



Continuity Report

June 30, 2020

The bridge that connects the previous grand jury to the current grand jury

2018-2019 Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations
2019-2020 Grand Jury Review of Responses



Pigeon Flat Campground, Middle Fork Stanislaus River

Photo: Luann Hopkins



Review of Responses Tuolumne County 2018-2019 Grand Jury Report

Summary

On June 26, 2019, the Tuolumne County Grand Jury issued its final report. It included five investigative reports: Tuolumne County Economic Development Authority/Economic Prosperity Council of Tuolumne County, Tuolumne County Jail, Sierra Conservation Center and Baseline Camp, the Mother Lode Regional Juvenile Detention Facility, and the Groveland Community Services District.

Elected officials and government agencies must respond to recommendations made in the Grand Jury Reports indicating their agreement or disagreement with those recommendations, and the reasons and actions taken. California Penal Code §933 tasks the Grand Jury to ensure that each response requested is submitted within the required time frame of 60 days for appointed officials and 90 days for elected officials. California Penal Code §933.5 further requires that the responses either state acceptance and agreement with the recommendations and whether the recommendations have already been implemented or a plan and timeline for implementation is noted; or, if there is disagreement, reasons are given.

The 2019-2020 Grand Jury received all responses from requested officials and agencies within the required time frame. Most of the agencies accepted the Grand Jury's recommendations and took the appropriate corrective actions in a reasonable time frame. When an agency disagreed with the Grand Jury's recommendations, they provided reasonable explanations. There was one letter accompanying the response to a report that stood out because of its defensive tone. In response, this report will include a brief history of the 2018-2019 Grand Jury's findings and recommendations concerning TCEDA.

Background

The 2018-2019 Grand Jury requested responses from the following entities:

- ▶ City of Sonora
- ▶ Tuolumne County Chief Administrative Officer
- ▶ Sierra Conservation Center
- ▶ Mother Lode Regional Juvenile Detention Facility
- ▶ Tuolumne County Jail
- ▶ Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors
- ▶ Groveland Community Services District Board of Directors

Methodology

All responses to recommendations are shown on a chart asking four questions:

- ▶ Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?
- ▶ Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report?
- ▶ Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?
- ▶ Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary action?

Review of Responses to the Report on TCEDA/EPCTC Oversight

Summary

The 2018-2019 Grand Jury investigated the Tuolumne County Economic Development Authority (TCEDA)/Economic Prosperity Council of Tuolumne County (EPCTC). It was the third Grand Jury investigation on this agency, one by the 2010-2011 Grand Jury and another by the 2017-2018 Grand Jury. The 2010-2011 investigation discussed the needs for measurable goals and oversight. The 2017-2018 Grand Jury investigation recommended a full financial audit and a conflict-of-interest analysis in the interest of full transparency. The conflict-of-interest analysis recommended by the 2017-2018 Grand Jury was completed by the County Counsel's Office. However, the TCEDA Board voted to not release any of the information citing attorney-client privilege. The Board could have waived this privilege in response to public requests for transparency but chose not to. The 2018-2019 Grand Jury asked for this conflict of interest analysis, but was denied. The financial audit was not completed due to the dissolution of TCEDA/EPCTC.

Just before the release of the 2018-2019 Grand Jury Report on TCEDA/EPCTC, the Joint Powers Agreement funding that entity was dissolved. The Grand Jury proceeded to issue its report in the interest of encouraging a more transparent process and better oversight in the future.

Responses were requested from the County Administrator's Office and the City of Sonora. The letter from the County Administrator's Office including their responses was troubling to this Grand Jury. <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/13040/County-response-from-tceda-2018-2019> It was disrespectful, defensive and argumentative, stating, "We find the report factually inaccurate, unbalanced and not well documented." It goes on to criticize the use of articles in the Union Democrat as "unreliable." The sources listed in the 2018-2019 Grand Jury Report also include TCEDA's and the county's own documents as well as several interviews, which are confidential by law. We expect that the general tone of the County Administrator's Office's response does not signal how transparency and oversight will be handled by this department in the future.

