

2017 – 2018 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY
Responses to the 2016 – 2017 Shasta County Grand Jury Reports
Are They Compliant?

SUMMARY

The power of the grand jury lies in its ability to publish fact-based reports that inform and educate both citizens and local government officials. Although the jury has no authority to enforce the recommendations included in such reports, it can determine whether local government agencies and officials have provided reasonable responses. These responses must follow a format and timeline clearly specified by law. The independent work and voice of grand juries is strengthened when local government entities and officials are held accountable and responsible to the will of their constituents.

To that end, the 2017-2018 Shasta County Grand Jury carefully reviewed all responses to the 2016-2017 Shasta County Grand Jury Consolidated Final Report for compliance with the law. This report presents the analysis of that review. The 2017-2018 Shasta County Grand Jury deemed all responses compliant except for the City of Redding City Council’s initial response to the *Unfunded Pension Liabilities* report. The City of Redding City Council later provided compliant responses.

The 2017-2018 Grand Jury appreciates the time and attention that all responders devoted to the work of the 2016-2017 Grand Jury. Although invited responders were not required to respond, several did, and the Grand Jury thanks them for their willingness to provide additional feedback.

BACKGROUND

Grand juries are impaneled in June of each year and serve a one-year term. At the end of that term, they publish consolidated final reports on the activities of local government. These consolidated reports include facts, findings and recommendations developed after intensive investigations. The reports also specify which government officials and entities must respond to any findings or recommendations as well as those who are invited, but not required, to respond.

California Penal Code § 933.05 mandates how local governing bodies and elected officials must respond to findings and recommendations that fall under their jurisdictions. It is the responsibility of the succeeding grand juries to monitor compliance.

METHODOLOGY

The Grand Jury reviewed

- California Penal Code § 933 et seq., which specifies how responses are to be formatted;
- the 2016-2017 Shasta County Grand Jury Consolidated Final Report;
- all responses to the 2016-2017 Shasta County Grand Jury Consolidated Final Report; and

- response reports from prior grand jury reports from Shasta County (2014-2015), Butte County (2015-2016), Napa County (2015-2016), Placer County (2015-2016) and Sonoma County (2015-2016).

DISCUSSION

Any report published by a grand jury must have at least one finding and may have one or more recommendations. There may be commendations as well. The 2016-2017 Shasta County Grand Jury Consolidated Final Report contained nine individual reports with a total of 66 findings, 47 recommendations, and four commendations. According to the Penal Code, elected bodies and officials are mandated responders.

There were 19 required responders identified in the 2016-2017 Consolidated Final Report. All responded to both findings and recommendations. The 2017-2018 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.*

In addition to the requirement to include a timeframe when responding to recommendations as indicated above, Penal Code § 933(c) sets a timeframe of 90 days following submission of a *final report on the operations of any public agency subject to its reviewing authority, the governing body of the public agency shall comment to the presiding judge of the superior court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the governing body.*

The Grand Jury determined that all responses to recommendations in the 2016-2017 Shasta County Grand Jury Consolidated Report were compliant with the exception of the City of Redding City Council's (RCC) responses to the *Unfunded Pension Liabilities* report. Those responses arrived four weeks after the 90-day deadline. Additionally, RCC's responses to Recommendations 1 and 2 did not specify any timeframe and its response to Recommendation 3 did not provide a timeframe within that required by the Penal Code. As a result, those responses were deemed non-compliant by the Grand Jury. The RCC was notified and offered the

opportunity to send in revised responses. RCC approved revised responses to this report at its regularly scheduled meeting on November 7, 2017. These responses were compliant.

In addition to required responders, there may also be invited responders. An invited responder is usually an appointed official or department head. In the 2016-2017 Shasta County Grand Jury Final Report, there were 16 invited responders who were not required to provide responses. Of those 16 invited responders, four did respond. They included the City of Anderson City Manager, the City of Redding City Manager and the City of Shasta Lake City Manager (all responded to the *Unfunded Pension Liabilities* report) and the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Fire Chief (*Shasta Lake Fire Protection District* report).

