

December 31, 2001

The Honorable Robert O'Farrell
Presiding Judge, Superior Court
County of Monterey
240 Church Street
Salinas, CA 93901

Dear Judge O'Farrell:

As I write this I can't help but think back to September 11th of this year when our Country was so savagely struck by terrorists. It is in such times that local problems pale by comparison.

Nevertheless, our 2001 Grand Jury was charged with certain responsibilities, and we're pleased to submit this Final Report, the culmination of our deliberations.

A wise person once said "change starts when someone sees the next step." We believe our 19 citizens with different backgrounds, varying interests, and unique personalities have indeed seen the next step and are hopeful that change will result.

In our Final Report you'll note that we have addressed a variety of topics which impact the citizens of Monterey County. The subjects chosen were the result of citizen complaints in some instances, while in others it was simply a matter of looking at a specific area of government to determine if it was functioning as intended and/or whether improvements could be made.

During its term the Grand Jury made all the mandated visits (Prisons, Jail, and Probation Department), as well as a number of non-mandated site visits to widen its exposure to and influence in the County's workings. This year we elected to go into more detail than usual concerning the non-mandated site visits in order to give the citizens of the County a greater appreciation and understanding of the departments, organizations, and agencies operating on their behalf. Most, if not all, fall under the oversight responsibilities of the Grand Jury.

The Honorable Robert O'Farrell
December 31, 2001
Page Two

A major mandate of the Grand Jury is to follow up on the Findings and Recommendations made by the previous year's Grand Jury and assure that Responses are submitted in a timely and appropriate fashion as prescribed by law. While a number of Responses were submitted properly, unfortunately, too many were not and were either late or incomplete or both. This tends to weaken the value of the Grand Jury system and reflects unfavorably on the Respondents. It was apparent that confusion and lack of understanding were the main problems.

To overcome these problems the Grand Jury has developed a new, and we believe improved, format to be used by those who are required to respond to the Findings and Recommendations in our Final Report. Following this proposed format will not only make it easier for Respondents, but will facilitate the follow up required by next year's Grand Jury.

This Final Report would be incomplete without acknowledging our appreciation to you and Judge Terrance Duncan for your guidance, District Attorney Dean Flippo and County Counsel Adrienne Grover and their staff for their shared knowledge, Sherri Pedersen and her staff for their encouragement, and to Eileen Wright, Court Administrative Aide to the Grand Jury, who patiently gave us her wisdom and support throughout the year.

We would also like to acknowledge and thank the California Grand Jurors Association and the League of Women Voters for their training assistance as well as their ongoing efforts in educating the public on the Grand Jury system.

Finally, my thanks and deep appreciation to all of the members of the Grand Jury for their tireless efforts. It's been a privilege to be associated with each and every one of them.

Sincerely,

Roy D. Lorenz, Foreman
2001 Monterey County Grand Jury

RDL:elw

**2001 MONTEREY COUNTY GRAND JURY
FINAL REPORT**

Table of Contents

	Page Numbers
List of 2001 Grand Jury Members	i
Photograph of 2001 Grand Jury Members	ii
Grand Jury Mission and Response Requirements	iii
Foreman's Comments	xii
 Reports:	
1 Animal Services in Monterey County	1
2 County of Monterey Department of Social Services Foster Care Program	3
3 County of Monterey Workforce Hiring/Retention	5
4 Greenfield City Council Processes For Selecting Legal, Engineering, and General Plan Consultant Services	11
5 Greenfield Police Department	14
6 Inclusionary Housing in Monterey County	18
7 Monterey Bay Beaches	21
8 San Lucas Union School District	24
9 School Board Training	27
 Mandated Site Visits	 31
 Non-Mandated Site Visits	 37

2001 MONTEREY COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

OFFICERS

**Roy D. Lorenz, Foreman
Thomas J. Walker, Foreman Pro Tempore
Nancy C. Hagler, Secretary
Jeanne Groseclose, Secretary Pro Tempore**

MEMBERS

Khadag B. Bisht	Salinas
William Burgess, Jr.	Seaside
Barbara E. Diamond	Carmel
Janice Escobar	Salinas
Richard P. Giffin	Salinas
Jeanne Groseclose	Salinas
Nancy C. Hagler	Salinas
Gretchen I. Kendall	Seaside
Brenda R. Lambert-Mellinger	Seaside
Roy D. Lorenz	Pacific Grove
William W. Marshall	Salinas
Marilyn A. Maxner	Monterey
Richard J. Miner	Marina
Constance M. Nelson	Carmel
Werner Oppelt	Monterey
Margaret C. Pagnillo	Monterey
Linda Stidham	Salinas
William G. Tucker II	Salinas
Thomas J. Walker	King City

2001 MONTEREY COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

FRONT ROW: (left to right)

**Eileen L. Wright, Grand Jury Staff
Thomas J. Walker, Foreman Pro Tempore
The Honorable Robert O'Farrell, Presiding Judge
Roy D. Lorenz, Foreman
Sherri L. Pedersen, Court Administrator
Patricia B. Ryan, Deputy Court Administrator**

MIDDLE ROW:

**Nancy C. Hagler, Brenda R. Lambert-Mellinger,
Jeanne Groseclose, Linda Stidham, Janice Escobar,
Margaret C. Pagnillo, Richard P. Giffin, Marilyn A. Maxner**

BACK ROW:

**Khadag B. Bisht, Barbara E. Diamond, Constance M. Nelson
Werner Oppelt, William G. Tucker II, William W. Marshall,
Richard J. Miner, William Burgess, Jr., Gretchen I. Kendall**

CIVIL GRAND JURY MISSION AND RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

The primary mission of a Civil Grand Jury in the State of California is (1) to examine county and city governments as well as districts and other offices in order to ensure that the responsibilities of these entities are conducted lawfully and efficiently, and (2) to recommend measures for improving the functioning and accountability of these organizations which are intended to serve the public interest.

According to Section 888 of the California Penal Code: "Each grand jury . . . shall be charged and sworn to investigate or inquire into county matters of civil concern, such as the needs of county officers, including the abolition or creation of offices . . . or changes in the method or system of, performing the duties of the agencies subject to investigation pursuant to Section 914.1."

Section 925 states, "The grand jury shall investigate and report on the operations, accounts, and records of the officers, departments, or functions of the county including those operations, accounts, and records of any special legislative district or other district in the county created pursuant to state law for which the officers of the county are serving in their ex officio capacity as officers of the districts." Additionally, Section 919(b) prescribes that, "The grand jury shall inquire into the condition and management of the public prisons within the county," and Section 919(c) prescribes that, "The grand jury shall inquire into the willful or corrupt misconduct in office of public officers of every description within the county."

Empowered as part of the judicial branch of local government, the Civil Grand Jury operates under the aegis of the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Monterey. The Judges of the Superior Court nominate 30 citizens who have volunteered from throughout the County to be selected as officers of the Court in a public drawing of 19 Jurors and 11 Alternates held during a court proceeding convened on the first Monday of each January, unless the first Monday is a holiday. In this case, the drawing is held on Tuesday.

All who appear as witnesses or communicate in writing with the Jury are protected by strict rules of confidentiality, for which violators are subject to legal sanction. The minutes and records of Jury meetings are protected by law and cannot be subpoenaed or inspected by anyone.

Section 933(a) declares: "Each grand jury shall submit . . . a final report of its findings and recommendations that pertain to county government matters during the fiscal or calendar year." Every "elected county officer" and "governing body" to whom a Finding and/or Recommendation has been addressed must respond in writing to the Presiding Judge within 60 and 90 days, respectively.

Section 933(b) declares: "One copy of each final report, together with the responses thereto, found to be in compliance with this title shall be placed on file with the county clerk and remain on file in the office of the county clerk. The county clerk shall immediately forward a true copy of the report and the responses to the State Archivist who shall retain that report and all responses in perpetuity."

Acting according to its statutory authority, the Jury investigates activities (1) by responding to written complaints from County residents about alleged irregularities in local government, and (2) by initiating inquiries about "offenses and matters of civil concern" (Section 915). Jury initiatives may involve investigations commenced by previous juries (Section 924.4), including evaluation of governmental responses to Findings and Recommendations given in prior Final Reports.

Residents of Monterey County may request complaint forms or correspond to the Grand Jury by contacting the Office of the Monterey County Civil Grand Jury at 831-755-5020. Residents may also view the Final Report or obtain complaint forms through the Grand Jury's web site address at www.co.monterey.ca.us/court/.

Sections 933 and 933.05 of the California Penal Code (excerpts on following two pages) describe who must respond to Findings and Recommendations published in the Final Report of a Civil Grand Jury, when the response must be submitted, and the format for the content of the response. Penal Code requirements are mandatory; please read and follow them carefully.

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933(b), responses to the Final Report of the 2001 Monterey County Civil Grand Jury are due as follows:

ELECTED COUNTY OFFICERS: (60-Day Response Period)
Due on or before March 4, 2002.

GOVERNING BODIES OF PUBLIC AGENCIES: (90-Day Response Period)
Due on or before April 2, 2002.

ADDRESS FOR DELIVERY OF RESPONSES TO THE PRESIDING JUDGE:

Mailing Address

Hon. Robert O'Farrell
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Monterey County
P. O. Box 1819
Salinas, CA 93902

Street Address

Hon. Robert O'Farrell
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Monterey County
North Wing, Room 320, 240 Church Street
Salinas, CA 93901

PENAL CODE SECTION 933 (c)

“Comments and Reports on Grand Jury Recommendations.