An evaluation of the responses to the 2018-2019 Grand Jury Report follow. Minor edits were made to correct grammar, punctuation, or typographical errors, but did not change the meaning of the finding or response.

The County Administrator’s Office was asked to respond to Recommendations 1 through 5.

Finding leading to the recommendation

F1. Effective economic development is crucial to Tuolumne County, which lags behind the state in economic health.

Recommendation

R1. Tuolumne County and the City of Sonora maintain continuous investment in economic development going forward. (F1)

Did the agency’s response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency’s response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accept	Yes	Implemented

Findings leading to the recommendation:

F2. There are multiple instances of lack of control and oversight by the TCEDA/EPCTC Board over the agencies.

F9. There was a lack of clarity on how to define economic development and how to measure TCEDA’s effectiveness to develop the County’s economy.

Recommendation:

R2. A new Economic Development entity be developed and be accountable to the CAO of the County. (F2,F9)

Did the agency’s response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency’s response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Partially Accepted	Yes	Implemented

Findings leading to the recommendation:

- F1.** Effective economic development is crucial to Tuolumne County, which lags behind the state in economic health.
- F2.** There are multiple instances of lack of control and oversight by the TCEDA/EPCTC Board over the agencies.
- F3.** This lack of oversight from the Board of Directors allowed the TCEDA Director to be compensated at a high level compared to other counties in California, and to other employees in Tuolumne County.
- F4.** The Employment Agreement for the TCEDA Director was overly broad with its benefits, travel and expense policies that surpass other County employees/managers.
- F5.** Private allowance and benefit negotiations of the TCEDA Director's contract hid the true and far-reaching compensation package from other County employees, and from the public.
- F6.** TCEDA misused public funds.

Recommendation:

R3. Tuolumne County appoints an Economic Development leader who is a County employee, under County policies and procedures, with standard County compensation packages. (F1 ,F2, F3, F4, F5, F6).

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accept	Yes	Implemented

Findings leading to the recommendation:

- F7.** The majority of TCEDA/EPCTC monies were not clearly accounted for in publicly available documents for approximately 10 years.
- F8.** There was a lack of clarity on how to define economic development and how to measure TCEDA's effectiveness to develop the County's economy.

Recommendation:

R4. The County develops measures to track progress of economic development. (F7, F8)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accept	Yes	Implemented

Findings leading to the recommendation:

- F10.** Two previous Grand Jury investigations indicated significant mismanagement issues and lack of measurable effectiveness of the TCEDA, which indicates a longstanding, structural incompetency of the agency.
- F11.** The County and City acknowledged the failure of the agency by dissolving it in 2019, even before the financial and managerial audits were complete.
- F12.** The TCEDA Board is responsible for countless hours spent by County Counsel and TCEDA's employees in responding to lawsuits and public records requests, and in three investigations by grand juries, because of its ongoing lack of transparency and its mismanagement.

Recommendation:

R5. The CAO and the City Administrator educate their respective elected officials and managers of "Code of Conduct" and "Code of Ethics" expectations as public servants, by providing ethics training on an annual basis, to ensure that they understand that their primary missions are to serve the public of Tuolumne County. (F10, F11, F12)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accept	Yes	Implemented

The City of Sonora was asked to respond to Recommendations 1 and 5.

Findings leading to the recommendation:

- F1.** Effective economic development is crucial to Tuolumne County, which lags behind the state in economic health.
- F5.** Private allowance and benefit negotiations of the TCEDA Director's contract hid the true and far-reaching compensation package from other County employees, and from the public.

