

# 2020-2021 GRAND JURY COMPLIANCE REPORT

## Responses to the 2019-2020 Shasta County Grand Jury Reports

### SUMMARY

This Compliance Report covers the responses to the 2019-2020 Grand Jury Consolidated Report. The full Consolidated Report, approved by the Shasta County Superior Court, is available to the public and is archived online at [www.shastacountygrandjury.org](http://www.shastacountygrandjury.org). California Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05 mandate there be responses to final Grand Jury Reports. The current sitting Grand Jury may review the responses to the Investigative Reports from the prior year's Grand Jury to ensure timely and adequate responses to the reports from the elected officials and governing bodies of the public agencies, special district or educational institution that are the subjects of the reports.

Elected officials must respond within 60 days; governing bodies (i.e., City Council) must respond within 90 days after a report is released to the public. The Grand Jury fully reviewed the Reports from 2019-2020 and the responses from the governing bodies charged with preparing those documents. It is with great appreciation that we report all were in total compliance with the required time period for compliance with Penal Code §933 and all responses complied with Penal Code §933.05.

### BACKGROUND

The goal of the Grand Jury is to provide analysis of local government functions, their effectiveness, compliance with law and effect upon the public. The Grand Jury is also charged with developing verifiable findings and recommendations, appropriate to the governing body or elected official who has jurisdiction over the subject of the investigation. To fully understand an investigative report's findings and recommendations, a careful read of the report is necessary.

### METHODOLOGY

This year's Grand Jury fully reviewed the Grand Jury Reports from 2019-2020 and the responses from the governing bodies and elected officials charged with preparing those documents. The prior year's Grand Jury produced the following *Final Investigative Reports*:

- County Clerk/Elections "Shasta County-Your Vote Counts"
- Fire Fuel Management "Summer of Fire"
- French Gulch Whiskeytown School District "So Much with So Little"
- Jail Inspection "It's a Jail"
- District Attorney "Fighting the Good Fight"

In addition, the 2019-2020 Grand Jury produced the following *Summary Reports* to which there were no recommendations made to, or response needed from, the governing bodies or entities:

- Sugar Pine Conservation Camp
- Juvenile Rehabilitation Facility
- Community Corrections Center (CCC)
- Day Reporting Center (DRC)

## **DISCUSSION**

The 2019-2020 Shasta County Grand Jury Consolidated Final Report contained five individual investigative reports with a consolidated total of 47 findings and 44 recommendations.

There were 12 required respondents and one invited respondent identified in the 2019-2020 Consolidated Final Report. All required responses, to findings and recommendations, have been received. The 2019-2020 Shasta County Grand Jury reviewed the responses to recommendations for compliance with the Penal Code.

According to the Penal Code § 933.05(b), for 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.*

## TABLES SUMMARIZING RESPONSES RECEIVED

The responses to each mandated responding agency/entity of the Investigative Reports are summarized in the table below. To review the complete responses of all respondents, go to the Shasta County Grand Jury's website at [www.shastacountygrandjury.org](http://www.shastacountygrandjury.org)

### 2019-2020 SHASTA GRAND JURY RESPONSE SUMMARY CHARTS

<b>Shasta County District Attorney – “Fighting the Good Fight”</b>		
<b>THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:</b>	<b>REQUIRED RESPONDENT</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>
<b>F1.</b> The DA's office caseload is large and the lack of more financial resources is resulting in a loss of experienced attorneys and increased difficulty in hiring qualified replacements.	Shasta County District Attorney	The District Attorney concurs with this finding.
<b>F2.</b> AB109 and Props 47, 57, and SB1437 have caused major workload increases in the DA's office resulting in burn-out and difficulty in hiring new attorneys.	Shasta County District Attorney	The District Attorney concurs with this finding.
<b>F3.</b> Rural Shasta County is not competitive with wages in the private sector or some other counties, leading to difficulty in hiring new attorneys.	Shasta County District Attorney	The District Attorney concurs with this finding.
<b>F4.</b> In the past, the DA's office relied on state and federal grants to fund some of their needs but many grants have been discontinued or have restrictions that hinder the functioning of the DA.'s office.	Shasta County District Attorney	The District Attorney concurs with this finding.
<b>F5.</b> People committing misdemeanors and nonviolent crimes are now booked and released within hours because of the lack of jail space. This impedes the DA's ability to prosecute because many offenders do not show up for their court hearing/arraignment and may continue to commit additional crimes.	Shasta County District Attorney	The District Attorney concurs with this finding.
<b>F6.</b> Plea Bargaining is used in approximately 90% of the cases which saves time, court costs and court space.	Shasta County District Attorney	The District Attorney concurs with this finding.
<b>F7.</b> Some prosecutors respond 24/7 to evaluate major crimes, which can cause burn-out.	Shasta County District Attorney	The District Attorney concurs with this finding.
<b>F8.</b> The DA's office has done an outstanding job of keeping morale high in spite of limited resources.	Shasta County District Attorney	The District Attorney appreciates this observation by the grand jury. The high level of morale in the office is a testament to the office's excellent staff, who daily work hard to ensure justice is done.
<b>R1.</b> No recommendation is given for F1.		It has long been recognized that additional resources were needed to address the challenges faced by the DA's office. Measure A was placed on to the March 2020 ballot in the hopes that voters would approve additional funding for public safety agencies. Measure A did not pass, and the lack of funding remains. Continued changes in the law

		along with new challenges created by the COVID-19 pandemic will likely worsen the financial situation. Several clerical support staff positions were added in the FY 2020/2021 budget. While these new positions will help, further attorney and investigator positions are needed to most efficiently address the challenges we face.
<b>R2.</b> By November 1, 2020, the DA's office will develop a program to recognize the prosecutors, acknowledging that they are appreciated.	Shasta County District Attorney	The District Attorney recognizes that the prosecutors in this office are extremely hard working and dedicated to their important work in serving the citizens of Shasta County. The DA seeks to notice and recognize (both publicly and privately) the excellent work of the DA team. Additionally, the DA's office has already taken steps toward implementing a formal system of recognition for those employees most worthy of recognition.
<b>R3.</b> By November 1, 2020, the DA's office will develop a recruitment program that emphasizes the quality of life in Shasta County.	Shasta County District Attorney	Over the last several hiring cycles, the District Attorney has attempted to broaden recruitment efforts by drafting a new recruitment flier and exploring placing the job posting in new forums. We will continue to look to creatively recruit and retain the best talent possible. During the hiring process, the majority of candidates tell us that they will be taking a pay cut if they decide to work in our office. Also, several attorneys who have left our office have indicated that they are able to make more money in civil firms while working fewer hours. Finally, during our recent organizational health survey it was raised by current deputy district attorneys the issue that they feel underpaid especially given the long hours they work to manage their large caseloads. The District Attorney believes that an increase to salary for deputy district attorneys would go far toward increasing both the quality and quantity of job applicants. A pay increase would also help to retain the quality prosecutors already working in the office.
<b>R4.</b> The DA's office will continue to be on the look-out and apply for any new grants that might help with the budget shortfall.	Shasta County District Attorney	Grants can be a useful tool to supplement existing programs or implement new ones. The DA's office will continue to research and apply for those grants that would best assist us in achieving our mission. We will also seek training opportunities for staff in the areas of grant research and application.
<b>R5.</b> By November 1, 2020, the DA's office will negotiate to increase the allocation of beds in the Chronic Offender Program (COP) from 9 beds to at least 15 beds. The increase in the number of beds for COP will emphasize accountability to repeat offenders.	Shasta County District Attorney	The Chronic Offender Accountability Program has been a useful tool to hold accountable those criminal defendants most responsible for draining law enforcement resources. We will continue to work with our law enforcement partners in the program to identify more chronic offenders and dedicate additional resources towards holding them accountable. Retaining offenders in custody will likely be an increasingly difficult goal as the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have resulted in sentenced state prison