No later than 90 days after the grand jury submits a final report on the operations of any public agency subject to its reviewing authority, the governing body of the public agency shall comment to the presiding judge of the superior court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the governing body, and every elected county officer or agency head for which the grand jury has responsibility pursuant to Section 914.1 shall comment within 60 days to the presiding judge of the superior court, with an information copy sent to the board of supervisors, on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of that county officer or agency head and any agency or agencies which that officer or agency head supervises or controls. In any city and county, the mayor shall also comment on the findings and recommendations. All of these comments and reports shall forthwith be submitted to the presiding judge of the superior court who impaneled the grand jury. A copy of all responses to grand jury reports shall be placed on file with the clerk of the public agency and the office of the county clerk, or the mayor when applicable, and shall remain on file in those offices. One copy shall be placed on file with the applicable grand jury final report by, and in the control of the currently impaneled grand jury, where it shall be maintained for a minimum of five years.”

PENAL CODE SECTION 933.05 (a) and (b)

“Response to Grand Jury Recommendations – Content Requirements; Personal Appearance by Responding Party; Grand Jury Report to Affected Agency.

(a) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:

(1) The respondent agrees with the finding.

(2) The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor.

(b) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

(1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.

(2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.

(3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

(4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.”

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RESPONDING TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On the following three pages are samples of the form letter and forms you should use to respond to the Findings and Recommendations:

1) *Letter returning Findings and Recommendations*

Note that this should be prepared on your letterhead. If you are responding on behalf of a board or council, note that you must include in the last paragraph the date on which your governing body approved the Responses to the Findings and Recommendations (as required by California Penal Code Section 933.05(a)(b)).

The letter should be signed by the Chair of your governing body or the elected official in charge of the department or agency.

2) *Response to Findings*

- a) Please put the Grand Jury's title of the Report on the first line.
- b) Please indicate the governing body or elected official responding on the second line.
- c) In the body of the Response:
 - i) In the first column, please write the number of the Finding to which you are responding.
 - ii) In the second column, please place a check mark in one of the two sub-columns, indicating whether you agree or disagree with that Finding. If you agree, your response to that Finding is complete, and you should proceed to the next, if there is more than one.
 - iii) If you disagree, please explain in the last column. You can write your comments by hand, type them, or prepare them on your computer and attach them. If the last is what you do, please indicate in the column "See attached comments."

3) *Response to Recommendations*

- a) Please put the Grand Jury's title of the Report on the first line.
- b) Please indicate the governing body or elected official responding on the second line.
- c) In the body of the Response:

- i) In the first column, please write the number of the Recommendation to which you're responding.
- ii) In the second column, please place a check mark in one of the four sub-columns, indicating whether the Recommendation has been implemented, will be implemented, requires further analysis, or will not be implemented.
- iii) In the last column, please (1) summarize what action you took if it has been implemented, (2) if it will be implemented, indicate by when, (3) if it requires further analysis, indicate when the analysis will be completed, or (4) explain why it will not be implemented. You can write your comments by hand, type them, or prepare them on your computer and attach them. If the last is what you do, please indicate in the column "See attached comments."

GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT TITLED _____

RESPONSE TO FINDINGS by _____

[as required by Section 933.05(a) California Penal Code]
(Agency)

Find -ing #	Check One §933.05(a) (1) (2)		Specify the portion of the Finding that is disputed and include an explanation of the reasons therefor.
From Grand Jury Final Report	The respondent agrees with the Findings	The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with Finding: see next column	<u>CONTINUE ON ATTACHED SHEETS AS NECESSARY</u>

GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT TITLED _____

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS by _____

[as required by Section 933.05(b) California Penal Code]
(Agency)

Rec. #	Check One §933.05(b)				Time frame, explanation, summary (attached), etc.
	(1) (4)	(2)	(3)		
From Grand Jury Final Report	Has been implemented, include	Will be implemented, include time frame	Requires further analysis, include time	Will not be implemented, include	<u>CONTINUE ON ATTACHED SHEETS AS NECESSARY</u>

AGENCY LETTERHEAD

Date

The Honorable Robert O'Farrell
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Monterey County
P. O. Box 1819
Salinas, CA 93902

Dear Judge O'Farrell:

Attached are [the responses of our governing body/my responses], as required by Sections 933 and 933.05 of the California Penal Code, to the **Findings** and **Recommendations** in the 2001 Monterey County Grand Jury Final Report dated January 2, 2002.

[The responses were approved by, our governing body, on, 2002.]

Sincerely,

Name and Title of Chair of governing body or elected official in charge of department or agency.

Attachments: Response to Findings
Response to Recommendations

Comments by Foreman Roy D. Lorenz
2001 Monterey County Grand Jury

I believe I can speak for all of our Grand Jury members when I say that this past year has been a tremendously rewarding experience. For most of us who didn't know a Special District from Inclusionary Housing when we started, this year has been an exciting and enlightening crash course in Democracy 101. Without exception we will all be better citizens as a result.

Part of our education was to visit many different County sites, which we have elaborated on in more detail in this Final Report. This was an impressive experience. Impressive, too, was the opportunity to meet individually with the members of the Board of Supervisors, the County Administrative Officer, the Mayors of all 12 incorporated cities, County department heads, and many other staff members. We were encouraged by the obvious dedication and forthrightness of those we met.

It should be noted that the democratic process requires not only dedicated leadership but an involved citizenry as well. Participation in volunteer organizations, school boards, commissions, advisory groups, and, yes, the Grand Jury, are all excellent examples of ways to get involved in one's community.

Monterey County and its cities and communities are not lacking in problems. Housing, water, education, health care, public safety, and transportation, to name a few, will present continuing challenges. The ability to address these problems appropriately will require not only the forward thinking of citizens and those in leadership positions, but a willingness on the part of both to compromise for the overall good.

We have seen a remarkable coming together at the national level of forces crossing political, cultural, ethnic, and religious lines as a result of the September 11 attack. If it can happen at that level, why not here?

ANIMAL SERVICES IN MONTEREY COUNTY

ISSUE

The 2001 Grand Jury looked into the quality of animal shelters in the County. There are several animal shelter systems in operation in Monterey County.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The Grand Jury visited three shelters: Monterey County Animal Shelter, Animal Services of the City of Salinas, and the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA). Documents on euthanized animals and the cost of caring for animals that will ultimately be euthanized were reviewed, and animal shelter managers were interviewed.

INVESTIGATION

The Grand Jury found the main problem at the shelters is overcrowding. This overcrowding is caused by people who abandon or surrender their pets. Also, these pets often have not been spayed or neutered, which results in many unwanted litters of kittens and puppies being born and abandoned. This leads to the euthanizing of thousands of unwanted animals. The Grand Jury interviewed shelter managers about two pieces of State legislation, passed in 1998 dealing with strays and mandatory spay and neuter programs. (SB 1785, Hayden, Stats. 1998 Chap. 752; AB 1856, Vincent, Stats. 1998 Chap. 747).

The shelters all have adoption programs, but there are far more animals available than there are places for them. Shelter managers reported that approximately 10,000 unwanted but often adoptable animals are euthanized yearly in Monterey County. One shelter manager explained that one female cat can potentially produce more than 20,000 descendants in her lifetime. The SPCA came under new leadership during 2001, and shelter managers have begun to collaborate more.

Shelter managers expressed a desire to do more to raise the awareness of the public about properly caring for animals and a pet owner's responsibility. They felt that their education and public awareness funds are too limited to allow them to adequately build a fully-informed and knowledgeable public.

FINDINGS

1. Financial costs vary from \$75 to \$100 to maintain an animal that will eventually be euthanized.

2. Since mid-2001, directors of animal shelters in Monterey County have held monthly collaborative meetings to discuss spay, neuter, and public awareness education program needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Board of Supervisors, along with the cities of Salinas and Marina, allocate funds sufficient for a spay and neuter program (per AB 1856 and SB 1785), with the goal that by 2010, no adoptable animal is being euthanized in Monterey County.

2. The Board of Supervisors allocate funds sufficient for an education program aimed at increasing the public's awareness of animal care and responsibility.

<i>Responses Required</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Board of Supervisors	1,2	1,2
City Council, City of Salinas	1,2	1,2
City Council, City of Marina	1,2	1,2

<i>Response Requested</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	1,2	1,2

Date Due: On or before April 2, 2002

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

COUNTY OF MONTEREY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
FOSTER CARE PROGRAM

ISSUE

The 2001 Grand Jury generated an inquiry into the Foster Care Program administered by the Monterey County Department of Social Services (DSS). It has been many years since the Grand Jury last investigated foster care in Monterey County.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The Grand Jury interviewed a DSS program manager and a DSS department administrator, spoke with children placed in foster care, identified additional foster care program approaches, and reviewed foster care documents. Literature from the Child Welfare League of America and the County Welfare Directors Association of California was also reviewed.

INVESTIGATION

When a child is judged by the Juvenile Court system to be in imminent danger, he or she will be placed in foster care. Attempts will be made to reunite the child with his or her biological family, but if this fails to provide a safe and nurturing environment, the child may be permanently placed in foster care. However, DSS lacks the funds and personnel to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the County-administered Foster Care Program.

Foster youth who have transitioned into adulthood face an increased risk of becoming homeless and experiencing other negative life experiences if there is inadequate or no transition follow up and support. An attempt has been made by the County to prepare these young adults (between the ages of 18 and 21) for life after foster care, but this effort, too, lacks adequate funds and staffing to ensure success.