Recommendation:

R1. Tuolumne County and the City of Sonora maintain continuous investment in economic development going forward. (F1)

Findings leading to recommendation:

- F10.** Two previous Grand Jury investigations indicated significant mismanagement issues and lack of measurable effectiveness of the TCEDA, which indicates a longstanding, structural incompetency of the agency.
- F11.** The County and City acknowledged the failure of the agency by dissolving it in 2019, even before the financial and managerial audits were complete.
- F12.** The TCEDA Board is responsible for countless hours spent by County Counsel and TCEDA's employees in responding to lawsuits and public records requests, and in three investigations by grand juries, because of its ongoing lack of transparency and its mismanagement.

Recommendation:

R5. The CAO and the City Administrator educate their respective elected officials and managers of "Code of Conduct" and "Code of Ethics" expectations as public servants, by providing ethics training on an annual basis, to ensure that they understand that their primary missions are to serve the public of Tuolumne County. (F10, F11, F12)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accept	Yes	Implemented

Review of Responses to the Report on Sierra Conservation Center and Baseline Conservation Camp

Summary

Each year, the Grand Jury is tasked with visiting and reporting on the Sierra Conservation Center and Baseline Conservation Camp. The 2018-2019 Grand Jury sent a group of its members to tour these facilities and asked for a response to their recommendation from the Camp Commander.

Findings leading to recommendation:

F1. No first aid kit at wood shop.

Recommendation:

R1: Install a first-aid kit in the wood shop area. (F1)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	Yes

Review of Responses to the Report on the Tuolumne County Jail

Summary

The Grand Jury requested responses from the Sheriff's Office, and the Board of Supervisors for each of their four recommendations.

The Tuolumne County Sheriff's Office was asked to respond to Recommendations 1 through 4.

Finding leading to recommendation:

F1. The Jail is currently understaffed by four officers. With the opening of the new jail in 2019, additional officers will need to be hired.

Recommendation:

R1: Recruit officers to fill current vacancies. This may include seeking additional budget funding. (F1)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	Implemented

Finding leading to recommendation:

F2. Safety issues found in the 2017-2018 Grand Jury Report have not been addressed. These would include the gray water being collected in drums rather than repairing the pipes and correcting the extension cord running down the hall.

Recommendation:

R2: Address safety and health issues. These will need to be addressed if the building continues to be occupied as planned. (F2)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Offered Excuse	No	No

Finding leading to recommendation:

F3. There appeared to be a lack of adherence to security protocol.

Recommendation:

R3: Adhere to security measures. This could entail refresher training on admitting private citizens into the Jail. (F3)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Partial*	Partial	Yes	Implemented

**2019-2020 Tuolumne County Grand Jury Note: The "private citizens" mentioned in the Report were the members of the Grand Jury. The Report states: "Upon initial entry to the Jail, Grand Jury badges were not checked, nor were the Grand Juror members asked about having prohibited items on their persons." This was not addressed in either response.*

It is important to note that when the 2019-2020 Grand Jury completed inspection of the Jail, security protocols were followed.

Finding leading to recommendation:

F4. Better educational opportunities and rehabilitative programs may reduce incarcerations.

Recommendation:

R4: Pursue educational opportunities and rehabilitation programs for inmates. This may include studying for and obtaining a GED or post secondary degree. And counseling services. Maybe some retired professionals would be willing to donate their time. (F4)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accept	Yes	Implemented

The Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors was asked to respond to Recommendations 1 through 4.

Finding leading to recommendation:

F1. The Jail is currently understaffed by four officers. With the opening of the new jail in 2019, additional officers will need to be hired.

Recommendation:

R1: Recruit officers to fill current vacancies. This may include seeking additional budget funding. (F1)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	Implemented

Finding leading to recommendation:

F2. Safety issues found in the 2017-2018 Grand Jury Report have not been addressed. These would include the gray water being collected in drums rather than repairing the pipes and correcting the extension cord running down the hall.

Recommendation:

R2: Address safety and health issues. These will need to be addressed if the building continues to be occupied as planned. (F2)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Offered Excuse	No	No

Finding leading to recommendation:

F3. There appeared to be a lack of adherence to security protocol.