		inmates remaining in local custody as state prisons are not receiving new inmates.
<b>R6.</b> The DA's office will continue to bargain for rehabilitation programs and/or community service as a viable sentencing option.	Shasta County District Attorney	In each case we prosecute, the goal of the DA's office is to achieve a just result. Often, this just result can be achieved in ways other than simply incarceration. We will continue to evaluate every case and defendant on an individual basis, making efforts of rehabilitative programs as appropriate.
<b>R7.</b> By November 1, 2020, the DA's office will encourage first responders who are involved in major violent cases to make at least one visit to a trauma therapist.	Shasta County District Attorney	The physical and mental well-being of all staff members is of the utmost importance to the District Attorney. We will look to implement this recommendation, as well as any other options that would promote the health of our dedicated prosecutors. We are working on creating a peer support program to help prosecutors deal with the trauma and stress inherent in their jobs. Additionally, we have taken active steps to promote a positive working environment through a team oriented atmosphere and frequent opportunities for staff social events.

**Shasta County District Attorney – “Fighting the Good Fight”**

THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES
<p>F1. The DA's office caseload is large and the lack of more financial resources is resulting in a loss of experienced attorneys and increased difficulty in hiring qualified replacements.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors agree with the finding. The Board of Supervisors unanimously voted to put Measure A, “The Shasta County Public Safety Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance” on the March 3, 2020 ballot. Measure A would have provided an estimated \$1.7 million per year to the District Attorney’s Office for hiring and training new staff and an estimated \$195,000 per year for obtaining equipment and supplies. Unfortunately, Measure A failed as it was not supported by a 2/3 majority of the persons voting on the measure.</p> <p>In order to assist the District Attorney’s Office staff with the large caseloads, the Board of Supervisors unanimously approved adding four additional support staff in the FY 2020-21 Adopted Budget for the District Attorney’s Office.</p>
<p>F3. Rural Shasta County is not competitive with wages in the private sector or some other counties, leading to difficulty in hiring new attorneys.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors wholly disagrees with the finding as, unfortunately, there is no data or other information in the report which supports this finding regarding comparing Shasta County attorney wages with private sector attorney wages or attorney wages in some other counties. The only mention of salaries or wages in the report is in the “Hiring” section, which states “...The Shasta County salaries for prosecutors are commensurate with the cost of living in the county. The salaries in Shasta County may be lower than in other areas. However, rents and mortgages have typically been lower than in other parts of California. Additionally, the quality of life in this rural area is excellent ...”</p> <p>However, the Board of Supervisors recognizes that the District Attorney has first-hand information regarding recent recruitment efforts and ongoing retention issues and can discuss any competitive wage concerns with the Shasta County Director of Support Services.</p>

**Shasta County Adult Detention Facility Inspection – “It’s A Jail”**

THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES
<p>F1. The jail facility is old and wearing out. The jail was never designed to serve for long term incarceration making it difficult to meet current demands.</p>	<p>Shasta County Sheriff</p>	<p>The Shasta County Sheriff’s Office agrees with the finding. The Shasta County Jail was built in the early 1980’s and, in fact, was not designed to house inmates for multiple year sentences. Prior to Assembly Bill (AB109), inmates would usually be sentenced to a county jail facility for up to one year. Although uncommon, there were extenuating circumstances where sentenced inmates would receive non-concurrent sentences, which would leave them confined to the county jail for longer than one year. Concurrently, because of AB109, prison re-alignment initiatives, the jail is now responsible for housing inmates for multi-year sentences, some greater than five years.</p>
<p>F2. The jail facility is too small, and its design does not fit current demands. This leads to early releases and classification issues as well as safety concerns.</p>	<p>Shasta County Sheriff</p>	<p>The Sheriff’s Office agrees with this finding. The 1984 facility was designed and built 36 years ago and based on how it was constructed, there is an inability to modify the facility to meet current needs.</p>
<p>F3. The jail has an internal approach for the early release of inmates but will be testing VPRAI in the future. Classification of inmates is a multifaceted issue requiring constant change to respond to current laws and bail reform requirements.</p>	<p>Shasta County Sheriff</p>	<p>The Sherriff’s Office partially agrees with this finding and is in the process of securing access to test the VPRAI Release tool via the Shasta County Probation Department. Bail reform, which is proposed in the November 2020 election, could however, impact the use of the VPRAI tool and other classification systems. It is unclear whether the proposed law will only identify certain classification systems as acceptable and if so will VPRAI be one of those systems. The Sheriff’s Office will reassess this subject after the November election if bail reform in fact passes.</p>
<p>F4. There are not enough cameras in the facility and many blind spots. The lack of cameras leads to higher potential of violence towards other inmates or correctional officers.</p>	<p>Shasta County Sheriff</p>	<p>The Shasta County Sheriff’s Office disagrees partially with the finding. The Shasta County Jail personnel continually assess the safety and security of the facility, which includes the current surveillance system. The Sheriff’s Office agrees that upgrades to the camera system in the jail would benefit operations. Within the adopted FY 2020-2021 budget is two million dollars in appropriations, which is offset by General Fund Accumulated Capital Outlay. These funds will go towards security upgrades to the Shasta County Jail, which will include an upgraded camera system. Jail policy and procedures are in effect to address any perceived limitations of the current system therefore we disagree the current system may lead to a higher potential of violence between inmates and/or staff.</p>

F5. The nutrition provided to inmates is above average.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Sheriff's Office agrees with this finding and will strive to continue to provide an above average nutrition service.
F6. The request/grievance procedure is well understood by inmates.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Sheriff's Office agrees with this finding as the custody facility has adopted an electronic tablet system for inmates to submit requests and grievances electronically. The system is far more effective than the previous paper system in which grievances and requests were handwritten.
F7. The introduction of the iPads has reduced the inmate violence within the housing units.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Sheriff's Office agrees with this finding as personnel assigned to the facility have reported fewer confrontations among the inmate population since the tablets have been deployed.
F8. The Inmate Welfare Fund is supplemented by the iPad placement fee paid by GTL. The placement fee is a potential source of revenue to be considered for jail improvements.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Sheriff's Office agrees with this finding and recently secured a body scanner system, which is being used during intake procedures to help eliminate drugs and other contraband from being smuggled into the facility. Additionally, the Sheriff's Office is also attempting to procure a mail scanner as well. Preventing drugs and contraband from entering the facility will help ensure the safety of the inmate population and personnel working inside the facility.
F9. Inmates have the opportunity, while incarcerated, to further their education.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Sheriff's Office agrees with this finding as inmates have access to education programming to earn their high school diploma and work toward earning an associate degree via the Step-up Program.
F10. The jail is understaffed leading to excessive overtime and low morale.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Shasta County Sheriff's Office disagrees partially with the finding. While it is widely agreed that the jail is understaffed and employees have worked excessive overtime, the jail administration has worked with employee groups to implement changes with the overall goal to enhance workplace satisfaction. Those changes have been received well and include a stronger jail training program. Morale has noticeably improved in the recent months and our personnel shortages have been waning.
F11. The Correctional Officers are underpaid based on state employment data. The lack of sufficient pay leads to issues with recruitment and retention of correctional officers and exacerbates overtime.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Shasta County Sheriff's Office disagrees partially with the finding in that the Grand Jury does not cite their source information for the state employment data and how Shasta County compares. In addition, it is unclear whether factors such as size of the County, cost of living, or other factors affecting the level of compensation were considered. "...are underpaid based on state employment data..." the report does not provide comparative data supporting this statement. While compensation is one factor in recruitment and retention, there are many other factors. The Board of Supervisors did recently negoti-