DSS loses touch with these older foster youth when they transition into adulthood and exit the program. Following up with those who have exited the program would provide much needed program data to improve the quality of life

for children currently in foster care and help these older foster youth adjust to independent living.

FINDINGS

1. Department of Social Services lacks an adequately funded follow-up program to ensure the success of foster youth transitioning to adulthood (beyond the age of 21).

2. Department of Social Services lacks adequate staff and funds to gather data from which to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the County's Foster Care Program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Department of Social Services' Foster Care program collaborate with other foster care and adoption programs in the County, such as the Kinship Center, to identify after-emancipation support, information, programs and approaches, in order to improve the quality of support services for foster youth transitioning to adulthood.

2. The Board of Supervisors allocate funds sufficient to staff a comprehensive follow-up program for foster youth who have transitioned to adulthood. This program should include collection of data on the quality of publicly funded foster care programs in the County. This program should also include a system of case management, allowances, and housing support designed to help these young adults become independent and successful in the future.

<i>Responses Required</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Board of Supervisors	1,2	1,2
Kinship Center Board of Directors		1

Date Due: April 2, 2002

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

COUNTY OF MONTEREY WORKFORCE HIRING/RETENTION

ISSUE

Staffing problems within the County of Monterey workforce have been a much discussed topic in recent times. Because of its importance and potential impact, the 2001 Grand Jury elected to study the subject, to include hiring and retention of employees.

INFORMATION SOURCES

In approaching these issues, the Grand Jury reviewed numerous Monterey County Fiscal and Organizational Policy Division (Human Resources) reports and documents, the County Personnel Services Manual, several pertinent Bureau of National Affairs Bulletins, and articles from both the Californian and the Monterey County Herald. Discussions were also held with selected department heads, Human Resources staff members and management, County executive management, a member of the Board of Supervisors, and a union representative. A Board of Supervisors budget session was also attended.

INVESTIGATION

The County of Monterey is by far the largest employer in Monterey County with a workforce in excess of 4,400. There are 10 bargaining units represented by five unions; eight additional units are unrepresented.

Staffing problems arise as an inability to retain current employees and/or an inability to hire employees. Two measures that are valuable in evaluating hiring and retention are vacancy rates and turnover rates, the former measuring unfilled job openings and the latter the retention of current employees.

Overall turnover for Monterey County during the period 7/1/00 through 6/30/01 was 9.4%. Turnover for Santa Cruz County and San Benito County was 13.1% and 17.2%, respectively. The most recent information available for the northern California private sector is 15.9%.

Essentially, there are two factors that enter into a person's decision to leave a job: desirability of leaving and ease of leaving. An employee may desire

to leave because of such things as more money, better benefits, better working conditions, and less stress. The ease of leaving on the other hand may be determined by overall economic conditions, special skills that are easy to sell, or shortage of people with certain skills. When jobs are plentiful, employees find it easier to leave, and vice versa.

In reviewing the subject of turnover, the Grand Jury looked at several personnel practices and procedures. Exit interviews, while not currently required, are conducted by 17 of the 26 County departments, eight departments do not have a formal practice, and information for one department was not available.

Of the 26 departments, 16 do attendance tracking, nine do not, and one department's information was not available. Performance evaluations, based on information provided in interviews, are not being given consistently in all departments. This lack of consistency can contribute to potential employee relations problems.

If better service and reduced hiring time are to be achieved and maintained, it will be important to provide appropriate clerical and administrative support to recently (1999) decentralized Personnel Analysts in the various departments, to maximize their performance. In addition, the monthly meetings of the Personnel Analysts, which are now being held, will aid in cross training and mutual problem solving. Both of the above were indicated as important in interviews with staff.

There is strong indication that current policies and procedures are cumbersome and a hindrance to the hiring process. In addition, there is no current auditing procedure to monitor Personnel Services activities.

During the Grand Jury's investigation, several other things were noted. Employee benefits are a major cost item to the County but one not always clearly understood by employees. Greater understanding might well lead to greater appreciation of the value of the benefits.

In reviewing salary steps, it was noted that salary increases are not based on merit but rather on time in service and absence of negative performance. This can act as a disincentive to high performance employees.

An important factor in retention of employees is proper training and development. The Monterey County Leadership Institute, which was inaugurated in May of 1999, seeks to help employees to have successful and fulfilling lives, especially at work, by offering a wide array of training and development programs.

Turning to the hiring portion of the hiring/retention equation, the Grand Jury reviewed vacancy rates during the year 7/1/00 through 6/30/01. Monterey

County's vacancy rate as of 6/30/01 was 13%. The rates for the counties of Santa Cruz and San Benito were 9.6% and 11.8%, respectively. Information for the private sector was not available.

While overall vacancy rates do not appear out of line compared to the other counties surveyed, there does appear to be a retention and/or hiring problem in certain specific positions. The Grand Jury elected to focus on six potential problem positions.

		Vacancy Rate 6/30/00	Vacancy Rate 6/30/01	Actual Hires 7/1/00 -6/30/01	Total # of Applications Processed
Staff Nurse II	Allocated Positions	108.4	139.2	26	203
	Vacancies	5.2	21.7		
	Vacancy Rates	5%	16%		
Deputy Sheriff-Corrections	Allocated Positions	146	146	22	380
	Vacancies	10	14		
	Vacancy Rates	7%	10%		
Probation Officer II	Allocated Positions	55	70	24	283
	Vacancies	3	10		
	Vacancy Rates	5%	14%		
Communications Dispatcher I/II	Allocated Positions	46	45	27	333
	Vacancies	9	5		
	Vacancy Rates	20%	11%		
Senior Planner	Allocated Positions	3	9	0	6
	Vacancies	1	4		
	Vacancy Rates	33%	44%		
Public Health Nurse II	Allocated Positions	21.95	27	10	25
	Vacancies	4.4	7		
	Vacancy Rates	20%	26%		

In several positions there is a local, state, and/or national shortage that affects the ability to hire and/or retain employees. The Staff Nurse II and Public Health Nurse II classifications are examples of this, and when you couple this factor with the financial competitive disadvantage with the other local hospitals, a serious problem results. A substantial increase was given nurses at Natividad in 2001, which has narrowed the gap, but continuing attention to this will be required. Shortages in the nursing staff have serious financial impact on the hospital, and creative solutions must be developed.

The Deputy Sheriff-Corrections is another position that suffers from an overall shortage of qualified applicants. This is compounded by transfers out of the Corrections Bureau into the Operations Bureau. Recent changes in the pension plan formula should be an asset in the hiring process. Proper staffing at the county jail is vital.

Probation Officers have fallen behind financially compared to other Peace Officer positions over the years, making it more difficult to attract and retain staff.

Communications Dispatcher I and II applicants must pass a background investigation similar to Peace Officers, and many fail. These positions also have a fair amount of stress, and working conditions in the basement of the courthouse leave much to be desired. In 2003 the department will relocate to a new, updated facility, which should help.

Senior Planners are also in high demand and short supply throughout the state. When going outside Monterey County to look for applicants, the cost of living in this area is a major deterrent.

The ability to hire and retain employees is indeed a critical factor in the proper functioning of County government. The County and all of its employee units must work cooperatively to resolve differences if they are to maximize service to the community. Any attempt to solve hiring/retention problems must give appropriate consideration to the following:

- fair pay and benefits
- recognition for performance
- job stability
- working conditions
- opportunity for advancement
- adequate training
- interesting work
- fair and consistent supervision

FINDINGS

1. Although overall turnover and vacancy rates are not out of line, specific positions are a problem.

2. There is a lack of consistency among departments concerning performance evaluation, absence tracking, and exit interviews.

3. The current salary step program is not based on merit but rather on time in position and an absence of negative performance.

4. The cost of employee benefits is a major County expenditure which is not clearly understood by employees.

5. Current policies and procedures remain an obstacle in the hiring process.

6. Audits of Personnel Services activities can be a valuable monitoring tool as well as a training device.

7. The Monterey County Leadership Institute has potential for a wide range of programs designed to train and educate as well as build teamwork and morale.

8. Personnel Analysts working in the various departments, in some instances, do not have sufficient clerical and administrative support to accomplish all their job requirements.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Board of Supervisors direct that a plan with specific solutions to prioritize and address those high impact problem positions be developed and implemented.

2. The Board of Supervisors direct Human Resources to work toward standardizing the County policies, procedures, and practices.

3. The Board of Supervisors direct Human Resources to study the introduction of the merit concept in pay for the various employee units.

4. The Board of Supervisors direct Human Resources to develop and provide to each employee an annual personalized employee benefit report, which spells out the value of each benefit as well as total compensation value.

5. The Board of Supervisors direct Human Resources to streamline and/or eliminate policies and procedures which are obstacles in the hiring process.

6. The Board of Supervisors direct Human Resources to develop an audit procedure to monitor and assure compliance with standardized policies, procedures, and practices.

