. Coordination between the two county's probation departments and Lake County Behavioral Health was not occurring and needs to be defined in the contract.

NEUTRAL.

The Board supports CPO Howe's commitment to considering this Finding in discussion of the next contract.

Response to Recommendations 1 and 2:

R1. When the contract is re-negotiated, particular attention must be given to all the commitments and details. (F1, F3)

AGREE, will be implemented within 90 days.

R2. Insure continuation of quarterly meetings/reports in a timely manner. (F2)

AGREE, has been implemented.

“WHO CARES ABOUT ANIMALS?”

Response to Findings 7-14:

F7. The [Lake County Animal Care and Control, LCACC] veterinarian's services are in high demand.

AGREE with finding.

F8. Availability of spay and neuter services are inadequate in relation to public demands.

AGREE with finding

This is a community need, and not solely a function of Lake County government.

F9. LCACC veterinarian services to examine and treat sick animals are insufficient.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board finds that veterinary services are appropriate given the resources available, and concurs with Animal Care and Control Director William Davidson's sense that the County is not set up to be the sole low cost provider in this community.

F10. The demand for spay and neuter operations at the Hellbush facility is likely to increase in the immediate future as the number of stray animals grows every year.

AGREE with finding.

F11. The lower fees LCAC can offer by employing a part-time contract veterinarian vs. private veterinary services incentivize low-income pet owners.

NEUTRAL.

F12. In Clearlake, animal care services are unmet because there is no full-time veterinarian is available.

NEUTRAL.

The City of Clearlake has independent authority over its jurisdiction.

F13. Clearlake has a better public outreach program than LCACC. The outreach program consists of a website and brochures.

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: The Board finds that Lake County Animal Care and Control has an active presence on social media, and shares information via a recently redesigned website.

F14. Clearlake will be able to provide more and better services to the community in the new Oglin Canyon facility.

AGREE with finding.

Response to Recommendations 6-11:

R6. The County should consider adding a full-time veterinarian to the LCACC (F1-F5).

DISAGREE with finding.

Explanation: As Director Davidson suggests, the current contract vet is typically present at least 40 hours per week. The County lacks funding to increase staffing.

R7. Clearlake should consider hiring a full-time contract veterinarian, rather than getting veterinary services from local independent veterinarians on an as-needed basis. (F6)

NEUTRAL.

This is not a matter under the Board's jurisdiction.

R8. Alternatively, the County could collaborate with Clearlake to share a full-time veterinarian. (F1-F7)

NEUTRAL.

R9. The County should also consider training students as veterinary technicians to help with the veterinary services. (F2, F3, F4)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: This recommendation is not feasible, given the lack of available veterinary technician students.

R10. LCACC should improve their public outreach program. A program in the schools would be helpful in getting the word out about responsible pet ownership. (F7, F8)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

The Board finds that LCACC regularly visits area schools.

R11. Clearlake should stage a Grand Opening when the Ogulin Canyon Road facility opens as a way of letting the public know about their program and services offered. (F8)

NEUTRAL.

The Board has no direct authority to respond to this recommendation.

This concludes the Board of Supervisors' response to the 2016-2017 Civil Grand Jury Report.

Sincerely,

LAKE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Jeff Smith
Chair of the Board

Attachments

cc: 2016-2017 Civil Grand Jury Foreperson
2017-2018 Civil Grand Jury Foreperson