

This document is an extract of a larger publication.

civilgrandjury.org is a project of UnGovr.org, a US-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to government transparency and public accountability.



PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Function

Under the general direction of the Judge of the Superior Court, the Probation Department administers the adult and juvenile probation programs of Plumas County. The goals of the department are to protect the community, rehabilitate probationers, prevent crimes and delinquency, and protect non-delinquent youth.

Background

Interviews were conducted with the Chief Probation Officer and two Deputy Probation Officers. This investigation was in conjunction with Plumas County Community School (PCCS). See Complaint #03/04-02.

Findings

1. One probation officer is now assigned to students on probation who are enrolled at PCCS. This officer follows prescribed procedures by signing the visitation log and notifies teachers if students on probation are to be removed from the classroom. This has improved communications between the Probation Department and PCCS.
2. The Probation Department does not have a separate juvenile division.
3. The Probation Department is in need of expanded office space for personnel and equipment. Lack of space has caused overcrowding conditions and lower staff morale. Currently, there is inadequate office space for fourteen employees.
4. Two hundred hours of training are required for newly employed probation officers. The Chief Probation Officer indicated the department experiences high turnover. Many officers leave for higher paying positions in other counties once they reach the two hundred hour mark. The average retention duration for entry-level probation officers is eighteen months. Current annual compensation levels are: entry level - \$29,448; 1 year - \$31,200; 4-5 years - \$34,800.
5. Funding for the Probation Department is provided from the County general fund (55%), six separate grants (22%), State and federal sources (20%) and fees charged to probationers (3%).
6. At the time of the Grand Jury interview, the Chief Probation Officer had not received a performance evaluation for eleven years.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends:

1. The space situation in the Probation Department should be addressed and corrected. The needs include three more offices and one room for conferences. Once some departments move to the new facility, the old law library could be considered for expansion of the Probation Department.
2. The Human Resources Director perform a study to address the turnover issues in the Probation Department.
3. The Board of Supervisors hold an annual performance evaluation with all the appointed Department heads.

FACILITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Function

The Facility Services Department maintains over thirty physical structures; real properties owned by the county; one park and one campsite. It also is responsible for the janitorial services for those facilities and the county vehicle fleet. Duties include maintenance, repair and renovation of county buildings. Staffing, after 2003/2004 budget reductions, was reduced from ten employees to a Department Manager, one office staff and five full-time field staff. However, since the beginning of the fiscal year, the Department has experienced the resignation of a heating and air conditioning technician, and the loss of two other field staff due to illness or injury, reducing the staff to four employees.

Background

The Facility Services Department head was interviewed in connection with certain repair and maintenance issues concerning the county jail (see comments under PLUMAS COUNTY JAIL). During the jail visits, this interview and comments from other departments, it became evident that serious problems may exist with the overall county maintenance program. Some of these problems stem from State law governing the contract bidding process, lack of staff and lack of established maintenance priorities.

Recommendation

Due to time constraints, the 2003-04 Grand Jury was unable to conduct a thorough investigation of the Facility Services Department. It therefore recommends that the 2004-05 Grand Jury undertake a comprehensive investigation of this department.

Complaint Summaries

COMPLAINT #03/04-01

Nature of Complaint

This is a continuation of last year's Grand Jury Complaint # 02/03-15.

Response

The issues in the complaint were investigated as part of the Plumas County Health Agency review, and were found to be without merit.

COMPLAINT #03/04-02

Nature of Complaint

A citizen submitted a complaint alleging improper conduct by County Probation officers, the Sheriff's Department and the District Attorney involving the Plumas County Community School (PCCS) and one of its teachers. This complaint was carried forward from the 2002-03 Grand Jury due to that Jury's time constraints. Specifically, the complaint alleged:

1. Disruption of the PCCS's instructional program and the health and safety of students and staff caused by the Probation officers.
2. Lack of timely follow-up by the Sheriff's Department to death threats against the PCCS's lead teacher and vandalism against this individual's property.
3. Lack of response to several potential sexual harassment cases referred by PCCS teachers to the School District.
4. Lack of cooperation from the School District, District Attorney and Probation Department to numerous reports of dangerous and negative conditions existing at the PCCS.