Recommendation:

R3: Adhere to security measures. This could entail refresher training on admitting private citizens into the Jail.

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Partial*	Partial	Yes	Implemented

Finding leading to recommendation:

F4. Better educational opportunities and rehabilitative programs may reduce incarcerations.

Recommendation:

R4: Pursue educational opportunities and rehabilitation programs for inmates. This may include studying for and obtaining a GED or post secondary degree. And counseling services. Maybe some retired professionals would be willing to donate their time. (F4)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accept	Yes	Implemented

Review of Responses to the Report on Groveland Community Services District

Summary

The 2018-2019 Grand Jury investigated the Groveland Community Services District based on a number of complaints from community members. Issues concerned fiscal mismanagement, wastewater treatment issues, intimidation of rate-payers and public trust issues.

The Groveland Community Services District Board of Directors was requested to respond to recommendations: R1 through R15.

Findings leading to recommendations:

- F1.** The GCSD is financially stressed and does not have the funds to maintain and replace all its equipment and technology needs.
- F2.** There is inadequate staffing to perform standard maintenance.
- F4.** Wastewater issues regarding lift stations and routine maintenance are not being properly addressed.

Recommendation:

R1: Increase field staff in 2019 to maintain reliability, efficiency, and long-term health of the GCSD. (F1, F2, F4)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	Yes

Findings leading to recommendation:

- F1.** The GCSD is financially stressed and does not have the funds to maintain and replace all its equipment and technology needs.
- F2.** There is inadequate staffing to perform standard maintenance.

Recommendation:

R2: Investigate the use of designated reserves and other creative sources of revenue for the wastewater system to address the current "crisis" or "reactionary" mode of operations. (F1, F2)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	In Progress

Findings leading to recommendation:

F3. The high cost of the fire and park areas under the jurisdiction of GCSD is not sustainable under the current budget projections.

Recommendation:

R3: Pursue a voter bond measure or special tax in the next two years to offset park and fire services costs. (F3)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	No

Findings leading to recommendation:

F2. There is inadequate staffing to perform standard maintenance.

F4. Wastewater issues regarding lift stations and routine maintenance are not being properly addressed.

Recommendation:

R4: To mitigate odors, hire a vacuum truck and thoroughly clean and flush to remove solids from all lift stations when the odors are the worst and complaints occur, which currently includes Lift Station 2 and 7. (F2, F4)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	Yes

Findings leading to recommendations:

F2. There is inadequate staffing to perform standard maintenance.

F4. Wastewater issues regarding lift stations and routine maintenance are not being properly addressed.

Recommendation:

R5: Implement regular, on-going, routine procedures for maintenance of the waste water collection system, and hire a designated pump station field maintenance staff for regular and routine upkeep. (F2,F4)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	Implemented

Findings leading to recommendation:

F1. The GCSD is financially stressed and does not have the funds to maintain and replace all its equipment and technology needs.

F6. GCSD is funding subcontractors for jobs that fall under the duties and obligations of the General Manager Consultant.

Recommendation:

R6: Invoice the General Manager Consultant for past GCSD payments to consultants/subconsultants that performed the job duties of the GM Consultant, and amend the 2018/2019 Budget to remove overlapping service expenses. (F1, F6)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Rejected	No	No

Findings leading to recommendation:

- F6.** GCSD is funding subcontractors for jobs that fall under the duties and obligations of the General Manager Consultant.
- F8.** Confrontational, intimidating behaviors toward rate-payers by GCSD representatives have occurred.
- F9.** The GCSD is heavily scrutinized by a small group of community members who emphasize shortcomings while not equally acknowledging improvements.

Recommendation:

R7: Create a procedure regarding communications with the public that includes training of consultants/subconsultants on how to handle sensitive and difficult issues and complaints. (F6, F8, F9)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	Implemented

Findings leading to recommendation:

F8. Confrontational, intimidating behaviors toward rate-payers by GCSD representatives have occurred.