		ate compensatory raise package, which is competitive with surrounding counties. This included a \$3.00 an hour stipend to most of the personnel assigned to the jail. We believe the increase in compensation will assist in improving morale, retention of personnel, and recruiting new employees.
F12. The Correctional Officers training and continuing education are above the STC requirements.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Sheriff's Office agrees with this finding and will continue working to ensure personnel assigned to the correctional facility receive adequate training that complies with STC Guidelines.
F13. Excessive use of force by Correctional Officers is not used as a form of punishment against inmates. If unauthorized excessive force is used, jail staff are disciplined and held accountable.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Sheriff's Office agrees with this finding and does not condone the use-of-force as a form of punitive action. Use-of-force by correctional officers are reviewed and evaluated to determine whether the use was consistent with Jail's policies and procedures.
R1. By July 1, 2021, alternative custody options shall be explored and a plan shall be established. Options could include a Navigation Center, out of county placement, work camps etc. Existing property assessment fees and monies being held in the county's public safety fund should be utilized.	Shasta County Sheriff	The recommendations will not be implemented as it is not warranted. The Sheriff's Office continuously explores the available alternative custody options considering the continuing limitations and factors impacting the viability of the available options. For example, Shasta County currently utilizes Global Positioning Surveillance (GPS) for qualified inmates, out-of-county jail beds for qualified inmates, and has an alternative custody work program for qualified inmates. A required date for a plan to be established is impractical due to continuing uncertainty and the need to be flexible to meet changing conditions; however, at the September 15, 2020, Board of Supervisors meeting, the Sheriff will provide an update on its ongoing assessment of alternative custody options. In regard to possible funding sources, "property assessment fees" is not defined in the report, so the Sheriff is unclear as to what this means. The County's public safety fund reserves are estimated to have a zero balance by June 30, 2021.
R2. By July 1, 2021, the Shasta County Jail shall obtain and implement an objective classification system.	Shasta County Sheriff	The recommendations will not be implemented because it is not warranted and is not reasonable. The Sheriff's Office agrees that considering the implementation of an objective classification system is warranted. However, at this time, there are many uncertainties regarding what factors should be included in such a system and how future changes in law or regulations might affect the system. As such, it is not warranted and is not reasonable to set a date within the statutory timeframes for implementation or completion of an investigation into the recommendation. As described in F3, Senate Bill 10 (bail reform laws) will be voted on as a ballot measure during the November 2020 election. If Senate Bill 10 passes, it will change the current classification system statewide. After November's voting, we should know if these laws have passed although implementation will be unlikely by that date. We feel it would

		be prudent to wait until after the election instead of investing in a system, which may become obsolete, not knowing the full extent of the proposed laws. Regardless the Sheriff's Office will still analyze the VPRIA program as described in F3.
<b>R3.</b> By July 1, 2021, the Shasta County Jail shall implement a plan to obtain better quality cameras and a plan for installation in sufficient numbers to provide adequate coverage. Funding to be allocated from a portion of the Inmate Welfare Fund, grant sources and yearly budgetary process. Upgrades should be completed within 4 years.	Shasta County Sheriff	The recommendations will not be implemented because it is not warranted and is not reasonable. Improving the jail camera system is an anticipated project during fiscal year 2020-21. Shasta County budget FY 2020-2021 outlines two million dollars in appropriations offset by general funds for the jail security upgrades, including potential upgrades to the jail's security camera system. However, it is not warranted and is not reasonable to commit to a specific timeframe at this time.
<b>R4.</b> By July 1, 2021, the Shasta County Jail shall create a plan to prioritize utilizing a portion of the Inmate Welfare Fund to benefit the safety of inmates by making improvement to the jail facility.	Shasta County Sheriff	The Sheriff's Office has implemented this recommendation and continually assesses the security needs of the facility. This process includes prioritizing their findings and working within the Inmate Welfare Fund (IWF) to finance these improvements. To enhance overall security the Sheriff's Office recently used the IWF to purchase a full body scanner system used to scan both new intakes and housed inmates within the jail. Additional projects related to inmate and staff security are being explored.
<b>R5.</b> By July 1, 2021, the Shasta County Jail shall increase security staffing by at least 10 additional personnel. Funding shall be prioritized and provided through budgetary process with the Board of Supervisors.	Shasta County Sheriff	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable in that the recommendation is unclear and unrealistic. To begin with, it is not clear whether the "10 additional personnel" are in addition to the current total positions allocated to the jail or if the "10 additional personnel" would first be used to fill any current vacant positions in the jail. In addition, hiring for all law enforcement positions, throughout California, have been difficult over the past several years. Finding qualified applicants is a challenge most law enforcement agencies are facing. As a result, it is unreasonable to commit to a specific hiring goal given the numerous factors that could impact the Sheriff's Office ability to meet that goal.
<b>R7.</b> By July 1, 2021 Shasta County Jail Administration will create and implement a recruitment team to highlight the benefits of living in Shasta County.	Shasta County Sheriff	The recommendation has already been implemented. However, the Sheriff's Office will continue to evaluate the program to determine whether any additional changes are warranted to meet the current recruitment standard.
<b>R10.</b> By December 31, 2020 the Board of Supervisors will follow through with their request of August 13, 2019 to have the Sheriff present to them an implementation plan that encompasses the recommendations of the CGL report.	Shasta County Sheriff	The recommendation has been implemented. The Sheriff has taken steps to implement recommendations contained in the CGL report where warranted and feasible. In addition, the Sheriff will make a presentation to the Board of Supervisors regarding

		those measures that have been implemented and-future plans for improvements in jail operations on September 15, 2020.
--	--	---

**Shasta County Adult Detention Facility Inspection – “It’s A Jail”**

THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES
<p>F1. The jail facility is old and wearing out. The jail was never designed to serve for long term incarceration making it difficult to meet current demands.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors disagrees partially with the finding in that the facility is old but is not wearing out. The 1984 facility was designed and built prior to numerous and continuous statewide fiscal and procedural modifications and impacts which require additional effort to meet current needs and those needs could be met more efficiently with a newer facility. However, through the efforts of the Shasta County Sheriff’s Office, the jail is able to meet the needs of the inmate population and is able to provide the necessary services.</p>
<p>F4. There are not enough cameras in the facility and many blind spots. The lack of cameras leads to higher potential of violence towards other inmates or correctional officers.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors disagrees partially with the finding. The Board of Supervisors agrees that improvements and updates to the jail’s camera system would benefit the operation of the jail. Towards that end, on June 30, 2020, the Board of Supervisors adopted the FY 2020-2021 budget, which includes two million dollars in appropriations offset by General Fund (Accumulated Capital Outlay) for Jail Security Upgrades which are currently planned to include upgrades to the jail’s camera system. The Board of Supervisors disagrees that the current camera system leads to a higher potential of violence towards other inmates or correctional officers as the jail’s operating procedures are designed and implemented to address any limitations in the current camera system.</p>
<p>F10. The jail is understaffed leading to excessive overtime and low morale.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors disagrees partially with the finding in that, while the Board of Supervisors agrees that, according to the report, some individuals interviewed as part of the Grand Jury’s process for the report indicated low morale in the workplace, the mention of low morale by some employees does not directly correlate with there being low morale amongst jail staff in general. In addition, it is the Board of Supervisors’ understanding that the Sheriff works diligently to address overall staff morale in the jail.</p> <p>The Board of Supervisors agrees that there is a high use of overtime spending in the jail budget; this was included in the CGL Jail Operations Review. However, “excessive” is a subjective term. Some overtime is used for transportation and special assignment-related activity. Depending on the jail’s population, overtime is a direct result of maintaining certain staffing levels in the jail when vacant positions exist. The number of local vacant positions under</p>