7. The Board of Supervisors continue strong budgetary support of the Monterey County Leadership Institute.

8. The Board of Supervisors authorize the addition of clerical support for Personnel Analysts, where necessary.

<i>Response Required</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Board of Supervisors	1-8	1-8

Date Due: On or before April 2, 2002

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

GREENFIELD CITY COUNCIL PROCESSES FOR SELECTING LEGAL, ENGINEERING, AND GENERAL PLAN CONSULTANT SERVICES

ISSUE

A citizen complaint was received by the 2001 Grand Jury regarding the termination and hiring of legal and engineering professionals for Greenfield. During the Grand Jury's investigation, the process of selecting a consultant to complete the Greenfield General Plan Update (GPU) also came under scrutiny.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The Grand Jury interviewed the complainant, members of the City Council, City staff, recipient of a contract awarded by Greenfield, and legal counsel. Pertinent documents reviewed include City Council Minutes and Agendas, the California Government Code, Greenfield's Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to prepare the GPU, responses to the GPU RFQ, and the District Attorney's (DA) investigation report. Several Monterey County General Law cities comparable in size to Greenfield were consulted as to their procedure for awarding contracts for professional services.

INVESTIGATION

Greenfield is a General Law city governed by a five member Council under the direction of the Mayor. The daily operations of the City are conducted by a combination of City employees and contract professionals who serve at will.

Selection of Engineering and Legal Professionals

On February 20, 2001, the City Council Agenda included items to consider authorization to circulate RFQs for City Engineer and City Attorney services. According to meeting minutes, motion was made and carried unanimously to remove these items from the agenda and place them on the next meeting agenda for closed session. During closed session on March 6, 2001, the Council voted to terminate the contracts of the City Attorney and City Engineer. Although there is no evidence that RFQs for legal and engineering professionals were publicized prior to the closed session vote, the professionals who were subsequently awarded City Attorney and City Engineer contracts were in attendance at the March 6 Council meeting. It is unclear why the engineering

firm representative was in attendance at the meeting. One Council member stated to the DA's investigator that the member had invited the attorney to attend the meeting; however, in testimony before the Grand Jury, that Council member no longer remembered this invitation.

The DA's Office investigated the matter and found no violation of open meeting laws (see the Ralph M. Brown Act, Govt. Code Sec. 54950 and following).

Surveyed cities indicated that when contract professionals are selected the standard procedure is to

- circulate RFQs;
- review submissions;
- select the most suitable applicant based on the city's needs.

One city responded that it contracts with a professional recruiter and reviews several candidates before making a selection.

Selection of General Plan Consultant

Greenfield's City Council voted on February 6, 2001, to approve the issuance of an RFQ in order to select a firm to update its General Plan. The State of California provides specific guidelines for city General Plans; however, a city's size and demographics must be considered when generating data for the General Plan. It is therefore desirable that a firm be selected with experience in similar communities.

Four planning firms responded to the RFQ, submitted proposals, and gave presentations to the City Council in an open session. The proposals were evaluated by City staff in consultation with staff of another city of comparable size in Monterey County. Of the four firms, one was recommended to the Council.

According to the City Council minutes, at three separate meetings, held on April 3, April 17, and May 1, votes were taken. At the April 3 meeting two motions were made and seconded to award the contract. Both motions failed for lack of a majority. At the April 17 meeting a decision was made to award the contract. At the May 1 meeting that decision was rescinded and the contract was awarded to a firm that had not been recommended by staff.

According to the minutes, a representative of the Greenfield Planning Commission expressed concern that the Commission had not been invited to participate in the process for selecting a GPU consultant. That representative also expressed concern at the decision reached.

FINDINGS

1. The process used to replace the City Attorney and the City Engineer is contrary to the standards used by similar cities in Monterey County and leaves the Council open to the perception of impropriety.

2. The process used to select a consultant to update the General Plan gives the appearance that the decision was not carefully considered. The Greenfield City Council rejected the staff recommendation. The Council also did not seek input from the Greenfield Planning Commission on the selection of the consultant for the GPU.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Greenfield City Council establish and adhere to a process by which contract professionals are selected.

2. When the Greenfield City Council circulates Requests for Qualifications, all requirements and selection criteria be clearly stated. If there are subsequent changes, all candidates should be informed.

3. The Greenfield City Council seek input from the Greenfield Planning Commission when considering updates to its General Plan and hiring a consultant.

<i>Response Required</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Greenfield City Council	1,2	1,2,3

Date Due: April 2, 2002

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

GREENFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT

ISSUE

In March 2001, an issue arose concerning the alleged harassment of school children by a group of migrant farm workers near the Greenfield Police Department (GPD). A review of this incident generated an inquiry into the GPD, its organization, and workings.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The Grand Jury reviewed several law enforcement reports and documents, as well as newspaper articles. The Tellus/Diganos 1999 Report, Trends Affecting Monterey County, was reviewed. In addition, eyewitnesses, law enforcement personnel, school personnel, and members of the community were interviewed. The GPD facility was visited.

INVESTIGATION

In 2001, the population of the City of Greenfield was 12,583. This represents a 5% increase over the last five years. Like much of South Monterey County, much of Greenfield's population works in the agricultural industry and is Spanish speaking.

In Greenfield there is a route that school children normally use to walk to and from the elementary, middle, and high schools. According to testimony provided to the Grand Jury, adult men frequently gather on this route at the time children are walking to and from school, making it difficult for the children to pass through without contact. According to the GPD, the Department is aware of this situation.

In reviewing this issue it became apparent that other concerns regarding the GPD existed.

One of the larger issues has been the inability to retain a police chief. The Department has had eight chiefs in a three-year period. Five of those were interim chiefs, serving while the city tried to hire a permanent one. A permanent chief was hired July of 2000, which has increased stability and helped morale. The new Chief maintains an "open door" policy, which provides an environment for improved communication. The number of sworn staff has been increased, and new procedures have been instituted. In addition, the Department now has

a computer system, which streamlines the paper work that all police departments rely on, such as crime reports, daily reports, and staff reports.

At the time the Grand Jury began its investigation in March 2001, the GPD had a budget for 15 officers, but was not fully staffed. The Department has since filled the vacancies and has received a budget increase for one additional officer. A force of 16 officers provides for two to three officers on duty per shift; however, with vacations, training, a full-time resource officer at a school, compensatory time, and court time, usually only 10 of the 16 officers are available. There are occasions when there is only one officer on the street at a given time.

Without sufficient officers a department is forced to put its resources into responding to calls rather than into preventive activities. Many situations can be prevented, or at least limited, if an officer has the ability to be proactive rather than reactive. Although the GPD had received verbal complaints regarding the situation with the children, the GPD indicated there were insufficient resources to routinely monitor the situation.

Even in a small department, communication between shifts is important to maintain continuous monitoring of situations. Currently, no formal briefings are being conducted. Instead, the Department relies on an available daily log or the officers informally communicating their information to the oncoming shift.

In a city where a large number of residents are Spanish speaking, three of 16 officers speak the language. According to Department personnel, this creates a lack of communication between the Department and the residents. Not only is it difficult for officers to get information from the residents, but it is difficult for the residents to present their needs to the Department.

The existing police facility contains two holding cells, neither of which can be used because they do not meet established codes. The lack of holding cells reduces the ability of the police to perform their necessary duties when officers are required to transport prisoners to a County facility.

The GPD has been working on educating school children regarding their safety. Since August 28, 2001, they have had a full time resource officer at the high school, who spends limited time at the middle school as well. In addition, they have had an Explorer Program since January of 2001, which enables students to participate in the safety of their community.

FINDINGS

1. The GPD lacked consistent leadership for three years, worked without a full complement of sworn staff, worked without computers, and operated in an inadequate facility. Improvements have been made; however, it is imperative that the City Council provide continuing support.

2. The frequent turnover of police chiefs in a relatively short period of time resulted in continuing problems within the Department.

3. Without a full staff, the Department was forced to be reactive rather than proactive, resulting in a potential decrease of service for the residents.

4. Currently, there are no formal briefings before shifts.

5. Three of the 16 officers speak Spanish, while a large segment of the population of Greenfield is Spanish speaking.

6. The current police facility is inadequate for the needs of the Greenfield Police Department.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Greenfield Police Department cultivate an environment of trust with the residents by promoting programs such as a ride-along program with an on-duty police officer.

2. The Greenfield Police Department maintain a visible presence when children are walking to and from school.

3. The Greenfield Police Department schedule formal briefings before each shift.

4. The Greenfield City Council budget funds to provide police officers with classes in conversational Spanish.

5. The Greenfield City Council budget funds to upgrade or replace the current police facility.

<i>Response Required</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Greenfield City Council	1,2,3,4,5,6	1,2,3,4,5

Date Due: On or before April 2, 2002

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

INCLUSIONARY HOUSING IN MONTEREY COUNTY

ISSUE

In response to citizen complaints, the 2001 Grand Jury undertook an investigation of the County's Inclusionary Housing Program (Program). The allegation was made that unfair practices and conduct were used in the administration of the Program, and that the community perception is that the Program has not accomplished its objectives.

INFORMATION SOURCES

In developing the background information, many interviews were conducted and documents reviewed. The sources of information for this investigation are listed at the end of this report.

INVESTIGATION

In 1980, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) initially approved the County Ordinance establishing the Program. The objective of the Ordinance is to create housing for low- and moderate-income households. At the Program's beginning, the Housing Authority administered it. In 1985, the Planning Department assumed administration of the Program, and in late 1999 the Program was transferred to the Redevelopment and Housing Division (RHD) of the County Administrative Office with continued assistance from the Housing Authority.

As part of the transfer process, RHD staff began an in-house review of Program documents and progress. The review process resulted in a determination that there needed to be a thorough evaluation of the Program and

possible revisions to the Ordinance. Problems were found with such things as record keeping, monitoring, title protection, applicant qualification standards, and in-lieu fees.