Background

The Grand Jury conducted interviews with Community School teachers, Probation Department personnel, School District officials, the County Personnel Director and the Sheriff's Department. A total of eleven interviews were conducted. In addition, the Grand Jury reviewed extensive documentation pertaining to these complaints, including internal memorandums, e-mails and a Sheriff's report.

Findings

1. At any one time, the PCCS enrollment may include both students who are or are not on probation. The Probation Department notifies the School District of those students sent to PCCS who are on probation; however, the School District does not inform the PCCS teachers of those students on probation. This creates a potential safety problem for those teachers.

2. Probation officers do not visit the PCCS on a regular basis.
3. There are no written procedures covering probation officers' visits to the PCCS. Drug testing is sometimes conducted on school premises.
4. Periodic reports on probationary students are not prepared by PCCS staff on a scheduled basis. Probation Department reports on students are not provided to PCCS staff, in some cases due to the confidential nature of these reports. This often results in a lack of adequate communication between Probation and PCCS teachers.
5. There is no present means to remove expelled students to a higher level of supervision. These students are often returned to PCCS within a few weeks as there is no other place to send them.
6. Conditions at the PCCS do not facilitate a good learning environment. Examples include worn carpeting, hoist equipment located in the middle of the classroom, students observed listening to "rap" music or unassigned reading of newspapers during class time.
7. Complaints by PCCS teachers to the Sheriff's Office were not investigated in a timely manner.
8. There is no juvenile officer assigned by the Sheriff's Department to the PCCS.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends:

1. That communications between the School District, Probation Department and PCCS staff be strengthened.
2. The School District administration should inform PCCS staff of all students enrolled who are on probation.
3. Written visitation procedures specifying appropriate conduct by probation officers should be prepared and communicated to both PCCS staff and the probation officers. These should include regularly scheduled visits, advance notification and permission, sign-in logs, and manner of performing student interviews.
4. Any drug testing should be performed at the Probation Department and not on school premises since the drug testing of minors requires confidentiality.
5. Periodic visits to the PCCS should be made by School District personnel to observe conditions and meet with teachers. We understand this is now being done since the beginning of the current school year.

6. If the Sheriff's Department does not presently have sufficient resources to assign a juvenile officer to PCCS, an officer should visit the school at least once each month to interact with students and to instill awareness for authority.
7. At least two to three times during the school year, a general meeting of the School District, Probation Department, Sheriff's Department and PCCS staff should be held to discuss current and emerging issues.

COMPLAINT #03/04-03

Nature of Complaint

A citizen submitted a complaint against the Sheriff's Department and the District Attorney alleging, among other charges, improper use of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System ("CLETS") program in the District Attorney's Office by a County employee.

Response

The Complainant was advised that this complaint was not within the jurisdiction of the Grand Jury and that his complaint and related documentation was forwarded to the California State Attorney General's Office. Complainant was further advised to pursue his complaint with the California Attorney General and to consider consulting with the current County Sheriff.

COMPLAINT #03/04-04

Nature of Complaint

A citizen requested the Grand Jury investigate the Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District (GLRID) in regard to its management in the Crocker Mountain area. Complaints were as follows:

- The GLRID refuses to serve (provide water) to the entire Crocker Mountain Subdivision
- GLRID does not have maps available of the water and sewer system pipes on Crocker Mountain
- GLRID does not post minutes of its board meetings and they do not have a Public Comment period on their agenda
- No citizen of the Crocker Mountain area serves on the board of the GLRID

Background

The GLRID is a special district in the eastern portion of Plumas County, south of Lake Davis. It is charged with supplying water and sewage services to the Delieker area and the Crocker Mountain area. Prior to the poisoning of Lake Davis by the State of California Department of Fish and Game, the GLRID supplied water to the Crocker Mountain area using water from Lake Davis by way of a county-owned water filtration plant. After the poisoning of Lake Davis the filtration plant was shut down. This plant filtered water from Lake Davis for domestic use of the City of Portola and Crocker

Mountain. Wells have been drilled by the county to provide water for Crocker Mountain on an interim basis.

The Grand Jury interviewed a former Plumas County Supervisor, the Plumas County Public Works Director, two employees of the GLRID and a member of the GLRID Board of Directors.