		current recruitment efforts is part of a nationwide issue of recruitment challenges. The Board of Supervisors recently approved a Memorandum of Understanding with the Deputy Sheriffs Association for "Correctional Officer-Deputy Sheriffs" that provides for scheduled compensation increases over the next three years, which may help to positively affect local recruitment and retention activities, reducing some need for overtime in the jail.
F11. The Correctional Officers are underpaid based on state employment data. The lack of sufficient pay leads to issues with recruitment and retention of Correctional Officers and exacerbates overtime.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	<p>The Board of Supervisors disagrees wholly with the finding. In regard to "...are underpaid based on state employment data..." the report does not provide comparative data supporting this statement.</p> <p>The Board of Supervisors disagrees with the assertion that there is a linear correlation between insufficient compensation and increased overtime. In regard to pay, while there is some evidence that compensation levels contribute to recruitment and retention issues, there is also evidence that other factors play an important role in whether employment with a particular entity is attractive or whether an officer will choose to remain with a particular entity. As noted previously, on April 7, 2020, the Board of Supervisors approved a Memorandum of Understanding with the Deputy Sheriffs Association for "Correctional Officer-Deputy Sheriffs" covering the period April 1, 2020, through March 31, 2023. This includes three separate salary increases and an additional specialty assignment pay for job classifications assigned to areas where criminally charged persons are confined. This action may help to positively affect local recruitment and retention activities.</p>
F15. Although the deadline was September 30, 2019 for CGL to issue a final report on Jail Operations to the BOS, this Grand Jury has found no evidence of a final report being submitted to the BOS.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	<p>The Board of Supervisors disagrees partially with this finding in that it is premised on the statement that there was a deadline to issue a final report on "Jail Operations to the BOS [Board of Supervisors]" by September 30, 2019. The agreement did not require CGL Companies, LLC (CGL) to provide a final report to the Board of Supervisors by September 30, 2019. Rather, the agreement provided that CGL was to provide the final report to the "County." In accordance with the agreement, the final report was provided to the County via County Administrative Office Staff on August 16, 2019. Prior to that report being received by the County, CGL made a presentation to the Board of Supervisors at its meeting on August 13, 2019. The County was advised by CGL that the only change to the report delivered to the county on August 16, 2019, was to remove the word "draft" from the report. In addition, Supervisor Moty, as the Board of Supervisors' designated liaison to</p>

		<p>CGL during the preparation of CGL's report, received a copy of the final version of the report on August 19, 2019.</p>
<p><b>R1.</b> By July 1, 2021, alternative custody options shall be explored and a plan shall be established. Options could include a Navigation Center, out of county placement, work camps etc. Existing property assessment fees and monies being held in the county's public safety fund should be utilized.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The recommendation will not be implemented as stated because it is not warranted in that, the Sheriff's Office continuously explores the available alternative custody options considering the continuing limitations and factors impacting the viability of the available options. For example, Shasta County currently utilizes Global Positioning Surveillance (GPS) for qualified inmates, out-of-county jail beds for qualified inmates, and has an alternative custody work program for qualified inmates.</p> <p>In addition to the usual limitations and factors impacting the availability of alternative custody options, there is continuing uncertainty about the impact of COVID-19 and Senate Bill (SB) 10 (2018) which abolished cash bail and implemented an inmate risk assessment system. Senate Bill (SB) 10 (2018) is the subject of a referendum that will be on the November 2020 ballot.</p> <p>A required date for a plan to be established is impractical due to continuing uncertainty and the need to be flexible to meet changing conditions; however, at the September 15, 2020 Board of Supervisors meeting, the Sheriff will provide an update on its ongoing assessment of alternative custody options.</p> <p>In regard to possible funding sources, "property assessment fees" is not defined in the report, so the Board of Supervisors is unclear as to what this means. The County's public safety fund reserves are estimated to have a zero balance by June 30, 2021.</p>
<p><b>R3.</b> By July 1, 2021, the Shasta County Jail shall implement a plan to obtain better quality cameras and a plan for installation in sufficient numbers to provide adequate coverage. Funding to be allocated from a portion of the Inmate Welfare Fund, grant sources and yearly budgetary process. Upgrades should be completed within 4 years.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted and is not reasonable. The Sheriff's Office is currently in the process of evaluating the jail's camera system and the software system supporting the camera system. In addition, on June 30, 2020, the Board of Supervisors adopted the FY 2020-2021 budget, which includes two million dollars in appropriations offset by General Fund (Accumulated Capital Outlay) for Jail Security Upgrades including potential upgrades to the jail camera system. However, it is not warranted nor is it reasonable to commit to specific time frames at this time as the completion date for upgrades could be impacted by construction delays due to COVID-19 and other potential delays, availability of qualified vendors, negotiating and finalizing agreements, and working within the daily safety and security parameters of the jail facility to complete the project.</p>

		The County of Shasta and the Sheriff continually evaluate the availability of financing for upgrades such as upgrading the jail camera system which includes the availability of Inmate Welfare Fund grants, General Fund, and other potential funding sources.
<b>R5.</b> By July 1, 2021, the Shasta County Jail shall increase security staffing by at least 10 additional personnel. Funding shall be prioritized and provided through budgetary process with the Board of Supervisors.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable in that the recommendation is unclear and unrealistic. It is not clear whether the "10 additional personnel" are in addition to the current total positions allocated to the jail or if the "10 additional personnel" would first be used to fill any current vacant positions in the jail. In addition, neither the Board of Supervisors nor the Sheriff's Office has control over how many qualified individuals apply for vacant jail positions. Moreover, the need for jail staffing can be affected by numerous factors and a fixed hiring goal does not allow the Sheriff the ability to adjust the need for staffing based on those changing circumstances whether the need is less than ten or more than ten additional staff.
<b>R6.</b> By July 1, 2021 the Board of Supervisors shall consider taking steps to ensure compensation levels for all Correctional Officers is commensurate with California counties of similar size.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted and is not reasonable. The report does not provide or reference comparative data showing that the compensation levels for all Correctional Officers is currently not commensurate with California counties of similar size. In addition, regardless of county population, the County of Shasta, like all California counties, have varying levels of funding available to compensate its employees including compensating Correctional Officers. Additionally, the County has finite fiscal resources available to support jail operations, as well as the other facets of the justice system and other county-wide responsibilities.  However, with respect to local compensation, as previously stated, on April 7, 2020, the Board of Supervisors approved a Memorandum of Understanding with the Deputy Sheriffs Association for "Correctional Officer-Deputy Sheriffs" covering the period April 1, 2020, through March 31, 2023. This includes three separate salary increases and an additional specialty assignment pay for job classifications assigned to areas where criminally charged persons are confined.
<b>R8.</b> All future studies/reports commissioned by the BOS, utilizing taxpayer funds, shall be made more easily available to the public on the BOS website within five days of the receipt by the board. This can be accomplished by setting up a Reports link that contains just commissioned reports without a user having to traverse a multi-layered and cumbersome website to locate them.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. Studies and reports commissioned by the Board of Supervisors are already made available to the public in the online agenda packet on the Board of Supervisors Meetings and Agendas webpage. This webpage displays materials in an organized manner and allows users to conduct searches by keyword or date. The online