The Grand Jury is aware that the RHD staff is working on revisions to the Ordinance and to Program policies and procedures. In early 2001, the RHD secured the services of a consultant to evaluate the Program's performance during the past 20 years. Workshops, public forums, and public review and discussions have been held. It is important that the final report of the RHD to the BOS include recommendations that are realistic and reflective of the community's input. If the BOS approves these revisions, it will be critical that the RHD, the Housing Advisory Committee, the Monterey County Planning Commission, and the BOS closely monitor this program for compliance and results.

FINDINGS

1. The current Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, Program, and procedures are out-dated and no longer serve County residents as intended.

2. Monitoring of the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance has been insufficient.

3. The application and selection process of the Inclusionary Housing Program has been perceived by the public as being unfair and biased.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Board of Supervisors revise the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, Program, and procedures to better reflect the needs of County residents.

2. The Board of Supervisors annually review the Inclusionary Housing Program for updating and compliance.

3. The Redevelopment and Housing Division continue to maintain the records and administer the Program.

4. Applicants be chosen by a lottery conducted by the Redevelopment and Housing Division.

**Response Required
Recommendations**

Findings

Board of Supervisors	1,2,3	1,2,3,4
----------------------	-------	---------

Date Due: On or before April 2, 2002

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

Information Sources

1. Inclusionary Housing Ordinance for Monterey County (Monterey County Code Chapter 18.40.050)
2. Minutes of the Housing Advisory Committee
3. Monterey County Inclusionary Housing Program and the potential revision to Program
4. Monterey County Herald, articles of June 15 and July 22, 2001
5. Study of inclusionary housing by California Association of Realtors dated October 1991
6. Documents provided by Monterey County cities regarding their inclusionary housing ordinances, if any
7. County of Monterey 2001 Housing Report, dated January 26, 2001
8. Attendance at Monterey County Planning Commission meetings
9. Attendance at Board of Supervisors meetings
10. Tour of Single Family Home Inclusionary Housing Projects
 - a. Pasadera
 - b. Oak Tree Views (Monterra Ranch)
 - c. Las Palmas Ranch

11. Interviews with complainants
12. Interviews with County Staff
13. Interview with a developer
14. Interview with Consultant to Monterey County
15. Interview with former Grand Jury members
16. Interview with Housing Advisory Committee
17. Interview with Housing Authority of Monterey County

MONTEREY BAY BEACHES

ISSUE

The 2001 Grand Jury received a complaint about sewage spills at local beaches and the quality of Monterey Bay ocean water. The Grand Jury focused on sewage spills and viral and bacterial contamination, but did not consider other sources of pollution.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The Grand Jury interviewed the complainant, met with the staff of the Environmental Health Division of the Monterey County Health Department (EHD), toured a waste water management facility, and reviewed various documents and statistics. The document review included the Regional Water Quality Control Board's National Pollution Elimination System Phase II Non-Point Source pollution control program, the Health Department's ocean water bacterial testing guidelines, and statistics on beach closures and warning advisories. Seasonal ocean surface current patterns affecting Monterey Bay were examined.

INVESTIGATION

Ocean beaches are routinely tested for bacteria levels by the EHD. Beaches adjacent to storm drains and with a large number of visitors (more than 50,000 annually) are tested weekly from April 1 to October 31 of each year. From November through March these designated beaches are tested monthly. According to the EHD, all other beaches are tested monthly. Testing occurs to protect the health of people who are in contact with these recreational waters. The water, of course, must be safe and free from viral and bacterial contamination. Diseases that can be acquired in polluted ocean waters include hepatitis-A, gastrointestinal diseases, E. Coli-157 (fecal coliform), and dysentery. Testing is done for total coliform, fecal coliform, and enterococcus bacteria.

The sources of bacterial contamination of ocean beaches include sewage spills, storm drains, run-off, animal waste, birds, and bacteria from outfalls and run-off that ocean currents bring to shore. The United States Environmental Protection Agency has mandated that by March 2003 cities must reduce water run-off with pollutants into storm drains that flow to the ocean. The Board of

Supervisors (BOS) has allocated approximately \$200,000 over the next 18 months. These funds will be used to create a new County Storm Water Management Utility. The BOS will commit an additional \$120,000 per year for two years to develop a companion storm water management program.

FINDINGS

1. In 2000 there were four Monterey County beaches closed due to sewage spills and 25 warning advisories of high bacterial content at local beaches. There were two additional sewage spills which did not result in the closure of the affected beaches.

2. Through September 2001 there had been one Monterey County beach closure due to a sewage spill and 11 warning advisories of high bacterial content at local beaches. There were three additional sewage spills in 2001 which did not result in closure of the affected beaches.

3. There is inadequate storm drain pipe maintenance in Monterey Peninsula cities.

4. Only one public information forum on how to keep beaches and coastal waters healthy was conducted in Monterey County during 2001. It was held in Monterey on February 28, 2001.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Board of Supervisors direct the Environmental Health Division of the Monterey County Health Department to share its expertise with Monterey Peninsula cities, working with the cities to determine what support they require to develop a community education program. The community education program that each Monterey Peninsula city develops should include, but not be limited to:

- a. Sources of run-off pollution into Bay waters;
- b. Monterey Bay bacterial pollution;
- c. Potential illnesses from polluted ocean water;
- d. Methods of prevention of pollution of Monterey Bay waters.

<i>Responses Required</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Board of Supervisors	1,2,3,4	1
Carmel-by-the-Sea City Council	3,4	1
Del Rey Oaks City Council	3,4	1
Marina City Council	3,4	1
Monterey City Council	3,4	1
Pacific Grove City Council	3,4	1
Sand City City Council	3,4	1
Seaside City Council	3,4	1

Date Due: On or before April 2, 2002

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

SAN LUCAS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

ISSUE

The San Lucas Union School District (District) was brought to the attention of the 2001 Grand Jury by a citizen complaint concerning the lack of community involvement in the school and the relationship among the Superintendent/Principal, the School Board, the faculty, and the staff.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The Grand Jury received and reviewed numerous documents from the District, including School Board meeting minutes and budgets. The Ralph M. Brown Act, the California Education Code, and the Tellus/Diganos 1999 report, Trends Affecting Monterey County (Tellus Report), were also reviewed. The Administrative staff, School Board members, teachers, and Classified staff of the District, and the staff at the Monterey County Office of Education, were interviewed. Several school board meetings were attended.

INVESTIGATION

The San Lucas Union School District is located 70 miles south of Salinas and is composed of approximately 120 students in a kindergarten through eighth grade program, including a Special Education class. The community of San Lucas has a population of fewer than 500. There is an elected school board which supervises a part-time Superintendent, who also functions as school Principal. According to the Tellus Report, two-thirds of the students attending school in the District are considered to be Limited English Proficient (LEP). LEP is a state mandated program that requires school districts to provide bilingual assistance to limited English speaking children. According to the Tellus Report, the LEP students are Spanish speakers.

According to administrative staff, school board members, and teachers, the school has difficulty filling positions on its committees and councils, and school board candidates usually run unopposed. According to these same sources, school board training has been minimal. The members have received training in the Brown Act, but several of these sources indicated a need for training in other areas. Training can be obtained through the Monterey County

Office of Education, the Monterey County Leadership Institute, and the California School Board Association, among others.

FINDINGS

1. Community involvement in the governance of the San Lucas Union School District has been limited.
2. Utilization of available school board training has also been limited.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that the San Lucas Union School District Board:

1. Develop and implement an outreach program to educate parents and community members about their roles in the governance of the District.
2. Offer student incentives and recognition for community involvement.
3. Establish a volunteer coordinator role to be assumed and developed by a School Board member.
4. Offer appropriate recognition for community involvement on boards, councils, and committees.
5. Provide Spanish/English interpreters for all School Board meetings and translate Board agendas and meeting minutes into Spanish.
6. Provide a budget for School Board training. This should cover at a minimum:
 - a. Parliamentary procedure
 - b. Ralph M. Brown Act
 - c. Budget management
 - d. Team building
 - e. Cooperative boardsmanship
 - f. California Education Code and new legislation
7. Work with the Monterey County Office of Education and/or the Monterey County Leadership Institute to develop School Board training.
8. Attend as many California School Board Association workshops as determined necessary.

Responses Required	Findings	Recommendations
San Lucas Union School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8
Monterey County Superintendent of Schools		7
Board of Supervisors		7

Date Due for:

San Lucas Union School District Board: **April 2, 2002**

Monterey County Superintendent of Schools: **March 4, 2002**

Board of Supervisors: **April 2, 2002**

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

SCHOOL BOARD TRAINING

ISSUE

The 2001 Grand Jury elected to initiate an investigation into public school board training.

INFORMATION SOURCES

Through a survey, the Grand Jury asked the 24 County elementary and secondary school district boards about training for school board members. The survey questions are attached at the end of this report. Interviews with staff at the Monterey County Office of Education (MCOE) were held. The Grand Jury attended several school board meetings throughout the county. The Grand Jury interviewed a member of the Board of Supervisors, school board members, teachers, and classified staff.

INVESTIGATION

The 24 school districts in the County are all governed by five or seven member elected boards. The school districts range in size from 31 students to almost 13,000 students. Of the 21 school districts which responded to the survey, seven do not budget for school board training. Of those which do budget for training, the annual amounts range from \$300 to \$10,000. Three of the responding districts have had no training in the last two years.

Some school board training is available through MCOE, often at no cost. The California School Board Association provides training for a fee. Other sources of training are available.