Tables Summarizing Responses Received

The tables on the following pages summarize the responses of each mandated responding agency/entity. To review the complete responses of all respondents, go to the Shasta County Grand Jury's website at https://www.co.shasta.ca.us/index/gj_index.aspx.

2017-2018 SHASTA GRAND JURY RESPONSE SUMMARY CHARTS

| UNFUNDED PENSION LIABILITIES: SHASTA COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF REDDING, ANDERSON, AND SHASTA LAKE | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. By October 31, 2017, the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, with the Shasta County Auditor-Controller, and the Cities of Redding, Anderson, and Shasta Lake City Councils each look for ways to increase their contributions to CalPERS over the next twelve years with minimal loss of key services. Options could include reducing their current amortization schedules and exploring debt refinancing opportunities. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| | Redding City Council | The recommendation requires further analysis. | NO ¹ |
| | | The recommendation will not be implemented because the timeline is unreasonable. | YES ² |
| | Anderson City Council | The recommendation will be considered. | YES |
| | Shasta Lake City Council | The recommendation will be considered. | YES |
| | Shasta County Auditor-Controller | The recommendation has already been implemented. | YES |
| R2. By October 31, 2017, the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, with the Shasta County Auditor-Controller, and the Cities of Redding, Anderson, and Shasta Lake City Councils each look for ways to increase their revenues or reduce other expenditures, with minimal loss of key services, as CalPERS contributions increase. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| | Redding City Council | The recommendation requires further analysis. | NO ¹ |
| | | The recommendation will not be implemented because the timeline is unreasonable. | YES ² |
| | Anderson City Council | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| | Shasta Lake City Council | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| | Shasta County Auditor-Controller | The recommendation has already been implemented. | YES |
| R3. By December 31, 2017, the City of Redding City Council establish a five-year financial plan to increase its funded ratio for its CalPERS Safety Plan from 64.5% to 70%, and for its Miscellaneous Plan from 70% to 75%, with minimal loss of key services. | Redding City Council | The recommendation requires further analysis. | NO ³ |
| | | The recommendation will not be implemented because the timeline is unreasonable. | YES ² |

1. Originally non-compliant – no timeframe provided as specified by Penal Code § 933.05 (b)
2. Revised response deemed compliant.
3. Originally non-compliant – not within the timeframe as specified by Penal Code § 933.05 (b)

| STILLWATER BUSINESS PARK | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. By December 31, 2017, the Redding City Council contract for an external audit of all funding and expenditures related to Stillwater Business Park. This audit can be paid for by existing funds allocated to Stillwater Business Park. | Redding City Council | This recommendation requires further analysis. | YES |
| R2. By September 30, 2017, the Redding City Council request Colliers International and the EDC to jointly determine the continued market demand for existing Stillwater Business Park parcels and present their findings to the City Council by November 10, 2017. | Redding City Council | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented within the timeline specified. | YES |
| R3. By September 30, 2017, the Redding City Council direct staff to identify alternative uses of the Stillwater Business Park property and report their findings to the City Council by November 30, 2017. | Redding City Council | The recommendation requires further analysis. | YES |
| R4. By December 31, 2017, the Redding City Council establish a formal procedure for comprehensively evaluating the viability of the Stillwater Business Park project. | Redding City Council | The recommendation requires further analysis. | YES |
| R5. By September 30, 2017, the Redding City Council establish a policy directing funds received from any future parcel sales be utilized only for Stillwater Business Park debt repayment or infrastructure. | Redding City Council | The recommendation will not be implemented. | YES |
| R6. By September 30, 2017, the Redding City Council establish a formal, documented procedure for comprehensively evaluating potential Stillwater Business Park sales using criteria such as financial viability, estimated wage rates, and number of jobs to be created. | Redding City Council | The recommendation requires further analysis. | YES |
| R7. By September 30, 2017, the Redding City Council appoint an existing City staff member to manage the Stillwater Business Park Project. This person would be responsible for routine evaluation of Stillwater, including supervising marketing coordination, sales negotiations, and fiscal accountability. Further, this City staff member will report on a quarterly basis to the City Council on these Stillwater Business Park evaluations. | Redding City Council | The recommendation will not be implemented. | YES |