		agenda packet also provides important context for studies and reports, such as the accompanying staff report and contact information for the appropriate County staff.
R9. By December 31, 2020 the Board of Supervisors will ensure that the finalized copy of the CGL Report is received and made available to the citizens of Shasta County.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted in that the County of Shasta received the final CGL report on August 16, 2019 pursuant to the terms of the agreement. The Board of Supervisors heard a presentation from CGL regarding the report at its meeting on August 13, 2019, and the final report received by the County on August 16, 2019 was to remove "draft" from the report. The final report has been and is available as a public document and there is a link to the document on the County's home page at: <a href="https://www.co.shasta.ca.us/index.aspx">https://www.co.shasta.ca.us/index.aspx</a> .
R10. By December 31, 2020 the Board of Supervisors will follow through with their request of August 13, 2019 to have the Sheriff present to them an implementation plan that encompasses the recommendations of the CGL report.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation has been implemented. The Sheriff has taken steps to implement recommendations contained in the CGL report where warranted and feasible. In addition, the Sheriff will make a presentation to the Board of Supervisors regarding those measures that have been implemented and future plans for improvements in jail operations on September 15, 2020.

**French Gulch Whiskeytown School District – “So Much with So Little”**

THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES
<p>F1. None of the current district board members and only several key employees have attended Brown Act training.</p>	<p>French Gulch Whiskeytown School District Board</p>	<p>Agree. Our board members, while committed to supporting the school, are all busy; trainings offered by SCOE tend to be on week nights late in the evening, which is not convenient when you work long hours (early in the morning), or have small children at home, or both. The online trainings are typically priced around \$200 per participant, not a small price point when we count every penny spent. That stated, we recognize that this is a gap and have identified some funding to allow those of us who cannot participate in the late night trainings to receive that education soon (see R1).</p>
<p>F2. Volunteers and dedicated paid staff willing to work unpaid extended hours are the life blood of the school and provide the much-needed support to keep the school functional and solvent.</p>	<p>French Gulch Whiskeytown School District Board</p>	<p>Agree. As in many schools, especially those that are small and minimally funded, we rely heavily on our volunteers and dedicated staff members to do go above and beyond with regard to the hours they devote to ensure a functional learning environment for the local children. The old adage, “it takes a village,” easily describes our situation. The school seeks opportunities for additional funding and support, donations, grants, and even ensuring our funding band are annual challenges which we recognize as opportunities which are never guaranteed, but we do it for the children of our community.</p>
<p>F3. Student absenteeism is a chronic problem causing, among other things, financial issues for the school and below average test scores for some of the students. Most of the students live within one mile of the school yet for some reason, still do not attend classes regularly.</p>	<p>French Gulch Whiskeytown School District Board</p>	<p>Agree. Student absenteeism in many cases is directly a result of lack of parental engagement, which unfortunately, we cannot directly impact. Many of our students are multi-generation homes, some raised by grandparents or other relatives, often with an IEP in place. In some cases, the parents are unwilling, and in others they are incapable, of engaging at a higher level to support their children’s education. The staff send out regular reminders of attendance expectations and meet with those families who struggle; we offer Saturday schools often to aid in retaining necessary funding.</p>
<p>F4. A backup generator with switch gear is needed.</p>	<p>French Gulch Whiskeytown School District Board</p>	<p>Agree. We recognize that a generator with switch is the ideal option for dealing with power outages, yet with our tight financial situation we have been very creative ensuring that we have not missed any days due to power outages, we (the board members) also provided refrigerator and freezer space to avoid loss of perishable food items. Our school staff was creative, providing outdoor and expeditionary learning opportunities to keep the students engaged.</p>

<p><b>F5.</b> Internet access for the school is unreliable, causing difficulty for staff to utilize necessary web-based programming.</p>	<p>French Gulch Whiskeytown School District Board</p>	<p>Agree. We have investigated multiple potential solutions for internet access; none have offered additional reliability over our current set up. Being in a rural area, lacking common infrastructure, as well as limited line-of-sight access due to the steep canyon walls, we are at a disadvantage with regard to technology. We do the best that we can, again, creatively combining online and paper resources.</p>
<p><b>R1.</b> The entire school board, current and future, along with the superintendent and office manager must attend Brown Act training. This training shall begin with the next scheduled training offered by SCOE at no personal cost.</p>	<p>French Gulch Whiskeytown School District Board</p>	<p>Agree. Three of our Four Board Members are signed up for Brown Act training August 14<sup>th</sup>, this training is grant funded. Additional training is offered this winter, the final Board Member will attend at that time.</p>
<p><b>R2.</b> A generator and automatic switch gear shall be acquired in preparation for power outages. This can be accomplished through grant funding or school fundraising opportunities.</p>	<p>French Gulch Whiskeytown School District Board</p>	<p>Agree. We have reached out for several quotes to ascertain the exact cost of a generator with automatic switch; to date we are under the understanding that the cost for the generator itself will be approximately \$12k, while the engineering plans (approx. 8k), automatic switch (approx. 10k) and installation costs (approx. 20k) push the total anticipated costs into the 45- 50k range. Along with requesting quotes, we are beginning to research funding opportunities- this will need to be through grants or other means as our district is overall under the federal poverty line and local fundraising is not reliable for more than small projects.</p>

<b>Fire Fuel Management – “The Summer of Fire”</b>		
<b>THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:</b>	<b>REQUIRED RESPONDENT</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>
<b>F1.</b> Fire fuel management for the prevention of wildfires in Shasta County has not been a top priority for far too long, due to lack of funding, and limited manpower leading to a higher risk for the well-being of Shasta County.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors partially disagrees with the finding. There are several contributing factors to higher risk for wildfires in Shasta County including, but not limited to, drought conditions, excessive heat, private property owners, and absentee landowners. Furthermore, the majority of the unincorporated lands in Shasta County are in the State Responsibility Areas (SRA). Therefore, the jurisdictional responsibility is with CalFire, not the Shasta County Fire Department.
<b>F2.</b> Fire Fuel management is an ongoing process that requires maintenance of previously completed projects so regrowth remains manageable.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.
<b>F3.</b> Shasta County Fire Department is unable to thoroughly identify defensible space and fire fuel management infractions due to understaffing. Absentee landowners and non-complying landowners stretch the limited law enforcement officers’ resources.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors partially disagrees with the finding. The Shasta County Fire Department is not solely in charge of identifying defensible space and fire fuel management infractions. Code Enforcement from many jurisdictions are responsible for identification of defensible space and fire fuel management infractions. For County areas, both Shasta County Fire Department and Code Enforcement under the Resource Management Department manages those assessments, contacts and infractions. CalFire can and does issue citations for defensible space violations (PRC-4291). The City and Forest Service follow their own jurisdictional laws and ordinances.
<b>F4.</b> A structure in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) has an improved chance of withstanding, or not igniting a wildfire when defensible space requirements are practiced.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.
<b>F5.</b> There are elderly, disabled and other at-risk people living in the WUI who need physical or financial assistance to achieve a proper defensible space and decrease their personal risk as well as risk to their neighbors.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.
<b>F6.</b> Some members of the public may be misinformed from time to time by the media and social media about fire fuel management and defensible space requirements, leading to confusion resulting in a lack of compliance and support.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding. There is also jurisdictional misinformation and confusion related to State Responsibility Areas (SRA); Local Responsibility Areas (LRA); and Federal Responsibility Areas (FRA) on fire fuel management responsibilities.