Findings

1. The original well did not supply enough water for existing residences in Crocker Mountain. Using \$ 1 0,000 from Plumas County (see report on Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for source of funds) the well was improved. Enough water is now available for existing residences of Crocker Mountain.
2. There is a building moratorium on new construction in the Crocker Mountain area. The GLRID plans to provide a new water storage tank by July or August 2004 to provide adequate water pressure to serve all of Crocker Mountain. The building moratorium will be lifted at that time.
3. The county is in the process of obtaining funding for a new water filtration plant to provide water for the City of Portola and Crocker Mountain. Completion of the plant is expected in 2006.
4. The GLRID Board of Directors holds monthly meetings. The agenda is posted in four places in the district, including a bulletin board at Crocker Mountain. Copies of the minutes are available for the public at the GLRID office. The public comment section of the agenda does not appear on the agenda, but the public is invited to make comment throughout the meeting.
5. As of May 2004, four members of the board are from Delieker and one from Crocker Mountain. Vacancies on the board are posted with meeting notices, indicated in bills to customers and sent to the county clerk.
6. Maps of both serving areas, Crocker Mountain and Delieker, are posted and available at the GLRID office.

Response

The grand jury concluded there is no longer any basis for this complaint.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends:

Public comment should be added to the agenda of board meetings.

COMPLAINT #03/04-05

Nature of Complaint

Parents of a teenager submitted a complaint alleging their son had received an unfair trial in 2003.

Response

The Complainants were advised that because their complaint involved the criminal justice system, it was not within the jurisdiction of this Grand Jury.

Complaint #03/04-06

Nature of Complaint

A citizen submitted a complaint asking if the Solid Waste Fee on his county property tax bill is legal. The Solid Waste Fee listing on the bill falls under the heading "Voter Approved Taxes, Taxing Agency Direct Charges, and Special Assessments," and the complainant states that he has never voted on this issue. He wanted the Grand Jury to determine if the fee is legal and if so, how long can it be imposed.

Findings

1. On March 27, 1990, Board of Supervisors (BOS) Resolution No. 90-5004 provided for a county trust fund to meet state-mandated requirements for funding the eventual closures of the Gopher Hill and Chester landfills. The resolution states "WHEREAS, engineers in the county's Department of Public Works have prepared initial landfill closure cost estimates showing that: the cost of closing Gopher Hill in five years will be met by depositing approximately \$130,446 annually in a trust fund with CIWMB (the California Integrated Waste Management Board) as beneficiary; and the cost of **closing Chester in twenty-five** years will be met by depositing \$197,431 annually in a trust fund with CIWMB as beneficiary; such deposits generating a total of \$5,588,008 (includes 20 percent contingency required by CIWMB); and (emphasis added) The BOS also stated in the resolution "...Further, the board intends to present to the voters of the county in April 1991 the choices available for funding solid waste mandates ... long-term borrowing, raising new revenues through user fees or taxes, or trimming the budget by deleting existing programs and services that are local options." The Grand Jury has been advised that no public election was held on that issue.
2. On June 18, 1991, Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 91-5191 established the solid waste generation fee of \$38.00 per year per residential equivalent for parcels in unincorporated county areas in order to meet the funding requirements of Resolution No. 90-5004. Section 5 of the resolution says, in part, "The 1991 solid waste generation fee shall be billed and collected with the FY 1991-92 property taxes by the County tax collector. **The fee shall be deemed a type of 'user fee' charged for the privilege of using or having available for use the county landfills.**" (emphasis added)

3. The solid waste fee has been renewed by the Board of Supervisors each year since. In fee-renewing Resolution No. 97-6021, dated April 15, 1997, the BOS specified that it "...relies on advice of County Counsel as to the legality of this fee and the manner of its continuation. ... The fee is a **'property-related service fee'** under Section 6 of Proposition 218 which takes effect on July 1, 1997. (emphasis added)
4. The fee-renewing BOS Resolution No. 03-6869, dated June 3, 2003, under findings and declarations, restates the Proposition 218 reference, cites an opinion letter from the Legislative Counsel of California and states that "... any incidental reference to the fee as a 'tax' or 'assessment' shall not be construed so as to change the nature of the fee from that of a property-related service fee."
5. The Director of Public Works advised the Grand Jury that the total solid waste generation fee revenues from fiscal years 1992/1993 through June 2004 will have totaled over \$7.5 million. Of this total, the closure trust fund has accumulated \$3.99 million. The Director of Public Works further reports "The remainder of the funds have been spent solely on solid waste budgeted items. This includes the construction of three transfer stations and the ongoing maintenance of the system as well as trying to satisfy all of the requirements of the state for solid waste compliance items." The accumulated trust fund of \$3.99 million is short of the 1990 goal of \$5.58 million.
6. The closure of Gopher Hill Landfill, originally predicted for 1995, is scheduled for the summer of 2004. A contract with a value of \$1.53 million has been awarded to Joy Engineering for this project.