| SHASTA COUNTY SERVICE AREAS – ELK TRAIL WATER IMPROVEMENT PROJECT | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors and Water Agency Board of Directors jointly direct staff to assess and report back on what measures the County could take to stem water losses in all the CSAs. The report should also be forwarded to the CSA CABs. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| | Shasta County Water Agency Board of Directors | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| R2. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors and Water Agency Board of Directors jointly direct staff to assess and report back the financial impact on CSA customers of current or future measures the County can take to stem water losses in the CSAs. The report should also be forwarded to the CSA CABs. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| | Shasta County Water Agency Board of Directors | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| R3. By December 31, 2017, the Board of Supervisors and the Water Agency Board of Directors jointly direct staff to appoint a single Public Works engineer solely dedicated to managing all water issues in the County. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| | Shasta County Water Agency Board of Directors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| R4. By December 31, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct staff to conduct an audit to determine which special districts pay administrative fees through the CSA Administration Fund – 00060, and the amounts of these fees. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has already been implemented. | YES |
| R5. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors enact a policy stating CSA customers do not pay fines levied against their CSA due to Public Works personnel errors. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| R6. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct Public Works staff to provide clear and concise information to County residents regarding any water sources to fulfill future needs. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has already been implemented. | YES |
| R7. By September 30, 2017, the Water Agency Board of Directors rescind Shasta County Water Agency Resolution No: 2008-01, Resolution of Intent to Transfer Water from County Service Area #25 – Keswick Water to County Service Area #6 – Jones Valley Water. | Shasta County Water Agency Board of Directors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |

Table continues on next page.

| SHASTA COUNTY SERVICE AREAS – ELK TRAIL WATER IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CONTINUED) | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R8. By September 30, 2017, the Water Agency Board of Directors direct staff to immediately reimburse Jones Valley Water Fund – 0377 all monies paid to Keswick CSA under Shasta County Water Agency Resolution No: 2008-01, Resolution of Intent to Transfer Water from County Service Area #25 – Keswick Water to County Service Area #6 – Jones Valley Water. | Shasta County Water Agency Board of Directors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| R9. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct Public Works staff to open the lines of communication with the Rural Communities Assistance Corporation and report back to the Board of Supervisors on the Corporation’s response. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| R10. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct Public Works staff to work with the Jones Valley CSA CAB to establish a mutually agreed upon CAB meeting schedule | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| R11. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct staff to determine and report back what specific legal authority exists to allow Public Works to charge CSAs for time spent on a Grand Jury investigation. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| R12. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct staff to provide a public report outlining legal justification for the charges under Project Number 111029 “CSA #6 Jones Valley Grand Jury Investigation” by December 31, 2017, or to refund Jones Valley CSA any and all charges under this project title. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| R13. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct staff to conduct an investigation to determine how much each CSA has been charged for Public Works staff time spent on any Grand Jury investigation. By December 31, 2017, staff publicly report on their findings and the legal justification for the charges, or refund the amounts charged. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| R14. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct Public Works staff to ensure and report back that they are in compliance with California Proposition 218. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |

Table continues on next page.