Each school board supervises its superintendent and is fiscally responsible for its budget. Budgets range from less than \$1 million to over \$100 million. Because board members come from various backgrounds and levels of expertise, and because boards are responsible for managing millions of dollars, the need for training is apparent.

FINDINGS

1. Not all school boards in Monterey County budget for or take advantage of available school board training.
2. School boards have ultimate responsibility for school district resources and personnel, including the superintendent.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that the 24 elementary and secondary school district boards in Monterey County:

1. Provide a budget for school board training.
2. Provide access to training, at a minimum, in the following areas:
 - a. Parliamentary procedure
 - b. Ralph M. Brown Act
 - c. Budget management
 - d. Team building
 - e. Cooperative boardsmanship
 - f. California Education Code and new legislation
3. Work with Monterey County Office of Education to develop school board training.
4. Attend as many California School Board Association workshops as determined necessary.

Responses Required	Findings	Recommendations
<i>Alisal Union School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>Bradley Union School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>Carmel Unified School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>Chualar Union School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>Gonzales Unified School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>Graves School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>Greenfield Union School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>King City Joint Union High School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>King City Union School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>Lagunita School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>Mission Union School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4
<i>Monterey Peninsula Unified School District Board</i>	1,2	1,2,3,4

North Monterey County Unified School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
Pacific Grove Unified School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4

Responses Required (continued)
Recommendations

Findings

Pacific Unified School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
Salinas City Elementary School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
Salinas Union High School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
San Antonio Unified School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
San Ardo Union School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
San Lucas Union School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
Santa Rita Union School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
Soledad Unified School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
Spreckels Union School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4
Washington Union School District Board	1,2	1,2,3,4

Date Due: April 2, 2002

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS
WITHIN MONTEREY COUNTY**

SCHOOL DISTRICT NAME: _____

1. Has your School Board received any formal training in the last two years?

Yes____ No____ If yes, please answer # 2 below.

2. Please list the training indicating whether it was an individual or group training, the subject, where the training took place, who did the training, and the approximate cost.

<u>Individual/ Group</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Where</u>	<u>When</u>	<u>By Whom</u>	<u>Approx.</u>	<u>Cost</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(If additional space needed, please attach separate page.)

3. Are there additional training areas or subjects you would like to see your Board receive? If so, please list.

4. Do you feel it is important for Board Members, particularly new Board Members, to receive specialized training? If so, list in order of importance the three or four most important areas:

5. Is budget provided for training of Board Members?

Yes____ No____ If yes, how much is budgeted for 2001? _____

August 16, 2001

Mr. Jim Tunney
President, Board of Trustees
Monterey Peninsula College
980 Fremont Street
Monterey, CA 93940

Dear Mr. Tunney:

Sorry for any misunderstanding from the Grand Jury regarding the term "training." We were addressing formal training your Board has had regarding such things as:

Brown Act
Budget Understanding
Boardmanship
Responsibility of Board members vs. President, etc.

Enclosed please find another copy of the questionnaire. Please return the form by August 30, 2001.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Margaret C. Pagnillo, Chair
Education Committee

Roy D. Lorenz, Foreman
2001 Monterey County Grand Jury

MCP:RDL:elw

MANDATED SITE VISITS

Penal Code Section 919(b) mandates that each year's Grand Jury inquire into the condition and management of the public prisons within the County.

The 2001 Grand Jury visited the public prisons listed below, and reports are included in this section.

Correctional Training Facility, Soledad

Salinas Valley State Prison, Soledad

County Jail, Salinas

Probation Department, Juvenile Hall, Salinas

Site Visit - Correctional Training Facility

In accordance with Penal Code Section 919b, the 2001 Grand Jury visited the Correctional Training Facility (CTF) north of Soledad on March 29, 2001.

The site, which opened in 1946, covers 680 acres and houses over 7100 inmates in a facility originally designed for 2700 inmates.

The mission of the CTF is to provide housing and services for minimum and medium custody inmates. The primary focus is to house inmates in a safe and secure manner and to ensure public safety. This is accomplished through a staff of 1445 employees: 907 custody employees and 538 support staff. The annual operating budget totals \$108,000,000.

During its approximate six-hour visit the Grand Jury members toured all three of the housing facilities, the yard areas, laundry, cafeteria, kitchen, and medical facility, as well as the vocational training operations and academic classrooms.

Overall, the Grand Jury was impressed with the professionalism exhibited by staff and with the general appearance of the facility. The staff is obviously working under extremely overcrowded conditions but appears to be doing a good job under trying circumstances.

At the time of the visit there were 80 unfilled budgeted Correctional Officer positions. A major problem in filling these positions is a recurring theme, the extremely high cost of housing.

Another problem is drugs which find their way into the facility, often through the visitor's program. A "drug dog" was in the process of being trained at the time of the visit, which should help the situation to some extent.

Prison gangs remain a major problem. The potential for a flare up is always present, particularly with the overcrowded condition. This puts a premium on the need for well trained professional personnel with appropriate resources.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Site Visit – Salinas Valley State Prison

Salinas Valley State Prison (SVSP) was visited by the Grand Jury on May 29, 2001. The prison, located east of the Correctional Training Facility, opened in May of 1996. It was designed to house 2024 prisoners but currently houses 4100 prisoners. To help ease overcrowding, inmates are housed two in a cell where possible and a gym has been converted to a 120-bed dorm-style housing unit. The facility has an annual budget of \$96,000,000.

The primary mission of SVSP is to provide long-term housing and services for minimum and maximum custody inmates. It is classified as a Level IV institution with all but 300 of its 4100 prisoners classified at that level, the most violent. It should be noted that SVSP consistently ranks among the highest in total incidents in the California Department of Corrections system, which currently numbers 33 prisons.

During its six-hour visit the Grand Jury members toured the A and D housing facilities along with the visitation room, yard, classrooms, vocational shops, kitchen, chapel, and the medical and dental health facility. Of note is the fact that approximately 20% of the inmate population is involved in the Mental Health Program.

Nothing unusual was noted during the tour, which included several discussions with inmates. Indeed, given the type of prisoners, the severe overcrowding, and acute problems filling budgeted positions, it can be said that a good job is being done under quite trying circumstances.

Among the problems heard from staff during the tour was the high cost of living, particularly housing, which directly impacts the ability to hire staff. At the time of the visit there were 130 unfilled peace officer positions (out of 732 budgeted), 50 unfilled noncustodial services staff (out of 281 budgeted), and 30 unfilled Health Care Services positions (out of 107 budgeted).

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Site Visit – County Jail

One of the basic duties of the Sheriff is to oversee the County Jail. As such, he is responsible to maintain the County Jail, the Adult Rehabilitation Facility, and auxiliary services which require the accepting of any person arrested over the age of 18 and holding that person in pretrial capacity until the case is properly disposed of in the court. It is also the Sheriff's duty to maintain custody of inmates who have been sentenced as a result of a conviction and to operate the Work Alternative Program.

The full Grand Jury made a scheduled visit to the County Jail on June 7, 2001. In addition, two unannounced visits were made by a subcommittee on August 8, 2001, from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., and August 16, 2001, from 10:00 p.m. to midnight. During all three of the visits, special attention was paid to the K-pod where an earlier, widely reported incident had occurred which involved the playing of an inflammatory tape recording.

Opened in 1977 with a capacity of 819 prisoners, the jail averaged 959 inmates in 2000. There are 129 employees assigned to the Jail Division, which handles the intake and release of all inmates along with the housing of both males and females. Total 2000-01 budget for the Sheriff's Correctional Division, including the County Jail, was \$19,807,853, less revenue (grants, etc.) of \$10,378,641, for a cost to the County of \$9,429,212.

During its three visits the Grand Jury did not notice any unusual situations or major items requiring attention given the overcrowded conditions. Indeed, the members were impressed with the professionalism of the staff and the willingness to discuss all matters of interest.

Overcrowding of potentially dangerous inmates, competing gangs, and racial tensions, coupled with less than a full compliment of officers, make operating the jail difficult. Periodic reports of fights and injuries are unfortunately a by-product of these conditions.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Site Visit - Probation Department

The County Probation Department is responsible for the operation of all adult and juvenile probation services, including Juvenile Hall. Probation protects the public's interest by holding offenders accountable for compliance with Court orders and assisting probationers in making a positive change in their lives.

On May 31, 2001, the Grand Jury toured the Juvenile Hall, the Youth Complex at the former Natividad Hospital, the Youth Center, and the Walker Building. On September 12, 2001, a tour was made of the Rancho Natividad site which, when completed, will replace the current Youth Complex with considerably larger capabilities.

The Juvenile Hall facility houses children between the ages of eight and 18 referred by law enforcement agencies. The primary purpose is to provide temporary, secure custody of delinquent juveniles. The present capacity is 102 minors.

The Youth Center residential facility, opened in December 1997, provides treatment for substance abuse and mental health disorders to adolescent boys and girls from ages 13 to 18.

The Youth Complex, currently located at the old Natividad Hospital, provides a variety of services including education, community resources, employment preparation, and job placement. At present the Program services approximately 20 youths a day. When relocated to Rancho Natividad it will be able to service 50 youths a day. Participants are between 14 and 18.

Adult Probation Services is located in the Walker Building, not far from the Courthouse. Following a conviction, Courts refer cases to the Probation Department to conduct investigations and to submit comprehensive written reports with recommendations for sentencing. Eligibility and suitability for probation are addressed as well as specific conditions of probation.