Response

The Grand Jury could find no illegality about the Solid Waste Fee. The BOS has, in multiple documents, stated that it is a user fee and, in Resolution 97-6021, that the BOS had consulted County Counsel. Since the Solid Waste Fee is renewed annually by vote of the BOS, the duration of its imposition is up to the BOS.

Complaint #03/04-07

Nature of Complaint

A citizen submitted a complaint against a County Supervisor charging a violation of Government Code Sections 6250-6270, the California Public Records Act (CPRA). The complainant stated that he was unable to gain full access to a file used by the Supervisor at a public hearing regarding authorization of a Special Use Permit.

Background

The complainant had informally requested access to the file in May 2003. On June 18, 2003, he submitted to the Supervisor a formal request for access to the file and to the previous Supervisor's file on the subject (then in the possession of the current Supervisor), which the previous Supervisor had informed him was public information.

Copies were sent to County Counsel and the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors. Complainant received a letter dated July 15, 2003 from County Counsel informing him that a copy of the first file was in his office and could be picked up or mailed. Complainant found that two items from the file had been excluded. He received another letter from County Counsel, dated August 14, 2003 and informing him that the previous Supervisor's file was available for inspection in County Counsel's office.

When the complainant came before the Grand Jury in December, he still had not gained access to the raw file originally requested. It was suggested that he submit another request to the new County Counsel. He was granted access to the file early this year.

The CPRA specifies that an agency receiving a request for access to documents has 1 days to decide whether or not they must comply. If they decide the documents are exempt from disclosure the agency must cite reasons for denial. If the documents are not exempt, the agency must make them available within another 14 days.

Findings

1. The complainant did not gain access to the requested documents within the time prescribed by law.
2. The county has no formal procedure for handling requests under the CPRA.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends:

1. The Board of Supervisors develop standardized procedures to achieve compliance with the CPRA.

COMPLAINT #03/04-08

Nature of Complaint

A citizen submitted a complaint against the Plumas County Sheriff's Department alleging lack of follow-up on a death threat and confiscation of Complainant's property.

Response

Complainant has been advised this matter is not within the jurisdiction of this Grand Jury due to criminal allegations made in this complaint.

COMPLAINT #03/04-09

Nature of Complaint

A citizen submitted a complaint alleging wrongful and retaliatory termination of employment from Plumas District Hospital (PDH).

Response

Following interviews and legal advice, the Grand Jury determined that this complaint is predominantly an employment dispute and that this complaint does not fall within the scope of the Grand Jury's jurisdiction.

COMPLAINT #03/04-10

Nature of Complaint

A county employee submitted a complaint against members of the Board of Supervisors alleging wrong doing regarding a salary issue.

Response

The complainant was advised that the complaint did not provide sufficient information for the Grand Jury to evaluate the merits of the complaint and asked that it be resubmitted with additional information.

COMPLAINT #03/04-11

Nature of Complaint

A citizen submitted a complaint alleging improper job posting, nepotism and improper pre-disciplinary hearing at the Plumas County Health Agency.

Response

A thorough review and investigation of the Plumas County Health Agency had been conducted prior to the submitted complaint.

The findings of the Grand Jury's investigation into the Health Agency indicated that the complaint was without merit.

APPENDIX A

The following is a list of some recommendations from the Grand Jury (GJ) reports and the Board of Supervisors (BOS) response. In some cases the BOS agreed with the recommendation and stated an action date for completion. The GJ could find no evidence that action was taken by the BOS nor that the completion date was met.