<p><b>F7.</b> There are fewer volunteer organizations available, than in previous years, to assist the “at-risk” community with defensible space maintenance, making that community more vulnerable.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.</p>
<p><b>F8.</b> Inmate fire crew reduction due to AB109 and the inability to use off-season volunteer firefighters, due to their limited fire fuel management training, has resulted in a lack of manpower available for fire fuel management projects.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors partially disagrees with the finding. There has been a lack of volunteer firefighters Statewide, this is not unique to Shasta County nor due limited fire fuel management training.</p>
<p><b>R1.</b> By November 1, 2020, the Shasta County Board of Supervisors (BOS) shall direct the Shasta County Fire Department (SCFD) to develop an annually prioritized Fire Fuel Management (FFM) Plan listing the top FFM projects necessary to significantly reduce the expectation of another catastrophic fire.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.</p> <p>The majority of unincorporated lands in Shasta County are within State Responsibility Areas (SRA). Therefore, CalFire has the jurisdictional responsibility, not SCFD.</p> <p>Fire fuel management projects are a collaborative effort between Government, citizen groups and private landowners, not just the public agency of a particular jurisdiction. Generally, Resource Conservation Districts or Fire Safe Councils lead multi-jurisdictional fire fuel reduction projects through grant opportunities funded by local, state and federal agencies.</p> <p>The Shasta County Board of Supervisors appoints members to the Western Shasta Resource Conservation District, who collaborate with landowners, government agencies, and other organizations to facilitate the conservation or restoration of Shasta County’s natural resources. Their Board meetings are held the fourth Wednesday of each month and are available to the public. As an example, the Western Shasta Resource Conservation District manages several fire and fuel related reduction projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. China Gulch Fuel Break Project which consists of approximately 500 acres;</li> <li>2. CalFire Grant Fuelbreak Outreach where The McConnell Foundation received a CalFire grant to conduct hazardous fuels reduction within the Carr Fire affected area;</li> <li>3. Castle Crags Root Creek Forest Fuels and Public Safety Project to implement fuels reduction within the Root Creek drainage to protect visitors, adjacent property and forest health;</li> <li>4. City of Shasta Lake Fuelbreaks, where a series of fuelbreaks are being constructed;</li> <li>5. Shingletown Ridge Phase 2 to widen and extend existing fuelbreaks on Shingletown Ridge;</li> </ol>

		<p>6. Shasta County CWPP Community Wildfire Protection Plan to update the CWPP for Cottonwood Creek (north), French Gulch, Keswick, Lakehead, Lower Clear Creek; Shasta West, Shingletown, and Stillwater Creek; and</p> <p>7. County-wide Mapping of Fuelbreaks Project.</p> <p>The McConnell Foundation has also participated in fire fuel reduction projects. Two fire fuel reduction projects are slated for the Rock Creek area and the Iron Mountain Road / Keswick area, both within the burn scar of the Carr Fire.</p> <p>Also, recently, the Shasta Fire Safe Council came to fruition and while still in its infancy, they are in the process of organizing as an IRC 501(c)(3) non-profit organization and looks to participate in fire fuel reduction grant opportunities and projects.</p> <p>Furthermore, Shasta County prepared and submitted a Shasta County and City of Anderson Hazard Mitigation Plan to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, FEMA in November 2017 which contained wildfire mitigation planning. <i>"FEMA's approval of the Shasta County and City of Anderson Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is for a period of five years..."</i> The next review of revision to the Plan is due by November 16, 2022.</p> <p>Shasta County Fire Department prioritizes the top fire fuel management projects for the land within its jurisdiction and responsibility based on a variety of factors, managing many projects that span multiple years (project planning, funding, environmental, contracting, conducting, and project completion). Therefore, an annual report from the SCFD is not warranted or necessary.</p>
<p><b>R3.</b> After receiving a report from SCFD, the BOS shall make the report public through its normal reporting process, and on their website, prior to the next scheduled board meeting.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The recommendation is premised on Recommendation 2, to which this Board was not requested to respond. However, Recommendations 2 and 3 will not be implemented because the recommendations are not warranted or are not reasonable.</p> <p>The progress of Western Shasta RCD's FFM projects are not the responsibility of the SCFD. Any progress, written report and inquiries should be made to Western Shasta RCD or the respective Fire Safe Council in charge of the projects.</p>
<p><b>R4.</b> By November 1, 2020, the BOS shall direct the SCFD to report monthly on the progress of the funding efforts and the project completions. Funding shall be developed through reprioritizing existing work plans, cost allotments and grants.</p>	<p>Shasta County Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.</p> <p>Shasta County as a whole has always looked for and identified new sources of revenue to meet the current and projected needs. SCFD staff is skilled and competent in identifying revenue sources and prioritizing projects. Shasta County Board of Supervisors adopts an annual budget at a properly noticed</p>

		public hearing. Contained in the County's annual budget is information to address capital improvement costs and operational costs in context with available revenue.
<b>R9.</b> By November 1, 2020, the BOS shall direct the Shasta County Fire Department to include ongoing "in-perpetuity" maintenance of fire fuel management projects in the quarterly report.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.  The SCFD is not the responsible agency for fire fuel mitigation projects in the State Responsibility Areas (SRA) and therefore quarterly reporting is not warranted. SCFD provides fire suppression and protection services to the unincorporated area of the County not served by either an independent fire district or a city fire department, to protect life, property and the environment. This includes structural and wildland fire control, first response medical care and assistance to other emergency services agencies.
<b>R10.</b> Beginning fiscal year 2021, the BOS shall provide funding for maintenance to include spring vegetation treatment, limbing and other operations deemed necessary by County Fire. Funding for maintenance to be provided from sources such as assessment fees and defensible space non-compliance fines.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	This recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future, to the extent there is available funding. Annually, all Departments provide budget requests to the County Administrative Office and recommended budgets are provided to the Board for consideration. Beginning with Fiscal Year 2021, the assessment fees and defensible space non-compliance fines will be reviewed and the Board will consider providing funding from those sources if any exist.
<b>R11.</b> The BOS shall identify other agencies and identify funding sources, such as grants, to further assist the at-risk community to maintain defensible space for their residences.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.  The Board is not aware of grant funding sources available for private property owners for defensible space. There are several state, federal, tribal, and non-profit entities that may provide grant funding opportunities; however, the Board of Supervisors does not endorse, track, or otherwise participate in private party's grant funding. Private property owners are responsible for defensible space and the funding source. Private property owners in communities should engage with their local Fire Safe Council to better understand grant opportunities and community fire issues.
<b>R13.</b> By November 1, 2020, the BOS shall consider amending their October 22, 2019, Defensible Space Ordinance to provide more compliance incentives through steeper fines, faster legal action, and property liens, which will be addressed and assessed in a timely manner.	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. Staff will analyze compliance of the Defensible Space Ordinance and should an amendment be deemed necessary, staff will present an amendment to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.
<b>R15.</b> Beginning with the 2021 Spring Quarter and one week each year for ten years thereafter, in order to ease costs to private land owners, the City Councils of Redding, Anderson and Shasta Lake City, along with the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, shall implement an	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.  Defensible space waste material (i.e.: green waste) does not belong in landfills. It belongs in cogenera-