| SHASTA COUNTY SERVICE AREAS – ELK TRAIL WATER IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CONTINUED) | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R15. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct Public Works staff to ensure and report back that they are in compliance with Shasta County Code 13.12.120. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| R16. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct County Administrative staff to either publicly report the legal justification for charging the CSAs, or create and present a policy ensuring CSAs are not charged for Public Works staff time spent on any Grand Jury investigations. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable. | YES |
| R17. By September 30, 2017, the Board of Supervisors direct Public Works staff to comply with Grand Jury confidentiality agreements. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has already been implemented. | YES |

| SHASTA COUNTY JOINT AUDIT COMMITTEE | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. By June 25, 2017, the Shasta County Board of Supervisors direct the Chairperson to hold a Joint Audit Committee meeting with the 2016/17 Grand Jury to discuss the committee's ongoing purpose. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. | YES |
| R2. By July 31, 2017, the Shasta County Board of Supervisors direct the Chairperson to schedule Joint Audit Committee meetings with the 2017/18 Shasta County Grand Jury Foreperson. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. | YES |

| SHASTA LAKE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. By December 31, 2017, the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Board direct staff to explore alternative revenue sources. Options may include creating a reasonable fee for service schedule including emergency medical services, and organizing additional community fundraising events. | Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Board of Directors | The recommendation will be implemented. | YES |
| R2. By September 30, 2017, the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Board direct staff to ensure that the District's website is updated, a schedule for website updates is implemented, and District matters are advertised on the website. | Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Board of Directors | The recommendation will be implemented. | YES |

| GPS ANKLE BRACELET MONITORING | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. By July 1, 2018, the Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff-Coroner direct staff to work with the Community Corrections Partnership to jointly determine if additional funding sources will be necessary to expand monitoring programs in anticipation of an increased offender population. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has already been implemented. | YES |
| | Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner | The recommendation has already been implemented. | YES |
| R2. By March 31, 2018, the board of Supervisors direct staff to explore and report back if smartphone applications utilizing facial biometrics would be a cost-effective option for expanding current monitoring programs. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. | YES |
| R3. By December 31, 2017, the Board of Supervisors and the Sheriff-Coroner direct staff to jointly explore and report back if contracting 24-hour GPS monitoring services to SHASCOM would be cost-effective and efficient. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. | YES |
| | Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. | YES |

| RESPONSES TO THE 2015/16 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY CONSOLIDATED REPORT | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. The Shasta County Board of Supervisors ensure its initial responses to any future Shasta County Grand Jury reports are compliant with California Penal Code § 933.05.0 | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented. | YES |
| R2. LAFCO ensure its initial responses to any future Shasta County Grand Jury reports are compliant with California Penal Code § 933.05. | Shasta Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO) | The recommendation has been implemented. | YES |
| R3. The Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner ensure his initial responses to any future Shasta County Grand Jury reports are compliant with California Penal Code § 933.05. | Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner | The recommendation has already been implemented. | YES |

| CITY OF REDDING CODE ENFORCEMENT | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. By September 30, 2017, the Redding City Council direct staff to conduct an analysis to clearly define code enforcement responsibilities and determine whether all personnel, supervision, and budgets for code enforcement should be consolidated under a single department, such as the Redding Police Department, with a single supervisor. This analysis is to be completed by December 31, 2017. | Redding City Council | The recommendation requires further analysis. | YES |
| R2. By June 30, 2018, the Redding City Council end any further short-term "Enhanced Code Enforcement" special funding. The Grand Jury further recommends the Redding City Council direct staff to identify and report on potential long-term funding needs and sources for future City code enforcement activities. | Redding City Council | This recommendation will not be implemented. | YES |
| R3. By September 30, 2017, the Redding City Council direct staff to begin cross-training all City personnel engaged in code enforcement in responsibilities related to unlawful camp abatement as well as other code enforcement complaints. | Redding City Council | This recommendation will not be implemented. | YES |
| R4. By September 30, 2017, the Redding City Council direct the Code Enforcement Division and the Redding Police Department to jointly develop a formal process for prioritization of workloads including case files, unlawful camps, problem motels and other code enforcement issues. This process is to be completed by December 31, 2017. | Redding City Council | This recommendation will be implemented by December 31, 2017. | YES |
| R5. By September 30, 2017, the Redding City Council direct Building/Code Enforcement Division staff to immediately prioritize "occupied without power" lists for enforcement. | Redding City Council | This recommendation will not be implemented. | YES |

