

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.



**Recommendation 2:** The County Auditor/Controller should release the final audit report within a reasonable timeframe to allow for Grand Jury review and questions prior to the scheduled County Audit Committee final review meeting.

**Finding 3:** The County Audit Committee final review meeting was scheduled one hour prior to final audit presentation to the Board of Supervisors.

**Recommendation 3:** The County Audit Committee final review should take place at least one week prior to presentation of the report to the Board of Supervisors to allow for any necessary changes found during the final audit review.

**Finding 4:** The Board of Supervisors representatives were not present at any of the County Audit Committee meetings.

**Recommendation 4:** The two members of the Board of Supervisors appointed to the County Audit Committee should attend the meetings.

**Finding 5:** The two members of the 2009-2010 Grand Jury Audit Committee had substantial professional work experience in public sector finance and accounting that made their participation on the County Audit Committee reasonably easy. Future years' Grand Jury participants may not have that sort of professional background.

**Recommendation 5:** The County Auditor/Controller, as committee facilitator, needs to be highly sensitive to the diverse backgrounds of the Grand Juror participants to assure full understanding of both the governmental audit process, as well as, any resulting findings.

## Summary of Citizen Complaints

### **Complaint C1 000000 (carried over from 2008-2009 Grand Jury)**

Complaint against the Plumas County Sheriff's office for failing to arrest an alleged assailant. Complainant also stated that the Plumas County District Attorney had refused to investigate the situation.

The Plumas County Grand Jury determined that an investigation should be conducted into policy and procedures at the Plumas County Sheriff's Department. However, this Grand Jury was unable to conduct the investigation and recommended it to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury (see Appendix B, Plumas County Grand Jury History of Investigations).

### **Complaint C2 050909 (carried over from 2008-2009 Grand Jury)**

Complaint against the Plumas County Probation Department procedures in processing a juvenile through arrest, incarceration, transfer to a detention facility and to a residential treatment center. The principal complaint was against the tone of voice used by the Probation Officer and the lack of psychological testing prior to placing a juvenile in a detention or other holding facility.

The Plumas County Grand Jury determined that an investigation should be conducted into policy and procedures at the Plumas County Probation Department. However, this Grand Jury was unable to conduct the investigation and recommended it to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury (see Appendix B, Plumas County Grand Jury History of Investigations).

### **Complaint C3 062309 (carried over from 2008-2009 Grand Jury)**

Complaint against the Plumas County Probation Department regarding procedures in processing a juvenile transfer to a detention facility.

The Plumas County Grand Jury determined that an investigation should be conducted into policy and procedures at the Plumas County Probation Department. However, this Grand Jury was unable to conduct the investigation and recommended it to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury (see Appendix B, Plumas County Grand Jury History of Investigations).

### **Complaint C4 080309**

Complaint against the Plumas County Probation Department procedures in processing documents and in the placement of a juvenile in a juvenile facility.

The Plumas County Grand Jury determined that an investigation should be conducted into policy and procedures at the Plumas County Probation Department. However, this Grand Jury was unable to conduct the investigation and recommended it to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury (see Appendix B, Plumas County Grand Jury History of Investigations).

**Complaint C5 052109**

Complaint against a State of California Child Protective Services attorney for failure to properly represent educational and other needs of foster children.

The Plumas County Grand Jury investigates Plumas County departments and organizations funded by Plumas County. The complaint did not fall under the jurisdiction of this Grand Jury.

While the Plumas County Grand Jury does not investigate State agencies and personnel, with concurrence of complainant, this complaint was referred to California Superior Court Judge Ira Kaufman, at his request.

**Complaint C6 092309**

Complaint against the Plumas County Sheriff's Office and a county District Attorney for failure to prosecute a case of alleged juvenile rape.

Although the Plumas County Grand Jury is civil in nature and this complaint did not fall under the jurisdiction of this Grand Jury, under advisement from California Superior Court Judges Kaufman and Hilde, and with concurrence of complainant, the Grand Jury referred the complaint to the California State Attorney General. The Attorney General determined that no action was required. The Plumas County Grand Jury closed the complaint.

**Complaint 7 092209**

Complaint against a Plumas County Board Supervisor and a Planning Department Director regarding approval of a new housing development in the county. The complaint alleges collusion and conflict of interest in the process.

The Plumas County Grand Jury had determined to review land development processes in Plumas County and had formed an investigative committee for said purpose. Refer to Development Approval investigative report which is part of this Final Report.

The Plumas County Grand Jury also interviewed County Counsel regarding conflict of interest when a Board member sits on boards of other county entities, such as a water district. Refer to Development Approval investigative report which is part of this Final Report.

**Complaint 8 111809**

Complaint against a Plumas County community development employee; judicial assistance was requested.

The Plumas County Grand Jury is civil in nature. The complaint did not fall under the jurisdiction of this Grand Jury and was, therefore, closed.

**Complaint 9 111709**

Complaint against Plumas County Animal Services requesting removal of a county employee for endangering the welfare of animals and the safety of people. Complaint content acknowledged that Plumas County Human Resources was expected to take