<p>“Amnesty Day” plan to permit ‘no-or-low cost’ dumping of defensible space waste materials at each landfill located within each entity’s jurisdiction.</p>		<p>tion facilities, which the County does not own or operate. California State Law, SB 1383 (Health &amp; Safety Code section 39730.6) requires a 50 percent reduction in organic waste disposal from 2014 levels by 2020, and a 75 percent reduction by 2025. In addition, CalRecycle has proposed regulations implementing SB 1383 designed to reduce the disposal of green waste in landfills. The emphasis is on the recycling of such materials, instead of disposing of them in a landfill.</p> <p>As an example of a successful program, the community of Shingletown reportedly operates a disposal event at the Shingletown Transfer Station twice a month. Also reportedly, the cost of the haul allows the operation to financially break even.</p>
--	--	--

<b>Fire Fuel Management – “The Summer of Fire”</b>		
<b>THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:</b>	<b>REQUIRED RESPONDENT</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>
<b>R1.</b> By November 1, 2020, the Shasta County Board of Supervisors (BOS) shall direct the Shasta County Fire Department (SCFD) to develop an annually prioritized Fire Fuel Management (FFM) Plan listing the top FFM projects necessary to significantly reduce the expectation of another catastrophic fire.	Shasta County Fire Department	<p>The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.</p> <p>The entire unincorporated area of Shasta County is State Responsibility Area (SRA) with the exception of a small stretch of the Churn Creek Bottom area. The prioritization and planning for fuel reduction in the SRA in Shasta County is the responsibility of the CAL FIRE Shasta-Trinity Unit (STU). The Shasta County Fire Department (SCFD) does not have jurisdictional responsibilities for fuel reduction in Shasta County.</p> <p>CAL FIRE is a suppression agency with fire prevention responsibilities. What differentiates CAL FIRE from the Federal Agencies is CAL FIRE is not a land manager. Federal Agencies manage public land and have full responsibility and authority to conduct fuel reduction under their guiding policies. However, CAL FIRE protects private land. In order to conduct fuel reduction projects on private landowner property, landowners have to be willing to participate in such activity by authorizing trespass authority to the State.</p>
<b>R2.</b> No later than December 31, 2020, the SCFD shall report progress of the FFM projects to the Shasta County BOS, and every quarter thereafter.	Shasta County Fire Department	<p>The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.</p> <p>Because there is an existing contract between CAL FIRE SHU and Shasta County for CAL FIRE to administer the County Fire Department, the CAL FIRE SHU Unit Chief is also the SCFD Fire Chief and County Fire Warden. As such, the Chief regularly attends Shasta County Board of Supervisor meetings. It is commonplace for the Chief on behalf of CAL FIRE to make presentations to the board annually regarding updates and progress on fuel reduction projects that exist in Shasta County.</p>
<b>R9.</b> By November 1, 2020, the BOS shall direct the Shasta County Fire Department to include ongoing “in-perpetuity” maintenance of fire fuel management projects in the quarterly report.	Shasta County Fire Department	<p>The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.</p> <p>The information is available in the CAL FIRE SHU Unit Fire Plan as part of the 2018 Strategic Fire Plan for California.</p>
<b>R12.</b> Beginning fiscal year 2021, the Shasta County Fire Department shall look into training and utilizing off-season volunteer fire department personnel for the purpose of Defensible Space Ordinance Enforcement Inspector activities. This can be funded through existing grants.	Shasta County Fire Department	<p>The recommendation will be not implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.</p> <p>The responsibility for defensible space enforcement fall under CAL FIRE jurisdiction for the unincorporated areas of Shasta County. CAL FIRE SHU currently employs seasonal Defensible Space Inspec-</p>

		<p>tors annually. SCFD does not have off-season volunteer fire department personnel. All SCFD professional and volunteer fire department staff are utilized year around for the jurisdictional responsibility of improvement fires, traffic collisions, hazardous materials incidents and medical emergencies.</p>
<p><b>R14.</b> By December 31, 2020, the SCFD shall prepare and initiate a comprehensive public education process to increase awareness of fire prevention, defensible space and fire fuel management. The BOS shall make the public aware of the positive effects of the Defensible Space Ordinance. The BOS can utilize social media platforms, mass media and their existing website to accomplish this task.</p>	<p>Shasta County Fire Department</p>	<p>The recommendation will be partially instituted.</p> <p>CAL FIRE SHU currently provides an extensive public awareness program for fire prevention, defensible space and fire fuel management through their Fire Prevention office as well as the CAL FIRE Communications office.</p> <p>In October 2019, the Shasta County Board of Supervisors passed a Defensible Space Ordinance that furthers Public Resource Code 4291 by requiring clearance on vacant parcels under 5 acres as well as extending protections around structures to include neighboring land owners. The enforcement of this new ordinance is accomplished through the cooperative agreement with CAL FIRE SHU and their Defensible Space Inspectors.</p> <p>SCFD will begin reporting the statistics and overall effectiveness of the Shasta County Defensible Space Ordinance in the SCFD Annual Report. The SCFD will defer all decisions to report through social media platforms to the Shasta County Board of Supervisors.</p>

<b>Fire Fuel Management – “The Summer of Fire”</b>		
<b>THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:</b>	<b>REQUIRED RESPONDENT</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>
<b>R5.</b> By November 1, 2020, the three incorporated city councils within Shasta County shall direct their respective fire departments to develop an annually prioritized Fire Fuel Management (FFM) Plan listing the top FFM projects necessary to significantly reduce the potential of another catastrophic fire	Redding City Council	This recommendation will not be implemented. Annual work plans will continue to be developed through collaboration with Redding Electric Utility, the Redding Fire Department and the Community Services Department based on funding and resources available.
<b>R6.</b> By December 31, 2020, the three city fire departments in Shasta County shall report on the progress of the FFM priority projects to their respective city councils, and every quarter thereafter.	Redding City Council	This recommendation will not be implemented. Reports to the City Council will occur in conjunction with updates related to the Redding Electric Utility Wildfire Mitigation Plan.
<b>R7.</b> After receiving a progress report the city councils shall make the reports public through their normal reporting process, on their respective websites and social media platforms, prior to the next scheduled council meeting.	Redding City Council	This recommendation will not be implemented. Communication with the public will continue through the existing channels as has been done in recent months.
<b>R8.</b> By November 1, 2020, each city council shall direct their respective fire departments to report monthly on the progress of the funding efforts and the project completions. Funding shall be developed through reprioritizing existing work plans, cost allotments and grants.	Redding City Council	This recommendation will not be implemented. As noted above, reporting will continue as it has over the past two years and the funding will be identified during the biennial budget process.
<b>R15.</b> Beginning with the 2021 Spring Quarter and one week each year for ten years thereafter, in order to ease costs to private land owners, the City Councils of Redding, Anderson and Shasta Lake City, along with the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, shall implement an “Amnesty Day” plan to permit ‘no-or-low cost’ dumping of defensible space waste materials at each landfill located within each entity’s jurisdiction.	Redding City Council	This recommendation will not be implemented. The cost to administer this program is excessive and there is no effective way to ensure the waste material is associated with fire fuels reduction rather than normal yard maintenance. Additionally, the added expected waste will impact the City’s ability to meet regulatory diversion requirements and may cause fees to increase.