There are 93 budgeted employees at the Juvenile Hall and 146 in the balance of the Probation Department activities. Total 2000-01 budget for the Probation Department including the Juvenile Hall was \$15,114,669, less revenues (grants, etc.) of \$9,686,940, for a cost to the County of \$5,427,729.

On July 1, 2001, the Probation Department assumed responsibility for reports to the Courts and the supervision component of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (Proposition 36) implementation. Appropriate budget and staffing adjustments have been made in the 2001-02 budget.

During its two tours, the Grand Jury found the Juvenile Hall and other areas to be clean and well maintained. The staff appeared to be professional in manner and absorbed in their attention to duty.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

NON-MANDATED SITE VISITS

The 2001 Grand Jury visited the following 17 facilities in Monterey County in order to broaden its knowledge and understanding of the County's workings. A brief synopsis of each visit is included in this section in order to provide a reference for interested residents.

Animal Services, City of Salinas

Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula

Emergency Medical Services Agency

Environmental Health Division of the Monterey County
Health Department

George L. Mee Memorial Hospital

Monterey County Animal Shelter

Monterey County Election Department

Monterey County Emergency Communications (911)

Monterey County Leadership Institute

Monterey Peninsula Airport District

Monterey Regional Waste Management District

Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency

Nacimiento Dam and San Antonio Dam

Natividad Medical Center

Salinas Valley Memorial Healthcare Systems

Seaside Family Health Center of the Monterey County
Health Department

Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

ANIMAL SERVICES IN MONTEREY COUNTY

ISSUE

The 2001 Grand Jury looked into the quality of animal shelters in the County. There are several animal shelter systems in operation in Monterey County.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The Grand Jury visited three shelters: Monterey County Animal Shelter, Animal Services of the City of Salinas, and the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA). Documents on euthanized animals and the cost of caring for animals that will ultimately be euthanized were reviewed, and animal shelter managers were interviewed.

INVESTIGATION

The Grand Jury found the main problem at the shelters is overcrowding. This overcrowding is caused by people who abandon or surrender their pets. Also, these pets often have not been spayed or neutered, which results in many unwanted litters of kittens and puppies being born and abandoned. This leads to the euthanizing of thousands of unwanted animals. The Grand Jury interviewed shelter managers about two pieces of State legislation, passed in 1998 dealing with strays and mandatory spay and neuter programs. (SB 1785, Hayden, Stats. 1998 Chap. 752; AB 1856, Vincent, Stats. 1998 Chap. 747).

The shelters all have adoption programs, but there are far more animals available than there are places for them. Shelter managers reported that approximately 10,000 unwanted but often adoptable animals are euthanized yearly in Monterey County. One shelter manager explained that one female cat can potentially produce more than 20,000 descendants in her lifetime. The SPCA came under new leadership during 2001, and shelter managers have begun to collaborate more.

Shelter managers expressed a desire to do more to raise the awareness of the public about properly caring for animals and a pet owner's responsibility. They felt that their education and public awareness funds are too limited to allow them to adequately build a fully-informed and knowledgeable public.

FINDINGS

1. Financial costs vary from \$75 to \$100 to maintain an animal that will eventually be euthanized.

2. Since mid-2001, directors of animal shelters in Monterey County have held monthly collaborative meetings to discuss spay, neuter, and public awareness education program needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Grand Jury recommends that:

1. The Board of Supervisors, along with the cities of Salinas and Marina, allocate funds sufficient for a spay and neuter program (per AB 1856 and SB 1785), with the goal that by 2010, no adoptable animal is being euthanized in Monterey County.

2. The Board of Supervisors allocate funds sufficient for an education program aimed at increasing the public's awareness of animal care and responsibility.

<i>Responses Required</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Board of Supervisors	1,2	1,2
City Council, City of Salinas	1,2	1,2
City Council, City of Marina	1,2	1,2

<i>Response Requested</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	1,2	1,2

Date Due: On or before April 2, 2002

Responses to the Findings and Recommendations shall be in the format as set forth on pages v and vi of this Report. Responses shall be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court as noted on page iv of this Report.

Name of Facility:

Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula
23625 W. R. Holman Highway, Monterey
(831) 624-5311

Date of Tour: June 4, 2001

Mission Statement:

Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula (CHOMP) is dedicated to identifying and meeting the changing health care needs of the people of the Monterey Peninsula and surrounding communities.

Brief History:

CHOMP is a private, not-for-profit health care system. It was started in 1927 as a clinic and was converted to a Community Hospital in 1934. CHOMP opened at its present site on Holman Highway in 1962. The former Eskaton Hospital in downtown Monterey became part of CHOMP in 1981, and it is now known as the Hartnell Professional Center. CHOMP added a Cancer Diagnostic and Treatment Center last year and plans to add a Heart Center. A Nursing School was set up in 1983, with CHOMP and Monterey Peninsula College sharing the cost of instructors. It graduates about 40 to 44 nurses annually.

Budget:

The annual budget for CHOMP is approximately \$189,000,000.

Staffing:

CHOMP employs more than 1,800 people.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Emergency Medical Services Agency
19065 Portola Drive, Suite #1, Salinas
(831) 755-5013

Date of Tour: February 1, 2001

Mission Statement:

The role of the Emergency Medical Services Agency (EMS) is to plan, coordinate, and evaluate the Countywide EMS system. This includes maintaining Countywide paramedic services, contracting for ambulance services, monitoring EMS training programs, planning for disaster medical response, and coordinating public information and education.

Brief History:

In 1980, the California Legislature adopted the "Emergency Medical Services System and the Prehospital Emergency Medical Care Personnel Act." That Act authorized counties to develop EMS programs by designating a "local EMS agency" to plan, implement, and evaluate the local EMS system. In 1981, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors designated the EMS Division of the County Health Department as the local EMS agency for Monterey County. The Director of Health serves as the EMS Director. A board-certified emergency physician serves as the EMS Medical Director.

On March 7, 2000, the voters approved Ballot Measure "A" to continue funding the Monterey County EMS system, replacing the previous benefit assessment on real property with a special tax of the same amount.

Budget:

The annual budget for the EMS is approximately \$2,500,000.

Staffing:

The EMS has 10 employees.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Environmental Health Division
Monterey County Department of Health
1270 Natividad Road, Salinas
(831) 755-4505

Date of Tour: April 19, 2001

Mission Statement:

The mission of the Environmental Health Division (EHD) of the Monterey County Department of Health is to protect, promote, and improve the health and well-being of the people and communities of Monterey County.

Brief History:

The EHD is responsible for the assessment and control of toxins, solid waste, drinking water quality, waste water/sewage treatment, environmental noise control, and a variety of other consumer protection concerns. Falling under the consumer protection purview are food sanitation, beach and recreation water quality, general sanitation, vector control, and housing and labor camps. Building permit review and violations also fall under the EHD.

Budget:

The annual budget is approximately \$6,000,000, with revenues of approximately \$3,300,000, for an annual estimated cost to the County of approximately \$2,700,000.

Staffing:

The Environmental Health Division is budgeted for 72 positions.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

George L. Mee Memorial Hospital
300 Canal Street, King City
(831) 385-6000

Date of Tour: April 9, 2001

Mission Statement:

Mee Memorial Hospital (Mee) is committed to community wellness and access to comprehensive healthcare in a professional, responsible, caring environment.

Brief History:

The first hospital in south Monterey County was a 22-bed, single story facility built in 1941 in King City by Dr. L. M. Andrus and was known as Southern Monterey County Memorial Hospital. In 1962, George L. Mee's son donated \$150,000 for a new hospital facility. The new Hospital was built in 1962 and is now the core of the 52,400 square-foot facility out of which the hospital operates today. It is the only hospital in south Monterey County.

Budget:

The annual budget for Mee is approximately \$51,000,000.

Staffing:

Mee employs approximately 260 people.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Monterey County Animal Shelter
2840 Fifth Avenue, Marina (former Fort Ord)
(831) 384-1396

Date of Tour: May 17, 2001

Mission Statement:

The mission of the Monterey County Animal Shelter (Shelter) is to ensure the health and safety of the public through rabies control via vaccination and licensing, to safely return stray domestic animals to their homes, and to shelter, protect, and care for unclaimed domestic animals.

Brief History:

This facility operates under the Monterey County Department of Health. The Shelter opened in July of 1999, in response to the SPCA's decision not to house stray animals. Ground breaking for the new location at 160 Hitchcock Road in Salinas was held in November 2001. The Shelter is open to the public Monday through Saturday, 12 noon to 5:30 p.m.

Budget:

The annual budget is approximately \$1,400,000, with revenues of approximately \$400,000, for an annual estimated cost to the County of approximately \$1,000,000.

Staffing:

The Program Manager oversees a staff of seven full-time and two part-time employees. Volunteers also help at the Shelter.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Monterey County Election Department
1370-B South Main Street, Salinas
(831) 647-7621

Date of Tour: February 8, 2001

Mission Statement:

The Election Department is responsible for conducting Federal, State, County and all other local elections.

Brief History:

The Registrar of Voters was part of the County Clerk's office until 1976. In that year the California Legislature removed election responsibilities from the County Clerk, and a separate Monterey County Election Department was created.

Budget:

The annual budget is approximately \$2,370,000, with revenues of approximately \$430,000, for an annual cost to the County of approximately \$1,940,000.

Staffing:

There are seven full-time employees and 30-40 seasonal employees.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Monterey County Emergency Communications (911)
Salinas and Monterey Courthouses

Date of Tour: June 18, 2001

Mission Statement:

The Monterey County Department of Emergency Communications (MCDEC) provides for the operation and administration of a consolidated emergency communications system serving the County of Monterey.