2002/2003 Planning Department

GJ Recommendation #2

"2. That the General Plan be reviewed and revised with regard to fire protection issues in Plumas County. The County Fire Warden, Fire District Chiefs and CDF should be consulted and be instrumental partners in this review".

BOS Response

"We agree that the General Plan should be reviewed with regard to fire protection issues in Plumas County. We also agree that the Fire Chiefs of the various districts and CDF should be consulted as part of this review. If necessary, revisions can be brought forward to amend the County's General Plan. We are directing the Planning Director to return with a report on the process at an estimated time frame no later than January, 2004."

GJ Recommendation #3

"3. That personal meetings between county department heads and State and Federal agencies be held on a scheduled basis in order to build inter agency rapport and cooperation ".

BOS Response

"We believe that this recommendation needs further analysis and the Planning Director is in the process of contacting the various agencies to specifically identify what problems or issues exist and will return with a recommendation for resolving the issues that would be acceptable to the various parties. This should be accomplished no later than December, 2003."

2002/2003 Fire Districts

GJ Recommendation #1

"1. That the Board of Supervisors form a Fire District Consolidation Committee, with members including the County Fire Warden, Fire District Chiefs, Executive Director of LAFCO and a representative of both CDF and Fire Safe Council to determine the feasibility of establishing three to five regional fire departments within the County. The Grand Jury urges the Board of Supervisors to make this a high priority and coordinate closely with LAFCO's Executive Director."

APPENDIX A (continued)

BOS Response

"The Board of Supervisors agrees to form a Fire District Consolidation Committee which would include the County Fire Warden, Fire Chiefs for the various Districts, the Executive Director of LAFCO, John Guilixson, as well as representatives from the Fire Safe Council and CDF. The County Administrative Officer would also be part of this committee. A letter will go out asking each of the Districts, as well as the other entities to designate a representative so that a meeting can be scheduled sometime in the near future."

NOTE: The Grand Jury has determined no letter ever was sent to the individuals noted above. On or about May 27, 2004 there was a meeting attended by some, Fire Chiefs, the County Administrative Officer (CAO), the County Fire Warden and two representatives of the CDF. The meeting was moderated by the Planning Director. There was no agenda nor written goals and objectives of the meeting. The Grand Jury does not believe this meeting complies with the spirit of the recommendation contained in last year's report. The Grand Jury recommends that the CAO assume control of this recommendation and hold meetings at an appropriate time when all the fire chiefs can attend and participate.

GJ Recommendation #2

"2. That the proposed Fire District Consolidation Committee advise the boards of County Fire Districts on methods to increase funding, including but not limited to, developer and user fees. The Grand Jury recognizes that this is a cumbersome, legalistic and political process, nevertheless, the Board of Supervisors should do everything necessary to provide the committee with expertise in raising fees and exactions to property fund the fire protection effort within Plumas County."

BOS Response

"The Board of Supervisors has always encouraged Fire Districts to consolidate areas and in order to provide enhanced services whenever possible within budgetary limitations the Board will, through its staff, provide what assistance it can with regard to fees, exactions and organization."

GJ Recommendation #4

"4. That the Board of Supervisors empower and direct the County Fire Warden to determine which areas in the county are not covered by a fire district and advise LAFCO, so that those areas can be annexed into a fire district."

APPENDIX A (Continued)

BOS Response

"The Board of Supervisors will direct the County Fire Warden to work with the Planning Director to determine which areas in the County are not covered by a Fire District and provide that information to LAFCO. The questions of whether or not those areas can or should be annexed into a Fire District is something for the District and the residents of the non-annexed areas to consider along with the Local Agency Formation Commission."

2001-2002 Fire Districts

Recommendation #2

"2. That residents living outside of a fire district consider annexation to an adjacent district to improve their fire protections."

BOS Response

No response

Recommendation #3

"3. That Fire Districts pursue available grants to assist with their needs. The County Fire Warden, working with the Fire Officers' Association, could assist with this effort. The Vision 2020 program may be able to provide assistance with grants in the near future."

BOS Response

No response.

Recommendation #4

"4. That the County Fire Warden, in collaboration with the Fire Officers' Association, coordinates implementation of countywide standardized training and safety programs. Additional funding through the County Fire Warden's office should assist in these endeavors. Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 Title HI funding, in addition to other grants, could be utilized."