F9. The GCSD is heavily scrutinized by a small group of community members who emphasize shortcomings while not equally acknowledging improvements.

Recommendation:

R8: Undertake an annual community building event (such as a picnic or potluck) that is out of the board room context and encourage open discourse among rate-payers, staff, and board members to foster better relationships. (F8, F9)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	Yes

Findings leading to recommendation:

F8. Confrontational, intimidating behaviors toward rate-payers by GCSD representatives have occurred.

F9. The GCSD is heavily scrutinized by a small group of community members who emphasize shortcomings while not equally acknowledging improvements.

Recommendation:

R9: Develop a clear reporting structure for handling complaints by identifying and publishing names with contact information including phone numbers for the currently undesignated "outside consultants" identified to field complaints against the GCSD in Resolution 2019-02, and not allow these "outside consultants" to be funded by the GM Consultant. (F8, F9)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Offered Explanation	Yes	Implemented

Findings leading to recommendation:

- F8.** Confrontational, intimidating behaviors toward rate-payers by GCSD representatives have occurred.
- F9.** The GCSD is heavily scrutinized by a small group of community members who emphasize shortcomings while not equally acknowledging improvements.

Recommendation:

R10: Combine the public and staff complaint reporting structures for one method for handling complaints in which both the public and GCSD staff have access to the currently undesignated "outside consultants" identified in Resolution 2019-02. (F8, F9)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Rejected	Yes	Implemented

Findings leading to recommendation:

- F1.** The GCSD is financially stressed and does not have the funds to maintain and replace all its equipment and technology needs.
- F2.** There is inadequate staffing to perform standard maintenance.

- F3. The high cost of the fire and park areas under the jurisdiction of GCSD is not sustainable under the current budget projections.
- F4. Wastewater issues regarding lift stations and routine maintenance are not being properly addressed.

Recommendation:

R11: Modify the November 2018 Communications Plan to target a date that the GCSD expects to transition from “crisis” mode to “regular and routine” operations mode. (F1, F2, F3, F4)

Did the agency’s response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency’s response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Rejected	No	No

Findings leading to recommendation:

- F9. The GCSD is heavily scrutinized by a small group of community members who emphasize shortcomings while not equally acknowledging improvements.
- F10. Board meetings are excessively long.

Recommendation:

R12: Change Board meeting times and agenda items to accomodate more local residents who work during the day and limit meetings to two hours. (F9, F10)

Did the agency’s response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency’s response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Rejected	No	No

Finding leading to recommendation:

F11. Board minutes do not adequately capture the substance of the meetings.

Recommendation:

R13: Document the substance of key discussions during Board meetings in Board minutes, and insert a timestamp in Board minutes to cross reference audio recordings. (F11)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?

Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.

Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?

Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?

Yes

Accepted

Yes

Implemented

Finding leading to recommendation:

F12. The GCSD website is difficult to navigate.

Recommendation:

R14: Update GCSD website's Board agenda packet links to include labels with dates, active links to the Policy and Procedures Manual, and include all supporting exhibits in Resolution links. (F12)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?

Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.

Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?

Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?

Yes

Accepted

Yes

Yes

Finding leading to recommendation:

F7. There is no time conflict in the General Manager Consultant representing several water districts at one time. However, given the new full-time employment position of a GCSD General Manager, there is a time conflict in the ability to perform full-time duties and part-time work at several other districts.

Recommendation:

R15: Require on-site, regularly scheduled 40 hours for a full-time General Manager. (F7)

Did the agency's response address the subject of the findings and recommendations?	Did the agency attempt to avoid the issues, offer excuses, or accept and begin to implement the action within six months of the published date of the report.	Did the agency's response indicate that it would take the necessary action to correct the problem?	Did the agency provide a specific date by which it would take the necessary corrective action?
Yes	Accepted	Yes	Yes

Complete responses to the 2018-2019 Grand Jury "Findings" as submitted by the subject agencies are available online at: <https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/1198/2019-Grand-Jury-Report>