| SHASTA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE – ANIMAL REGULATION UNIT | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. By September 30, 2017, the Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner direct Animal Regulation Unit supervisors to create and seek legal County Counsel approval of an animal seizure policy and procedures. | Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner | The Sheriff-Coroner agrees with the recommendation to have written policies and procedures for animal seizure. | YES |
| R2. By December 31, 2017, the Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner direct Animal Regulation Unit Supervisors to create written policies and procedures for record-keeping and case-tracking in the Animal Regulation Unit. | Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner | The recommendation by the Grand Jury will not be implemented at this time. | YES |
| R3. By September 30, 2017, the Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner direct Animal Regulation Unit Supervisors to discontinue the use of the dedicated Animal Regulation Unit phone line and update its website and voicemail to direct callers to the SHASCOM non-emergency line. | Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner | The Sheriff-Coroner partially agrees with the recommendation. The recommendation by the Grand Jury will not be implemented at this time. | YES |
| R4. By September 30, 2017, the Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner direct Animal Regulation Unit supervisors to develop, maintain, and enforce comprehensive policies and procedures or delegate this responsibility to an officer in the Animal Regulation Unit. | Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner | This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. | YES |
| R5. By June 30, 2018, the Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner direct staff to fulfill the provision of the County's Personal Services Agreement with Haven Humane Society that calls for annual evaluations of the Agreement. The results of these annual evaluations should be reported to the Board of Supervisors. | Shasta County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. | YES |
| | Shasta County Sheriff-Coroner | This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. | YES |

| SHASTA LAKE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| THE 2016-2017 SHASTA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED: | RESPONDENT | RESPONSES | PENAL CODE COMPLIANT? |
| R1. By December 31, 2017, the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Board direct staff to explore alternative revenue sources. Options may include creating a reasonable fee for service schedule including emergency medical services, and organizing additional community fundraising events. | Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Board of Directors | The recommendation will be implemented. | YES |
| R2. By September 30, 2017, the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Board direct staff to ensure that the District's website is updated, a schedule for website updates is implemented, and District matters are advertised on the website. | Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Board of Directors | The recommendation will be implemented. | YES |

END OF RESPONSES

The full set of responses to all of the findings and recommendations in the 2016-2017 Shasta County Grand Jury Consolidated Final Report is available online at:

https://www.co.shasta.ca.us/index/gj_index.aspx

FINDINGS

- F1. All mandated responders submitted responses as requested, most within the timeframe specified in Penal Code § 933(c), which allots 90 days for governing bodies to respond and 60 days for elected officials.
- F2. Although Redding City Council's original responses to the *Unfunded Pension Liabilities* report were deemed noncompliant with Penal Code § 933(c) and § 933.05(b), it later submitted revised responses that were in compliance.
- F3. Four of the 16 invited responders also submitted responses although they were not required to do so.

COMMENDATIONS

The Grand Jury commends:

- C1. The City Managers of Anderson, Redding and Shasta Lake for their thoughtful and timely responses to the *Unfunded Pension Liabilities* report. All were invited responders and not required to submit responses.
- C2. The Shasta Lake Fire Protection District Fire Chief for his thoughtful and timely responses to the Shasta Lake Fire Protection District report. He was an invited responder and not required to submit responses.
- C3. The Cities of Anderson, Redding and Shasta Lake City Councils and the Shasta County Board of Supervisors for scheduling approval of their respective responses during a regular session portion of their meetings, allowing open discussion of those responses and public comment.

When there is a perception of a conflict of interest involving a member of the Grand Jury, that member has been required to recuse from any aspect of the investigation involving such a conflict and from voting on the acceptance of or rejection of that report. No member of the Grand Jury recused from this report.

Reports issued by the Grand Jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code § 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.

Released January 24, 2018