BOS Response

No response.

APPENDIX A (continued)

Recommendation #5

"5. That the Board of Supervisors clarify the County Fire Warden's job description in regard to countywide enforcement of all laws and ordinances, rules and regulations relating to fires or to fire prevention and protection, as addressed in Government Code Section 24008."

BOS Response

"Response: The recommendation will be implemented by March, 2003, or shortly thereafter in the CAO's discretion."

Recommendation #6

"6. That all Fire Chiefs, or their representatives, participate in the Plumas County Fire Officers' Association."

BOS Response

No response

2001-2002 Plumas County Purchasing Procedure

Recommendation #4

"4. That the purchasing officer should be charged with preparing guidelines for purchasing; especially in areas like office supplies, computers and printers and office furniture so that savings may be realized through bulk buying."

BOS Response

"RESPONSE: This recommendation requires further analysis, which will be concluded by mid-February, 2003.

1999-2000 Building Department:

Recommendation #1

"1. The Board of Supervisors should set forth protocol to better evaluate performance of the Building official (and other department heads). The protocol should include input from employees within the department as well as those individuals or agencies served by the department."

APPENDIX A (continued)

BOS Response

"Recommendation No. 1. Existing performance review forms and procedures apply to all employees, including department heads. A special department head performance review protocol will be drafted for consideration by the Board of Supervisors prior to March 31, 2001."

1999-2000 Human Resources

Recommendation #1

"1. That the county move expeditiously towards solving the space needs of the Human Resources Department."

BOS Response

"Recommendation No. 1. The county is moving expeditiously toward solving the space needs of the Human Resources Department. There appears to be a leasing/purchase opportunity at the old Fidelity Title Building across from the courthouse on Court St. The Courthouse itself has no room for expansion of the HR Department."

Recommendation # 6

"6. That a formal evaluation procedure be developed for department heads and management which incorporates input from employees and other departments or advocacy groups."

BOS Response

"Recommendation No. 6. Existing performance review forms and procedures apply to all employees. Special department head performance review protocol, which includes input from employees and other, will be drafted for consideration by the Board of Supervisors prior to March 31, 2001."

APPENDIX B

Plumas County Grand Jury Evaluations

DEPARTMENT/ AGENCY/PROGRAM	Earlier Years	2000- 2001	2001- 2002	2002- 2003	2003- 2004
Administrative/CAO	95-96		X		
Assessor	95-96, 98-99				
Auditor/Controller			X		
Board of Supervisors			X		
Clerk/Recorder			X inc.		
Chamber of Commerce					
Information Technology	99-00				
Fair			X		
Farm Advisor					
Law Library	99-00				
Library	98-99				
Literacy Program	98-99				
Museum	98-99				
Human Resources	99-00				X
Treasurer/Tax Collector	98-99				
Alcohol and Drug	95-96		X inc.		
Senior Services					
District Attorney – Family Support Division	97-98				
Mental Health	95-96, 99-00				
Plumas County Public Health Agency					X
Public Administrator					
Public Guardian/Conservator	99-00				
Sierra House	99-00				
Social Services	95-96				
Veteran’s Services	95-96				
Animal Control	95-96		X	X	
County Counsel					
District Attorney	98-99				
Fish and Game Commission					
Jail	98-99		X	X	X
Victim Witness					
Office of Emergency Services					
Probation	98-99		X		X
Juvenile Hall				X	

APPENDIX B (continued)

Plumas County Grand Jury Evaluations

DEPARTMENT/ AGENCY/PROGRAM	Earlier Years	2000- 2001	2001- 2002	2002- 2003	2003- 2004
Public Defender					
Sheriff/Coroner	95-96, 96-97, 98-99		X		
Fire			X	X	
Ag. Commissioner					
Engineering					
Environmental Health					
Housing and Community Development					
Local Agency Formation Commission					
Planning				X	
Public Works	95-96, 97-98, 98-99		X		
Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District					X
Airport Operations					
Building	99-00			X	
Building and Grounds	99-00				
Extension Office	95-96				
Central Plumas Recreation District	95-96				
Greenville Nutrition	95-96				
Plumas Corporation			X		
Plumas District Hospital			X		
Indian Valley Community Services District				X	
Plumas Unified School District				X	X