<b>Fire Fuel Management – “The Summer of Fire”</b>		
<b>THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:</b>	<b>REQUIRED RESPONDENT</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>
<b>R5.</b> By November 1, 2020, the three incorporated city councils within Shasta County shall direct their respective fire departments to develop an annually prioritized Fire Fuel Management (FFM) Plan listing the top FFM projects necessary to significantly reduce the potential of another catastrophic fire.	Anderson City Council	Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05(b)(4), the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable due to the fact that the Council has no authority over the Fire District.
<b>R7.</b> After receiving a progress report the city councils shall make the reports public through their normal reporting process, on their respective websites and social media platforms, prior to the next scheduled council meeting.	Anderson City Council	Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05(b)(4), the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable due to the fact that the Council has no authority over the Fire District.
<b>R8.</b> By November 1, 2020, each city council shall direct their respective fire departments to report monthly on the progress of the funding efforts and the project completions. Funding shall be developed through reprioritizing existing work plans, cost allotments and grants.	Anderson City Council	Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05(b)(4), the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable due to the fact that the Council has no authority over the Fire District.
<b>R15.</b> Beginning with the 2021 Spring Quarter and one week each year for ten years thereafter, in order to ease costs to private land owners, the City Councils of Redding, Anderson and Shasta Lake City, along with the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, shall implement an “Amnesty Day” plan to permit ‘no-or-low cost’ dumping of defensible space waste materials at each landfill located within each entity’s jurisdiction.	Anderson City Council	Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05(b)(4), the recommendation requires further analysis because the landfill located within the City of Anderson is operated by a private company, and not the City, and discussions with that entity will need to occur before the recommendation could be implemented. The further analysis would be completed by no later than November 1, 2020.

<b>Fire Fuel Management – “The Summer of Fire”</b>		
<b>THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:</b>	<b>REQUIRED RESPONDENT</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>
<b>R5.</b> By November 1, 2020, the three incorporated city councils within Shasta County shall direct their respective fire departments to develop an annually prioritized Fire Fuel Management (FFM) Plan listing the top FFM projects necessary to significantly reduce the potential of another catastrophic fire.	City of Shasta Lake City Council	The City of Shasta Lake was not contacted regarding the above entitled Shasta County Grand Jury Report prior to its issue. Additionally, the City of Shasta Lake does not have a City fire department. The fire protection for the City and surrounding area are within the jurisdiction of the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District which has a wholly separate board of directors.
<b>R7.</b> After receiving a progress report the city councils shall make the reports public through their normal reporting process, on their respective websites and social media platforms, prior to the next scheduled council meeting.	City of Shasta Lake City Council	The City of Shasta Lake was not contacted regarding the above entitled Shasta County Grand Jury Report prior to its issue. Additionally, the City of Shasta Lake does not have a City fire department. The fire protection for the City and surrounding area are within the jurisdiction of the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District which has a wholly separate board of directors.
<b>R8.</b> By November 1, 2020, each city council shall direct their respective fire departments to report monthly on the progress of the funding efforts and the project completions. Funding shall be developed through reprioritizing existing work plans, cost allotments and grants.	City of Shasta Lake City Council	The City of Shasta Lake was not contacted regarding the above entitled Shasta County Grand Jury Report prior to its issue. Additionally, the City of Shasta Lake does not have a City fire department. The fire protection for the City and surrounding area are within the jurisdiction of the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District which has a wholly separate board of directors.
<b>R15.</b> Beginning with the 2021 Spring Quarter and one week each year for ten years thereafter, in order to ease costs to private land owners, the City Councils of Redding, Anderson and Shasta Lake City, along with the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, shall implement an “Amnesty Day” plan to permit ‘no-or-low cost’ dumping of defensible space waste materials at each landfill located within each entity’s jurisdiction.	City of Shasta Lake City Council	The City of Shasta Lake was not contacted regarding the above entitled Shasta County Grand Jury Report prior to its issue. Additionally, the City of Shasta Lake does not have a City fire department. The fire protection for the City and surrounding area are within the jurisdiction of the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District which has a wholly separate board of directors.

<b>Shasta County Clerk / Elections – “Your Vote Counts”</b>		
<b>THE 2019-2020 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND AND/OR RECOMMENDED:</b>	<b>REQUIRED RESPONDENT</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>
F1. In years past, only a sworn verbal statement was required to establish citizenship and/or eligibility at the time of voter registration. This provided the potential of stacking votes in a given election in many different ways. In the modern era, use of the DMV Driver’s License or ID card, the last four digits of the Social Security number, and a long list of other recognized sources of valid identification allows the Shasta County Department of Elections to properly vet all new voter registrants.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.
F2. To assure current and accurate voter information, the voter registration records are updated continually. An inactive voter will eventually be removed from the active voter list, but this could take up to eight years (two presidential election cycles).	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.
F3. A good percentage of voter registration as well as good voter turnout is attained in part by the Shasta County Elections Office providing the public with constant reminders (mailings, media, etc.) to register and to vote before each upcoming election.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.
F4. Shasta County has a good record of preventing voter irregularities (fraud) because of the various cross-checks in place, the updates of voter information and the diligence of the employees and volunteers involved.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.
F5. The Shasta County Department of Elections indicate that the problems initially experienced with the DMV-provided voter registrations have been essentially eliminated, but are still being monitored.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.
F6. Voting machine results are accurate because of the initial program checks, many data checks against known results, the security provided, and the multiple tabulations of votes on isolated servers which includes a random hand count.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.
F7. Polling operations and tabulation of election data are efficient and accurate partly because of the detailed training required and provided by the Shasta County Elections Department.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.
F8. Due to the extensive checking that is done, there are no known massive or pervasive voting irregularities in Shasta County. While fraudulent/extra votes are theoretically possible, they are few and have not caused problems or raised questions in any final tabulations.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.
F9. The entire vote tabulation process has been made very efficient by the personnel in the Elections Office due to their job dedication and a proactive approach to continual improvement.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.

<b>F10.</b> Errors in ballot measure titles and/or summaries, such as occurred with Measure A in the November 2019 election, can mislead voters, causing some to not vote the way they intend.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk appreciates the opportunity to respond and improve election administration in Shasta County.
<b>R1.</b> The Shasta County Elections Office and poll workers shall continue to maintain diligence through every avenue available to them to prevent a non-citizen or ineligible citizen from registering to vote or from voting in an election.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.
<b>R2.</b> Voter registration records are currently updated by the Shasta County Elections Office on a continuous basis. The Shasta County Elections Office shall continue to do so.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.
<b>R3.</b> The Shasta County Elections Office should continue to inform and encourage eligible citizens to register and to vote.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.
<b>R4.</b> The Shasta County Elections Office should continue its current procedures of voter fraud and election irregularities prevention.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.
<b>R5.</b> The Shasta County Elections Office shall continue monitoring DMV voter registration until the types of errors experienced to date are eliminated. DMV registrations thereafter shall be vetted as are all other voter registrations.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.
<b>R6.</b> The Shasta County Elections Office shall assure that all efforts to maintain completely accurate election results continue.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.
<b>R7.</b> The Shasta County Elections Office shall continue its training program at its current level.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.
<b>R8.</b> The Shasta County Elections Office shall continue to monitor and be alert for current and newly created types of voter fraud.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.
<b>R9.</b> The Shasta County Elections Office shall continue to be proactive in foreseeing and solving problems in the voting and voting tabulation processes.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.
<b>R10.</b> The Shasta County Elections Office shall assure that all election materials presented to the voters are absolutely correct.	Shasta County Clerk / Registrar of Voters	The Clerk and our office will continue to provide efficient, transparent election administration services to the voters and jurisdictions of Shasta County.

Reports issued by the Grand Jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code Section 929 requires that reports of the Grand Jury not contain the name of any person or facts leading to the identity of any person who provides information to the Grand Jury.