Brief History:

MCDEC has two centers for 911, one located in the basement in the Salinas Courthouse and the other located at the Monterey Courthouse. MCDEC is planning a joint move of the two centers to a new consolidated Communication Center to be located at 1322 Natividad Road, Salinas, in December 2003.

Budget:

The annual budget is approximately \$5,000,000, with revenues of approximately \$3,500,000, for an annual estimated cost to the County of approximately \$1,500,000.

Staffing:

MCDEC has a staff of 88 employees.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Monterey County Leadership Institute
2354 Garden Road, Monterey
(831) 647-7721
and
Natividad Training Center
1330 Natividad Road, Bldg 840, Salinas
(831) 755-5593

Dates of Tours: July 30 and September 24, 2001

Mission Statement:

The Institute develops, facilitates, and initiates programs that establish the County of Monterey as a value based, learning organization. It serves as a catalyst for community excellence by developing leaders in County Government. The Institute helps individuals to achieve self-fulfillment and improve the quality of their work lives.

Brief History:

It was started May 1, 1995, and operates at two facilities: 2354 Garden Road in Monterey and the Training Center in Building 840 on the Natividad Medical Center Campus.

Budget:

The annual budget is approximately \$1,445,000 with revenues of approximately \$92,000, for an annual estimated cost to the County of approximately \$1,353,000.

Staffing:

The Institute operates with ten staff members.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Monterey Peninsula Airport District
200 Fred Kane Drive
Highway 68 and Olmstead Road, Monterey
(831) 648-7000

Date of Tour: March 6, 2001

Mission Statement:

The Monterey Peninsula Airport District's (District) mission is to provide facilities and services to meet public air transportation needs.

Brief History:

The District was created by California Law (SB 1300) on March 22, 1941. Five hundred acres of undeveloped land were acquired for an airport and services. Over the years, full-service operators and a jet center were established. The terminal has been improved and expanded; the main runway has been lengthened to 7,600 feet.

Budget:

The District's annual budget is \$5,600,000 for operations and \$1,300,000 for capital spending.

Staffing:

The District has a staff of 39 full-time employees.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Monterey Regional Waste Management District
14201 Del Monte Boulevard, Marina, CA
(831) 384-5313

Date of Tour: May 15, 2001

Mission Statement:

The mission of the Monterey Regional Waste Management District (MRWMD) is to provide the highest quality, cost efficient, integrated waste management services to the greater Monterey Peninsula, while preserving our environment and protecting public health through the reduction, reuse, recycling and safe disposal of our wastestream.

Brief History:

The MRWMD began in 1951 with the establishment of a disposal district. The opening of a new landfill on 570 acres north of Marina occurred in 1966. This facility became part of a Joint Powers Authority in 1993. It is a public agency organized as a Special District.

A unique program offered by this facility is its resale store, The Last Chance Mercantile, that sells salvageable items back to the public. This landfill also generates electricity from the methane gas produced by decomposing wastes at the site, enough to power the needs of the site and to power more than 3000 homes.

In 1998 MRWMD was the recipient of the Solid Waste Association of North America's coveted "Best in North America" award.

Budget:

The MRWMD has an annual operating budget of \$9,669,000.

Staffing:

There are 123 full-time employees and seven part-time employees in the District.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency
5 Harris Court, Monterey
(831) 372-3367

Date of Tour: May 15, 2001

Mission Statement:

The mission of the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) is to support the protection of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary and the enhancement of water resources.

Brief History:

The MRWPCA was formed in 1972. Eight separate treatment plants were replaced in 1989 with the new plant located two miles north of Marina. This plant has the capacity to treat 29,000,000 gallons of wastewater. It presently treats 21,000,000 gallons.

Wastewater is treated to a tertiary level which renders it suitable for agricultural irrigation. The use of recycled water in irrigation slows the process of saltwater intrusion by 30% to 40 %.

Methane gas is a byproduct of the solid waste. The facility uses the methane to power the secondary treatment plant which saves the District \$120,000 per year.

Budget:

The MRWPCA has an annual operating budget of \$11,333,452.

Staffing:

The MRWPCA has 72 regular employees.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Names of Facilities:

Nacimiento Dam and
San Antonio Dam

Owned and operated by:
Monterey County Water Resources Agency
P. O. Box 930, Salinas
(831) 755-4860

Date of Tour: August 30, 2001

Mission Statement:

The mission of the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA) is to provide management of groundwater resources and flood control protection in Monterey County.

Brief History:

Both Nacimiento and San Antonio are earth fill dams. Their reservoirs are multiuse facilities: flood control, water conservation, recreation. Their water levels fluctuate according to rainfall, runoff, release of water, and evaporation. A hydroelectric power plant was built in 1987 at the base of Nacimiento Dam at a cost of \$4,600,000. It converts water flow into electricity, which produces substantial revenue.

<u>Some Comparative Statistics</u>	<u>Nacimiento</u>	<u>San Antonio</u>
-completed	1957	1967
-height above streambed	215 ft.	201 ft.
-capacity of lake	378,000 acre feet	335,000 acre feet
-length of lake	18 miles	16 miles
-length of shoreline	165 miles	100 miles
-funds for construction	\$7,000,000 in bonds	\$12,400,000 in bonds
-retirement of debt	1996	2005

Budget:

The annual budget for Nacimiento Dam is \$998,199, for San Antonio Dam, \$3,558,140.

Staffing:

There are two budgeted employees who work at both sites. The operation of both dams is conducted by the 57 employees of MCWRA.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Natividad Medical Center
1441 Constitution Boulevard, Salinas
(831) 755-4111

Date of Tour: April 5, 2001

Mission Statement:

The mission of Natividad Medical Center (NMC) is to provide high-quality, cost-effective health care to all residents of the community.

Brief History:

Founded in 1886, NMC is a 163-bed, acute-care teaching hospital specializing in family medicine and affiliated with the University of California at San Francisco Medical School. The NMC also hosts a Hartnell College Nursing and Health Services education program.

In addition to the main campus, two satellite outpatient facilities are also operated by NMC: Natividad Professional Plaza on Alvin Drive in north Salinas, and Natividad Family Health Center at Blanco Circle in south Salinas.

Budget:

The annual budget for NMC is approximately \$113,000,000. The anticipated revenue from various sources is estimated to be approximately \$113,000,000 and an anticipated County cost of zero.

Staffing:

NMC employs approximately 800 people.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Salinas Valley Memorial Healthcare Systems
450 East Romie Lane, Salinas
(888) 757-4333

Date of Tour: May 7, 2001

Mission Statement:

The mission of the Salinas Valley Memorial Healthcare Systems (SVMHS) is to improve the health of our community.

Brief History:

The Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital (SVMH) was formed in 1947 as a special district that is governed by five Board Members elected from within the district. SVMH has changed its name to Salinas Valley Memorial Healthcare Systems. Under this new healthcare system, the following have been added: The Harden Heart Center, Cancer Care Center, High Technology Diagnostic Imaging, Position Emission Tomograph (PET) Scanner, and the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit.

The hospital has a library on site, with a part-time librarian available for patient, family, and staff.

A medical museum, which is open to the public, is located in the Downing Resource Center on hospital grounds.

Budget:

The annual budget for SVMHS is approximately \$166,000,000.

Staffing:

SVMHS employs more than 1,700 people.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Seaside Family Health Center
Primary Health Care Clinic
Monterey County Health Department
1150 Fremont Boulevard, Seaside
(831) 899-8100

Date of Tour: April 23, 2001

Mission Statement:

The Seaside Family Health Center (SFHC) is part of the Monterey County Health Department, the mission of which is to protect, promote, and improve the health and well-being of the people and the communities of Monterey County.

Brief History:

The SFHC is one of three Primary Health Care Clinics and a health center in the Division of Primary Care. The three Primary Health Care Clinics operated by the Monterey County Health Department are the SFHC, the Alisal Health Center in Salinas, and the Marina Health Center in Marina. These Clinics provide prenatal care, family planning, pediatrics, women's health services, and immunizations. The Clinics offer care to the medically under served and medically indigent in Monterey County. All three Clinics have Federally Qualified Health Center look-alike status, which qualifies the Primary Health Care Division to receive cost-based reimbursement of eligible and reasonable cost for treatment of Medi-Cal patients.

The SFHC sees approximately 22,000 patients per year. The goal is to develop a networking and data processing system between Natividad Medical Center and the three Primary Care Clinics.

Budget:

The annual budget for the Division of Primary Care, of which SFHC is a part, is approximately \$5,000,000, with revenues of approximately \$4,000,000, for an annual estimated cost to the County of approximately \$1,000,000.

Staffing:

SFHC has a staff of approximately 55 employees.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

Name of Facility:

Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
1002 Monterey-Salinas Hwy, Monterey (across from Laguna Seca)
(831) 373-2631

Date of Tour: July 23, 2001

Mission Statement:

It is the mission of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) to provide leadership in animal welfare through protection, advocacy, education, and example.

Brief History:

The SPCA of Monterey County has been serving the community as an independent, donor-supported humane society since 1905. It is open to the public Monday through Friday from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and Saturday and Sunday from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Owners can surrender pets daily from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. but must call first.

Budget:

The SPCA has an annual budget of \$2,740,000.

Staffing:

The Executive Director of the SPCA has a staff of 40 working in animal control, maintenance, and the Clinic.

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED