



NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY

**P.O. BOX 5397
NAPA, CALIFORNIA 94581**

The Honorable Scott Snowden
Presiding Judge
Napa County Superior Court
825 Brown Street
Napa, CA 94559

June 23, 2004

Dear Judge Snowden:

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933, the 2003-2004 Napa County Grand Jury submits to you its 2003-2004 Final Report. Our investigations were conducted in a manner consistent with the historic role of the Grand Jury -- to protect the interests of the citizens of Napa County

The members of this Grand Jury came from widely diverse backgrounds and from all geographic areas of the County. They have given selflessly of their time and talents to serve the citizens of Napa County. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to work with them.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Ann Carroll

Mary Ann Carroll, Foreperson
2003-2004 Napa County Grand Jury

To the Citizens of Napa County:

We, the members of the 2003 - 2004 Napa County Grand Jury, are pleased to present our final report.

The role of the Grand Jury is to serve as a watchdog over public agencies in Napa County. The 2003 - 2004 Grand Jury conducted investigations into the operation and management practices of eight agencies. We also investigated a number of citizen complaints.

Our final report includes:

- A description of how we conducted the business of the Grand Jury.
- Required Reports – the results of investigations that are conducted pursuant to Penal Code Section 199, which states in part, “Every County Grand Jury will inquire into the condition and management of public prisons in the County.”
- Investigation Reports – the results of our investigation into other agencies that are examined on a regular, rotating basis.
- A report on the extent to which County agencies are implementing the recommendations of the 2002 - 2003 Grand Jury.

Napa County Counsel has reviewed this final report, and the Presiding Judge of the Napa County Superior Court has certified that the report complies with Title 4 of the California Penal Code. The final report has also been accepted and filed as a public document by the County Clerk.

Copies of the final report are available for your review in the Napa City Library and online by following the link to *Grand Jury* at <http://www.napa.courts.ca.gov/>

It has been a pleasure to serve you over the course of the last twelve months. We hope you find the final report interesting and informative.

2003-2004 Napa County Grand Jurors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I 2003-2004 Napa County Grand Jurors	2
II Foreperson's Letter to Presiding Judge	3
III Grand Jury letter to Citizens of Napa County	4
Acknowledgments	6
Function of Grand Jury	7
Notes to Respondents	10
IV 2003-2004 Grand Jury Report	
Auditor-Controller Department Report	12
City of Napa Community Development Division Report	16
Napa County Jail Report	19
Napa County Juvenile Hall Report	21
Napa County Mosquito Abatement Report	24
Napa County Office of Education School Age Child Development Program Report	28
Napa Sanitation District Report	33
Responses to 2002-2003 Grand Jury Final Report	47
Water Report	49
V Citizens Complaints to Grand Jury	57
VI Citizen Complaint Form	58

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

**The 2003-2004 Napa County Grand Jury wishes to
acknowledge the assistance of the following:**

The Honorable Stephen T. Kroyer, Napa County Superior Court

Robert Westmeyer, Napa County Counsel

Patricia Tyrrell, Deputy County Counsel

Georgene Larson, Assistant Court Executive Officer

Rachel Cryor, Fiscal Department, Napa County

Maxine Edwards, Fiscal Department, Napa County

Pat Grisham, Secretary, Napa County Administrator's Office

Helene Franchi, Analyst, Napa County Administrator's Office

Joseph G. Peatman, President, Gasser Foundation

Nielann A. Martinez, Office Manager, Gasser Foundation

Linda Waterbury, Administrative Assistant, Gasser Foundation

Napa County Grand Juror's Association

California Grand Juror's Association

The Families of the Grand Jury Members

Cover and Grand Jury Member Photograph by Marissa Carlisle, "Photos By Marissa"

FUNCTION OF THE GRAND JURY

The Grand Jury

The primary function of the Grand Jury is to examine all aspects of local government, including county and city agencies and special districts. The nineteen-member Grand Jury in Napa County conducts non-criminal investigations to ensure that governmental funds are judiciously used, that services are effectively delivered, and that all accounts are properly audited.

The Grand Jury is an independent and confidential body. The Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, the District Attorney, the County Counsel and the State Attorney General can, and do, provide advice, but they may not, except for legal cause, prevent the body from acting within its jurisdiction.

A county Grand Jury does not have jurisdiction in state and federal matters and cannot investigate state or federal agencies. Nor does it have any jurisdiction over the courts or a matter that is in litigation. But, in general, governmental bodies within Napa County, and events involving those bodies, can be investigated by the Grand Jury.

Grand Jurors are expected to be fair, to show sound judgment, to maintain absolute confidentiality, and to serve as representatives of the public. Therefore, the Grand Jury is not the forum from which to express narrow political ideals or viewpoints, but is, rather, the organization that seeks to better the government that presently exists. Members are selected from among Napa County residents. Beginning in 1993, all residents were offered an opportunity to volunteer. Judges and friends of the court also may nominate county residents. Up to ten members, in their initial term of service, may volunteer to hold over for one additional year. Each Grand Jury is impaneled for one year, from July 1 through the following June 30.

Napa County residents who are interested in serving as Grand Jurors are encouraged to apply. To be considered, an applicant must:

- Be a citizen of the United States and at least 18 years old
- Have resided in Napa County for at least one year
- Have ordinary intelligence and good character
- Possess a working knowledge of the English language
- Not currently be serving as a trial juror
- Not have been a Grand Juror within one year of being selected (except holdovers)
- Not have been convicted of a felony or malfeasance in office
- Not currently be serving as an elected official

Interested citizens should write to the Superior Court, Napa County, Suite 125, 825 Brown Street, Napa 94559, or call 299-1113 to volunteer or nominate someone. To find out more, visit the Grand Jury website at www.napa.courts.gov/.

The Grand Jury is an arm of the court system rather than the District Attorney's Office and is not a law enforcement agency. For the most part, Grand Juries function as civil grand juries rather than criminal grand juries. The reason for this is that preliminary hearings in the Courts have, in general, taken the place of criminal indictments by grand juries. In the federal system, the rule is the opposite because the United States Constitution requires Grand Jury indictments for all serious federal crimes.

A Grand Jury has very limited powers. The California Supreme Court has held that the Grand Jury does not have inherent powers to establish its own investigative apparatus for the detection of crime. Moreover, a Grand Jury should not engage in fishing expeditions, have hidden agendas, or meddle indiscriminately. The scope of inquiry of a Grand Jury is limited to those subjects that are founded upon knowledge which comes to the Grand Jury and by information acquired from Grand Jury investigations or from individual Grand Jurors' own observations. For the most part, Grand Jurors are charged with investigating the operations, accounts and records of the officers and departments of local government, and the method or system those officers and departments employ in performing their duties.

A Grand Jury conducts investigations and then reports on its investigations to the general public after its reports have been reviewed and approved for release by the court. Although approval by the court precedes the release of the Grand Jury Report, the court does not have the right to require changes to the Grand Jury Report. The reports are usually issued in the form of a Final Report that is published at the end of the Grand Jury's year of service.

In extraordinary circumstances, the Grand Jury may become a participant in the legal process to remove from office, or indict, a government official, but any such action initiated by a Grand Jury must be based on facts substantiated and confirmed by the Grand Jury's own investigation. The Grand Jury can take no action based solely on allegations of other parties.

California law provides for civil and criminal functions for Grand Juries. While a Grand Jury may function also as a criminal Grand Jury, it is unlikely that would occur. Were a criminal matter to be taken up by a Grand Jury at the request of the District Attorney, it is likely that a separate Grand Jury would be convened for that purpose.

How investigations are conducted

Jurors initially meet with the management and staff of an agency. The various records of the agency are inspected, the physical facilities are inspected, and representative public meetings, if any, are attended. Leads are followed that might provide additional information. Eventually, proposed findings and recommendations are developed.

Citizen complaints and letters to the Grand Jury

Correspondence is received occasionally from citizens expressing concern or requesting investigation of various city agencies, county agencies and special districts. Each complaint is reviewed by the Grand Jury and action is taken to either (1) investigate the matter and make a report; (2) investigate the matter and drop it; or (3) drop the matter without investigation. It is best to submit any complaint or request at the beginning of the jury term so that the Grand Jury will have sufficient time to investigate the matter. Due to the constraints of time, a Grand Jury may refer a complaint to the subsequent year's Grand Jury.

What happens after the Grand Jury's Final Report is published

Copies of the Grand Jury Final Report are maintained on file in the office of the Court Executive Officer and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, where they remain accessible to the public. Final Reports are also available at county libraries, published in the newspapers and on the following website, www.napa.courts.ca.gov. Agencies that are required to make responses must respond in writing to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, Napa County, within 60 to 90 days after publication of the Report. The responses must be placed on file with the clerk of the investigated agency and at the office of the Court Executive Officer, and may be accessed by the public at those locations.

NOTE TO RESPONDENTS

The legal requirements for response to Grand Jury findings and recommendations are set forth in California Penal Code, Section 933.05. Each Respondent should become familiar with those legal requirements and, if in doubt, should consult with legal counsel before responding. For the assistance of Respondents, Section 933.05 of the Penal Code is summarized below.

How to respond to findings

The responding person or entity must respond in one of two ways:

1. That there is agreement with the finding.
2. That there is disagreement, wholly or partially, with the finding. In such a case, the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons for the disagreement.

How to report action taken in response to a finding and recommendation

Recommendations by the Grand Jury require action. The responding person or entity must report action on each recommendation in one of four ways:

1. The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary of actions taken.
2. The recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.
3. The recommendation requires further analysis. If a Respondent replies in this manner, the law requires a detailed explanation of the analysis or study and a time frame not to exceed six months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury Final Report by which the recommendation will be discussed.
4. The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation as to why it is not warranted or reasonable.

Budgetary or personnel recommendations

If a finding or recommendation deals with the budgetary or personnel matters of a county department headed by an elected officer, both the elected officer and the Board of Supervisors shall respond, if the Grand Jury so requests. While the response of the Board of Supervisors may be somewhat limited, the response by the department head must address all aspects of the findings and recommendations.

Advance release of Grand Jury Report

Two working days prior to public release of the Final Report, the Grand Jury is required to provide a copy of the pertinent portion of the report to each affected agency or person. *No officer, agency, department, or governing body of a public agency shall disclose any contents of the report prior to its public release.*

Time to respond; to whom to respond

The Penal Code provides for two different response methods:

1. For a Public Agency: The governing body (i.e. the Board of Supervisors, a City Council, Board of Governors of a special district, etc.) of the public agency must respond within ninety days after public release of the Final Report. The response must be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.
2. For an Elected Officer or an Agency Head: All elected officers or heads of agencies who are required to respond must do so within sixty days after public release of the Final Report. The response must be addressed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, with an information copy to the Board of Supervisors.

Napa County Grand Jury 2003-2004 Auditor-Controller Department Report

Summary

In conducting its investigation, the Grand Jury Audit Committee met with the Chief Executive Officer of Napa County, the Napa County Auditor-Controller and the Napa County outside auditors about an ongoing concern noted in previous Grand Jury Reports regarding the Auditor-Controller Department's difficulty in completing preparations for the audit and closing accounting records in a timely manner. The Auditor-Controller and the Chief Executive Officer believe that these concerns are being adequately and affirmatively addressed with additional application training and Information Technology Department support. The County has also begun to put into place software that will for the first time ensure supervisory oversight of the timekeeping function as well as provide project management and costing information previously unavailable to managers.

The external auditors examined the ledgers of the Napa County Jail and noted that year-end cash balances for two accounts held for inmates were not reconciled. However, a system has been proposed to cure these deficiencies.

The Grand Jury received a complaint alleging that Proposition 172 monies were not allocated as an addition to the basic budget for public protection services but rather in lieu of the basic budget. The auditors confirmed that Proposition 172 funds were additive to the general funds and disbursement of the Proposition 172 funds was in compliance with the law.

Background

The Grand Jury Audit Committee's mandate is to investigate the means and methods by which the management of Napa County has established, monitored and maintained internal control over the revenues and expenditures of the various county agencies. The objectives of the internal control system are to provide management with reasonable assurance that Napa County's assets are safeguarded against loss from unauthorized use or disposition and that transactions are properly executed and recorded to permit the preparation of basic financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards.

Methodology

In conducting its investigation, the Grand Jury Audit Committee interviewed:

- The Napa County Auditor-Controller
- The Napa County outside auditors - Bartig, Basler & Ray (BB&R)

- Napa County's Chief Executive Officer
- The North Bay Employment Connection (NBEC)

Discussion

The Auditor-Controller department has a laudably stable work environment with little or no employee turnover and, in general, does a very good job conducting procedures to close the annual accounts and book of the County. There has, however, been an ongoing concern noted in previous Grand Jury reports and in annual management reports about the Department's inability to complete the preparations for the annual audit and to close accounting records in a timely, efficient and cost-effective manner. The Auditor-Controller and the Chief Executive Officer believe that these concerns are being adequately and affirmatively addressed with additional application training and IT Department support. The preparation of financial statements is the responsibility of the management of Napa County and the audit is made for the purpose of allowing the outside auditors to express an opinion on those financial statements.

The IT Department is currently implementing an updated version of the PeopleSoft platform for financial reporting. This new software will enable the County to provide the outside auditors with closing statements on a more timely basis and in turn provide County management with earlier access to the audited financial statements.

Proposition 172

In 1993, the passage of Proposition 172 amended the California State Constitution to provide a dedicated revenue source for public safety purposes. Known as the Local Public Safety Protection and Improvement Act, it imposed an additional one-half of one percent state sales tax effective January 1, 1994.

During the course of its investigation, the Grand Jury learned that there was a question whether Proposition 172 funds were properly allocated to the Sheriff's Department. The Grand Jury investigated this matter and concluded that Napa County was in compliance with Proposition 172. This determination was in accordance with the opinion of the California Attorney General. The Grand Jury also investigated the disbursement of Proposition 172 monies to see if they were allocated as an addition to the basic budget for protection services, or if they were being used in lieu of the basic budget. The auditors confirmed that the allocation of Proposition 172 funds was additive to the general funds and in compliance with the law.

Napa County Jail Inmate Cash Trust

During the outside auditor's audit of the Inmate Cash Trust, the auditors noted that the ledgers of the Napa County Jail were not reconciled. Due to a lack of proper and appropriate detail in the collection and disbursement of inmate cash

funds, the Treasury and the Corrections Department were not able to reconcile the balances held by individual inmates. Under these circumstances, the potential for fraud and/or embezzlement increases and the likelihood of collecting excess disbursements diminishes.

Innovative Demonstration Grants for Youths with Disabilities

Napa County is the designated operational center for the North Bay Employment Connection, which serves Napa, Solano, Marin and Sonoma Counties. NBEC is a one-stop center for a group of organizations dedicated to assisting displaced employees and those with limited skills. NBEC falls under the jurisdiction of the Assistant County Administrator, and the Napa County Auditor-Controller has fiscal responsibility for all the grants and other funds received by NBEC.

During the audit of grants administered by NBEC, thirty-four employee personnel activity reports were examined. It was determined that signatures were missing on two of the reports. Employee signatures on personnel activity reports provide a good safeguard against incorrect charging of personnel costs to federal programs.

Finding 1

The Auditor-Controller's staff lacks the skills to implement the new version of the PeopleSoft software.

Recommendation 1:

The Auditor-Controller should ensure that the staff receives the requisite training.

Response Requested:

Auditor-Controller
Chief Executive Officer

Finding 2:

There are discrepancies in the cash reconciliation process.

Recommendation 2:

The general ledger should be reconciled each month.

Response Requested:

Auditor-Controller

Finding 3:

The County Treasury and the Department of Corrections lack an effective system to guarantee that inmate funds are collected and disbursed in the appropriate manner.

Recommendation 3:

The Treasury department and the Corrections department should:

- Investigate the source of excess funds and return the funds to their proper source.
- Locate the individuals to whom the outstanding balances are owed and return the money to them promptly.
- Always examine the cash history ledger and verify balances before disbursing monies to inmates.

Response Requested:

- Treasury Department
- Department of Corrections

Finding 4:

Two personnel activity reports in the Demonstration Grants for Youth with Disabilities lacked employee signatures in violation of Office of Management and Budget regulations.

Recommendation 4:

NBEC should develop a review process to ensure that personnel activity reports are signed by the employee.

Response Requested:

North Bay Employment Connection

Napa County Grand Jury 2003-2004 City of Napa Community Development Division Report

Summary

In 2003, the City of Napa combined the Departments of Planning, Building, Development Engineering and Code Enforcement into a single Division under a Director of Community Development following a study by Maximus, a management and financial services consultant. Although the reorganization has been implemented for only a few months, the Grand Jury was impressed by the accomplishments that have been achieved thus far and by the plans of the new Division to be more responsive to community needs. The Grand Jury recommends that a formal survey be conducted within the next six months to evaluate the results of the reorganization.

Background

The Grand Jury received a complaint from a citizen alleging unfair treatment by the Napa Building Department during the remodeling of a house purchased in 1997. Specific complaints about the Building Department included:

- Poor customer relations
- Out-of-date building codes
- Building inspectors who are less knowledgeable than the private sector
- Lack of coordination between building inspectors and plan readers

In response, the Grand Jury investigated the practices and procedures of the Building Department to determine if it was operating in accordance with City regulations and in the best interests of the community.

The City of Napa combined the Departments of Planning, Building, Development Engineering and Code Enforcement into the Community Development Division in 2003 following a study by Maximus, an outside consultant. The study, commissioned by the City Council upon the recommendation of the City Manager, was completed in December 2002. In the summer of 2003, a Director of Community Development was hired with the mandate to implement the recommendations of the study.

Methodology

During its investigation, the Grand Jury:

- Conducted two interviews with the Director of Community Development
- Reviewed an "Assessment of the Development Review Process" by Maximus

- Reviewed input from the Napa City Manager

Discussion

The Grand Jury met with the Director of Community Development to discuss the Maximus study. The study looked at document processing, from project planning through the issuance of certificates of occupancy. The Director outlined the steps that were being taken to improve procedures and the cooperation of the four departments that had been combined under his leadership. Though on the job for only a few months, the Director cited the following accomplishments:

Building Division

- Adopted the 2001 California Building Codes, replacing the 1987 Codes
- Prepared more than 40 user handouts for patio covers, decks and code interpretations
- Modified the routing and review process for small projects to eliminate unnecessary steps and to review small projects on a daily basis
- Developed and implemented a plan to review response time targets for all applications

Planning Division

- Hired a Planning Manager
- Adopted a new zoning ordinance
- Began a review of all checklist handouts
- Finalized checklists for variances and use permits
- Developed a permit tracking system
- Assigned planners as case managers
- Now includes recommendations in reports to the Planning Commission

Engineering Division

- Relocated a key staff member to work with the planners
- Updated the Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines
- Drafted subdivision map checklists and application procedures
- Drafted plan check procedures

The City of Napa is developing a computerized Permit Tracking System that will allow employees from all divisions to locate and update a plan in progress. In addition, the public will be able to access the system by computer to check the status of their applications.

According to the Director of Community Development, the new philosophy of his organization is to tell applicants, "This is what you need to do for approval" rather than, "You can't do that".

After reviewing the above information, the Grand Jury concluded that all of the specific issues cited in the complaint had been, or would be, addressed and/or resolved as a result of the integration of the Departments of Planning, Building, Development Engineering and Code Enforcement into the Community Development Division. The Director of Community Development has the mandate and the authority to ensure cooperation among the formerly independent departments. This new level of cooperation should lead to policies that improve the efficiency of development from project planning through the issuance of certificates of occupancy.

Although the reorganization has been implemented for only a few months, the Grand Jury was impressed by the accomplishments that have been achieved to date and by the plans of the new Division to be more responsive to community needs. However, a formal survey of Division personnel, building contractors, homeowners and other clientele served by the Division is needed before a complete evaluation of the reorganization can be made.

Finding 1:

Although the early signs are positive, it is not yet clear whether the reorganization that created the Community Development Division has successfully resolved all of the issues raised by the Maximus study.

Recommendation 1:

Within six months, the Community Development Division should conduct a survey to evaluate the results of the recent reorganization. The survey should seek input from Division personnel, building contractors, homeowners and other clientele served by the new Division.

Response requested from:

Napa City Council
Napa City Manager
Director of the Community Development Division

Napa County Grand Jury 2003-2004 Napa County Jail Report

Summary

As prescribed by law, the 2003-2004 Napa County Grand Jury investigated the Napa County Jail to determine if it complies with governmental regulations and is effective in its use of funds.

The Grand Jury believes that the Napa County Jail has effectively used funding to maintain the facility. The jail staff is well versed in the policies and procedures of the facility and performs its duties in a professional manner. The Napa County Jail has the distinction of being one of two correction facilities in California to be commended by the Institute for Medical Quality.

Since the jail population is approaching capacity, the Grand Jury recommends that Napa County use the building to be vacated in 2006 by the Sheriff's Department for future jail expansion.

Background

The Napa County Jail is located at 1125 Third Street in the City of Napa. It is a secure facility used for the detention and placement of male and female offenders over the age of eighteen. The Napa County Jail Department of Corrections is responsible for its operation in compliance with applicable governmental regulations. Although most county jails in California are under the jurisdiction of the sheriff, the Napa County Jail is supervised by its own director who reports to the Board of Supervisors through the County Executive Officer.

Methodology

The Grand Jury reviewed the jail's policies and procedures manuals and inspected the following areas of the jail:

- Initial booking
- Holding cell
- Prisoners cells (male & female)
- Sick bay
- Mental health cells
- Kitchen
- Dining area
- Laundry
- Exercise area
- Visitation area

The Grand Jury interviewed the following people to determine if staffing and treatment of detainees were in compliance with governmental regulations:

- Director, Napa County jail
- Watch Commander (male)
- Acting Sergeant (female)
- Correction Officers (male & female)
- Registered Nurses (Program Manager and a staff nurse)
- Inmates (male & female)

Discussion

The policies and procedures of the jail were in compliance with regulations, and the facility was in good repair, neat and functional. Appropriate procedures exist to handle inmates' personal property, and the medical information taken at initial booking was adequate. Each shift has a Watch Commander, a Sergeant, and other Corrections Officers (male and female). The training of officers and their continuing education met state requirements. Correctional Officers are not sworn law enforcement officers and are not allowed to carry weapons. However, the officers do receive additional training in self-defense. The morale of the staff was generally good. The inmates reported that they were treated fairly and had no real complaints against the staff or jail conditions.

The Napa County Jail can house 250 inmates and is now near capacity. Although it occasionally exceeds capacity for short periods, the increase can be handled on a short-term basis. The jail staff proposes the following solution to the problem of overcrowding. The Sheriff's Department is located next to the jail and will move to a new building located near the Napa Airport in 2006. The Napa Jail could handle the increase in inmate population by acquiring that facility when it is vacated. This would allow the jail to remain in proximity to the Napa Courthouse, which is essential for the transfer of inmates for court proceedings.

Napa County has a contract with California Forensic Medical Group, Inc. (CFMG) to provide the medical and mental health services in the Adult Detention Facility. The contract includes an onsite medical director and a registered nurse, who acts as the program manager. The services include a psychiatrist, nursing staff, and a dentist. CFMG contracts with Napa County Mental Health for full-time onsite counseling services, with after-hours coverage provided by the county crisis team. Health records are retained for at least seven years. Custody staff provides security training to the nursing staff. The medication nurse provides all medications based on the order of the clinician, and officers accompany the nurses to insure control of the pill lines and confirm ingestion. Custody staff is not involved in delivering medications. The times at

which medications are dispensed are consistent and appropriate. Medication records and transfer of medical information were in compliance with governmental regulations.

Commendation

The Grand Jury commends the Napa County Jail for being one of only two corrections facilities to meet 100% of the California Medical Association's applicable "essential" and "important" standards for a healthcare delivery system.

Finding 1:

The Napa County Jail occasionally exceeds its maximum capacity of 250 inmates.

Recommendation 1:

The Grand Jury recommends that Napa County use the building to be vacated by the Sheriff's Department in 2006 for future jail expansion.

Response requested from:

Napa County Board of Supervisors
Director of Napa County Jail

Napa County Grand Jury 2003-2004 Juvenile Hall Report

Summary

The 2003 -2004 Napa County Grand Jury investigated the Napa County Juvenile Hall as prescribed by law to determine if it complies with governmental regulations and is effective in its use of funds.

Juvenile Hall staff complies with the security rules for the institution and is well versed on operating procedures. The staff exhibits a caring attitude for the welfare of the detainees and honors the treatment recommendations of medical and mental health clinicians. The morale of staff and detainees is generally good.

The Grand Jury believes that the Hall is minimally but adequately maintained in anticipation of occupying a new facility by year's end.

Background

The Juvenile Hall is located at 2350 Old Sonoma Road in the City of Napa. It is a secure facility used for the detention and placement of male and female offenders under the age of eighteen.

Construction is underway for a new Juvenile Hall on the existing site. The first phase of the building program should be completed by the end of 2004. Project completion is scheduled for the spring of 2005.

Methodology

In conducting its investigation, the Grand Jury inspected the following areas:

- Admissions and holding area
- Male and female cells
- Kitchen
- Dining area
- Laundry
- Exercise area

In addition to the facility inspection, the Grand Jury interviewed the following people to determine if staffing and treatment of offenders were in compliance with governmental regulations:

- Chief Probation Officer
- Assistant Probation Officer

- Counselors
- Nurse
- Detainees (male and female)

Discussion

The policies and procedures of the Hall are in compliance with regulations. The Hall is clean and functional, although the staff and detainees expressed the need for a better exercise area. This should be resolved in the new facility.

The staff exhibits a professional manner and understands the needs of the detainees. Upon admission, a point system that regulates the detainees' activities is explained to the detainees. A list of agencies available for the detainees is posted in the hall in both English and Spanish. The kitchen prepares nutritional meals, and snacks are available at various times during the day.

Under California law, parent(s) /guardian(s) share equal responsibility for support of a minor child/ward, and the County is authorized to seek reimbursement for certain reasonable costs of care incurred on a child's behalf. The Chief Probation Officer has the approval of the Board of Supervisors to implement a reimbursement program.

The Napa County Probation Department's Financial Evaluation packet is given to the parent(s) /guardian(s) by the presiding juvenile judge at the time of arraignment. If parent(s) /guardian(s) are unable to pay, there is a schedule for paying a lesser amount. Payment is made to the Napa County Treasurer - Tax Collector.

Commendation

The Grand Jury commends the Napa County Juvenile Hall for meeting 100% of the "essential" standards set by the Institute for Medical Quality and for being awarded "Accreditation With Special Recognition".

Napa County Grand Jury 2003-2004 Napa County Mosquito Abatement District Report

Summary

The Grand Jury investigated the Napa County Mosquito Abatement District (NCMAD) to determine if it is effective in its current use of tax funds and to ensure that the incremental assessment funds it will receive beginning in December of 2003 will be used effectively. The potential threat that the county faces from West Nile Virus makes this especially important. The Grand Jury is impressed by the job that the District is doing and concludes that the citizens of Napa County can have confidence that the District will fulfill its mission.

Educating the public is essential to the District's efforts to prevent West Nile Virus from becoming a major public health problem. The Grand Jury recommends that the District engage a public relations firm to help with this effort.

Background

The District's mission is to control the mosquito population and to prevent the spread of diseases such as malaria and encephalitis. It is staffed with a Director, three full-time field technicians, and a half-time administrator, and is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of representatives from the cities in Napa County and the county-at-large.

NCMAD works with other public agencies, and wineries to provide an environmentally sound mosquito control program. It works with the Flood Control and Water Conservation District to minimize mosquito production in wetland restoration / enhancement projects.

The District has been funded by an ad valorem tax that produces approximately \$600,000 per year in revenue. A new voter-approved assessment will produce approximately \$700,000 in additional funds.

Methodology

In conducting its investigation, the Grand Jury:

- Conducted interviews with the District Director and members of the District staff.
- Reviewed budgets and audit reports.
- Observed a Board of Trustees meeting and District staff meeting.

Discussion

The Mosquito Abatement District provides the following services:

- Assists landowners and agencies in eliminating mosquito sources.
- Responds to complaints of mosquitoes; determines the source of the problem.
- Provides mosquito fish free of charge during the mosquito season.
- Monitors mosquito populations and diseases.
- Uses sentinel chicken flocks to attract mosquitoes, which can then be tested for disease (the chickens themselves remain disease-free).
- Provides emergency control of larval mosquitoes.
- Informs the public about mosquitoes and mosquito-borne diseases.

The District controls mosquitoes by targeting the larvae found in stagnant water because preventing adult emergence has proven to be the most effective and most environmentally safe way to control mosquito populations. Four methods are used:

- Biological control – use of natural predators, parasites, and hormones.
- Chemical control – emergency control when pupae are present.
- Physical control – exclusion or improved water circulation.
- Public education – information resource on mosquitoes and their diseases.

The Board of Trustees meets monthly and reviews all aspects of the operation. The Grand Jury was impressed by the business-like nature of the Board meeting and by the strong support the Director receives from the Board.

Controlling costs is a priority for all District personnel. The Director personally oversees all expenditures. The staff maintains most District equipment to avoid costly contracted repairs and seeks to minimize operating costs. Staff morale is high.

The District is very customer sensitive. The Director personally responds to all complaints and ensures that they are dealt with promptly and satisfactorily.

The District believes that the mosquito population in the county would be reduced by 50% if residents took the following precautions in order to avoid creating the conditions required for them to breed:

- Fishponds – stock with mosquito fish (provided free by the District).
- Swimming pools & spas – chlorinate; cover tightly when not in use.
- Birdbaths – change water at least once per week.
- Containers – empty, invert, or cover to prevent mosquito entrance.
- Basement & under house – drain the area; correct leaky plumbing, dripping air conditioners, or refrigeration units.

- Catch basins & storm drains – do not dispose of litter or debris into these.
- Sump – construct so that water does not stand, or screen over.
- Standing water – eliminate by draining or filling.
- Tires – dispose of properly, or cover so that water does not collect inside.
- Tree holes – consult with a licensed nursery or tree service before draining, filling, screening, or removal.
- Septic tank – keep tightly covered. A major mosquito producer!
- Watering trough – stock with mosquito fish or change water weekly.
- Creek – do not dump litter or debris into creek or create obstructions.

In October, there were two reported West Nile Virus cases in Southern California. Because Napa County is in the Pacific Flyway, the District believes that it is very likely that there will be an outbreak of the disease here in 2004, posing a serious public health issue.

The District intends to use new funding to:

- Hire additional staff and convert the administrator to full-time status.
- Deploy nine additional chicken flocks as an early warning system.
- Prepare for, identify, and eradicate mosquitoes carrying West Nile Virus.
- Take on the responsibility to control the yellow-jacket population.
- Staff up to provide 24-hour response to citizen complaints.
- Educate the public about mosquito control and disease prevention.

The District intends to double the staff of field technicians in time to deal with the 2004 mosquito season. A lab scientist will be hired in March of 2004 to test dead birds and live mosquitoes for disease and to assist in formulating strategies to combat mosquitoes and other disease-bearing vectors.

Commendation

The Napa County Mosquito Abatement District has effectively employed revenues to control mosquitoes in the County.

Finding 1:

The District believes that the public is generally unaware of both the magnitude of the threat posed by West Nile Virus and of the steps which residents and homeowners can take to prevent it.

Recommendation 1:

The Grand Jury recommends that the District hire a public relations firm to develop a comprehensive campaign to make the public aware of the dangers

associated with West Nile Virus and the actions residents should take to prevent a major outbreak of this disease.

Response requested from:

District Director, Napa County Mosquito Abatement District
Board of Trustees, Napa County Mosquito Abatement District

Finding 2:

The newly hired field technicians will not yet be fully trained when the 2004 mosquito season begins. Therefore, there is a danger that the technicians will be spread too thin if they take on new vectors and West Nile Virus reaches Napa County early in the season.

Recommendation 2:

The District should continue to make controlling the mosquito population its highest priority.

Response requested from:

District Director, Napa County Mosquito Abatement District
Board of Trustees, Napa County Mosquito Abatement District

The Grand Jury urges the newspapers and other media in Napa County to assist the District in educating the public regarding the dangers of West Nile Virus and the steps that the general public needs to take to prevent a major outbreak of this disease from occurring.

**Napa County Grand Jury 2003-2004
Napa County Office of Education School Age Child
Development Program Report**

Summary

The focus of this Grand Jury investigation is the Napa County Office of Education (NCOE) School Age Child Development Program (SACDP). This program is funded by the State to provide before and after school care for kindergarten through fifth grade students. SACDP staff shows dedication and personal concern for all of the children and families involved in the program.

The Grand Jury found several areas where SACDP could be improved:

- NCOE needs to recruit additional bilingual staff and substitutes.
- SACDP provides limited information to keep parents updated on program activities and potential resources.
- There are no volunteers to help with the students' homework.
- SACDP incorporates limited community involvement into after school programs.
- The Westwood Center is located in close proximity to the Boys and Girls Club (BGC), which offers similar services on the same campus.

The Grand Jury makes recommendations to address these issues and believes that if they are implemented, SACDP will be able to better serve its staff, the children, their families, and the taxpayer.

Background

The State Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division (CCL), licenses SACDP. Each of SACDP's three centers in Napa County provides services for 28 to 35 children with a staff to child ratio of 1:14. SACDP provides services for a total of approximately 91 children with a staff of one permit teacher (site supervisor) and one or more teaching assistants (associate teachers) in each center. A majority of the children are from low-income Hispanic families who receive fully subsidized services. SACDP also provides services for a limited number of fee-paying families at each center. These families give SACDP a small financial cushion.

SACDP operates under the California Department of Education, Child Development Division (CDD). The CDD has established quality requirements; SACDP must comply with these requirements in order to receive funding. The Grand Jury used these quality requirements to evaluate SACDP. Listed below are excerpts from the CDD program quality requirements:

- *Cultural and Linguistic Appropriateness*
Characteristics of the families served by the contractor
- *Staff Development Program*
Identification of training needs
- *Parent Involvement and Education*
Parent Meetings
Parent Advisory Committee
Parent Education
Parent Participation and Communication
- *Community Involvement*
Solicit Support from the Community

Methodology

In conducting its investigation, the Grand Jury:

- Interviewed NCOE staff involved with SACDP, staff working at program centers, volunteer coordinators and a vocational instructor from a local high school, and the Coordinator of Calistoga Community Learning Center.
- Visited and made observations at each of the three SACDP centers.
- Reviewed budgets, faculty and parent handbooks, parent surveys, CDD General Child Care Program Quality Requirements, CCL Evaluation Reports, and SACDP Self-Evaluation Facility Reports.

Discussion

CDD sets clear guidelines for state-funded childcare programs. SACDP is a CDD contractor and, pursuant to CDD guidelines, SACDP is required to provide services that reflect the cultural and linguistic attributes of the families served. During our visits to each of the centers and our discussions with staff, the Grand Jury found limited evidence that the staff reflected those Spanish-speaking families. Subsequent to the initiation of the Grand Jury investigation, a new bilingual staff member was hired for Westwood Center.

Another guideline stressed by CDD is parent involvement and education. SACDP is inconsistent in providing information to parents concerning program activities and community resources. This inconsistency was noted in parent surveys. The Grand Jury also noted the lack of posted schedules for required parent /teacher conferences. SACDP stated that it has recently developed a Parent Advisory Committee that represents all of the centers to help address parental issues.

During interviews with SACDP staff, the Grand Jury observed a need for volunteers to assist with students' homework. The staff to student ratio is 1:14 as required. However, if one staff member is occupied in helping a student with homework, then the other staff member is responsible for the remaining 27

children. SACDP is required by the CDD guidelines to solicit support from the community.

The Grand Jury was impressed with the Phillips garden project. At this site, the teachers have solicited support from the community to develop, maintain, and sell summer vegetables. This project created a great sense of pride for the Phillips Center.

The Grand Jury also had an opportunity to visit and observe the Calistoga Community Learning Center (CCLC). The CCLC differs from SACDP in that it provides after school care for children from kindergarten through twelfth grade and is funded through a state grant; however, the CCLC Coordinator has successfully recruited numerous community partners.

Another CDD guideline is a requirement for the identification of training needs. The SACDP staff indicated a need for discipline, health and disaster training. Currently, the SCADP staff is not paid or reimbursed by NCOE for any outside training.

On a site visit, the Grand Jury observed a satellite Boys and Girls Club of Napa (BGC) within twenty-five yards of the Westwood Center. After staff interviews, the Grand Jury was concerned about the duplication of services. The BGC moved to the Westwood Campus within the last year. The Westwood Center staff cited problems with supervision, equipment misuse, and safety due to the coexistence of the BGC. During this investigation, the BGC and Westwood staffs worked out a playground use agreement.

Finding 1:

NCOE has one newly hired bilingual staff member who reflects the cultural and linguistic attributes of the families served.

Recommendation 1:

NCOE needs to recruit additional bilingual staff and substitutes. College child development programs could be a potential resource.

Response requested from:

Superintendent, Napa County Board of Education

Finding 2:

SACDP provides limited information to keep parents updated on program activities and potential resources.

Recommendation 2:

The SACDP Director should develop a monthly master resource calendar. This calendar should include, at a minimum, all educational opportunities concerning or involving parental issues. Each SACDP head teacher should add his or her own specific events (e.g., parent/teacher conferences, potluck dinners, school hours) to the calendar, and a center-specific calendar should be posted in each center and given to each child.

Response requested from:

Director, School Age Child Development Program

Finding 3:

There are no volunteers to help with the students' homework.

Recommendation 3:

The SACDP Director should recruit volunteers from private and public high schools, Senior Centers, Retired Teachers' Association, and Community Colleges to assist with students' homework.

Response requested from:

Director, School Age Child Development Program

Finding 4:

SACDP incorporates limited community involvement into after school programs.

Recommendation 4:

SACDP should learn from the CCLC model program which has established partnerships with many agencies in its community (e.g., BGC, Recreation Departments, Public Safety, Library, and Service Clubs). These partnerships play a pivotal role in providing enrichment programs.

Response requested from:

Director, School Age Child Development Program

Finding 5:

NCOE does not provide financial incentives for staff to attend continuing education and training.

Recommendation 5:

Payment of hourly wages by NCOE to staff for continuing education and training is recommended. There are many opportunities for low and/or no-cost training locally (e.g., COPE, CARES, CRC, Napa Valley College, and CERT).

Response requested from:

Superintendent, Napa County Office of Education

Finding 6:

The Westwood Center is located in close proximity to the Boys and Girls Club (BGC), which offers similar services on the same campus.

Recommendation 6:

NCOE should conduct a needs assessment of the Westwood Center to determine if this is a good use of funding.

Response requested from:

Superintendent, Napa County Office of Education

Glossary

- BGC – Boys and Girls Club
- CARES – Compensation and Retention Encourage Stability
- CCL – Community Care Licensing Division
- CCLC – Calistoga Community Learning Center
- CDD – Child Development Division
- CERT – Community Emergency Response Team
- COPE – Child or Parent Emergency
- CRC – Community Resources for Children
- NCOE – Napa County Office of Education
- SACDP – School Age Child Development Program

Napa County Grand Jury 2003-2004 Napa Sanitation District Report

Summary

The Grand Jury investigated the Napa Sanitation District (NSD) to determine if it is effective in its use of public funds. The Grand Jury was impressed by the quality and dedication of NSD's employees and management team and believes that the District is performing an effective and useful public service for the community.

This investigation produced the following key findings:

- NSD has not yet reached agreement with the Regional Water Quality Control Board to renew its wastewater permit. Failure to reach agreement will have serious consequences.
- NSD may be in violation of regulations requiring that all ratepayers pay the same fees for equivalent service.
- It was inappropriate for a member of the Board of Directors to discuss charges against NSD's General Manager with local newspapers prior to an investigation to determine the validity of those charges.

This report includes other findings and recommendations for improvements at NSD. The Grand Jury is confident that if the District implements these recommendations, it will become an even more effective operation.

Background

NSD was established as an independent Special District in 1945 to collect, treat, beneficially reuse, and dispose of wastewater in an effective, economical, and environmentally sensitive manner that maintains the public's health and meets or exceeds all local, state and federal regulations. The District's service area encompasses 12,448 acres and includes the City of Napa, Silverado Country Club, Napa State Hospital, Napa Airport industrial areas and other unincorporated areas of the County. Revenues are collected via property taxes, connection fees and dumping fees for septic tank systems throughout the County and are budgeted to reach \$10,490,572 for fiscal year 2003-2004.

A Board of Directors comprised of three elected officials from the City and County and two public appointees, governs NSD. The District is run by a General Manager and has 42 employees. The District also employs four consultants. There are over 33,000 consumer and business connections within the District's service area. Through a network of approximately 250 miles of underground pipelines and six pumping stations, raw sewage makes its way to the Soscov Water Recycling Facility for treatment. This facility is a secondary

and tertiary biological physical-chemical treatment facility that treats a mixture of domestic and industrial wastewater. NSD has upgraded the facility to include primary treatment, activated sludge facilities, and sludge digestion and solids de-watering facilities. The facility has a dry weather treatment design capacity of 15.4 million gallons per day (MGD). Wastewater is treated and discharged in various ways, depending on the source of the wastewater and the time of year.

NSD's regulating body, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, permits discharge to the Napa River from November 1 through April 30 (the wet season). The average discharge of treated water to the Napa River is approximately 14.7 MGD. From May 1 through October 31 (the dry season), discharge to the Napa River is prohibited and wastewater is either stored in stabilization ponds or treated and beneficially reused for landscape irrigation in industrial parks, golf courses, pasturelands, and vineyards. High quality, unrestricted use recycled water is provided to all recycled water users.

Methodology

In conducting its investigation, the Grand Jury:

- Reviewed NSD policies and procedures manuals.
- Examined financial and audit reports.
- Reviewed prior Grand Jury Reports regarding NSD.
- Toured the Soscol facility.
- Interviewed the NSD Board of Directors, District Counsel, and all NSD employees.
- Interviewed an auditor from NSD's outside auditing firm - Bartig, Basler & Ray.

Discussion

Review of the 1998-1999 Napa County Grand Jury Findings

The Grand Jury sought to determine whether the following findings reported by the 1998-1999 Napa County Grand Jury had been addressed:

1998-1999 Finding 1: NSD is not being managed in an efficient manner for the benefit of the community it serves. Management is not effective and does not display the mutual respect and support for either one another or the line staff that is mandatory for efficient operation.

Management expertise and performance has improved significantly since 1999. Interviews with employees, management, and the Board of Directors revealed the following positive results:

- Construction of the highly advanced Soscol facility was completed.
- New capital improvement and strategic planning programs were implemented.
- Substantial improvements were made in formalizing training and safety programs.
- Networked computers and a Nextel telephone system have improved communications and efficiency.
- Ongoing efforts have reduced raw material and process costs.
- The Board of Directors now receives more detailed financial reports.

In addition to these improvements in NSD operations, employees consistently reported that morale and relationships with management improved dramatically over the past five years and particularly during the last three years. Over 90% of the employees reported morale as "generally good" to "very good". Total employee attrition, a generally useful indicator of morale level, averaged less than 10% per year during the last three years.

While employee morale is good, the majority of non-managerial employees reported that it has deteriorated in the last few months. These employees believe that the District has received inaccurate and unfair press regarding operations. They report cases of being approached by members of the public regarding accusations reported in the press, and they find this disturbing. They feel that they are not given public credit for a good record of timely and courteous service. Employees also report dismay at recent newspaper reports indicating that the District may be brought under the control of the City of Napa Water Department.

1998-1999 Finding 2: The Board of Directors is too involved in the day-to-day managing and supervising of the operations of the District, including the handling of grievance hearings. If the management arrangements were better structured by the Board, the Board of Directors would be free to perform its primary purpose, which is the setting of policy.

The NSD Board of Directors is no longer micro-managing the District. In recent years, the Board has focused primarily on policy matters and left managing day-to-day operations to management.

1998-1999 Finding 3: The present Board of Directors meeting facilities are crowded and inadequate.

Board meetings are now held at the Soscol treatment plant in a large meeting room that provides ample space and comfort for participants, including members of the public. The Grand Jury also noted that Board meetings are scheduled well in advance and are publicized on the NSD website.

1998-1999 Finding 4: There have been numerous recommendations to discontinue the use of potable water for the irrigation of Kennedy Golf Course, owned by the City of Napa, and to substitute the use of reclaimed waste water. It has been at least eight years since the first such suggestion, and to date the use of potable water for irrigation continues.

The District completed the Kennedy Pipeline in 2003, and the Kennedy Golf Course now uses NSD recycled water. Plans have been made to extend the pipeline to Napa State Hospital.

1998-1999 Finding 5: Notwithstanding the recommendation of the 1994-1995 Grand Jury and the NSD's own auditors, the District has not yet prepared an inventory of its fixed assets.

The District has yet to conduct a physical inventory of its fixed assets.

Alleged General Manager Credit Card Abuse and Sexual Harassment

On January 2, 2004, NSD Counsel informed the Board via email that the departing NSD General Manager had used his District credit card to pay for personal, non-business related expenses. Counsel subsequently spoke on the telephone with one or more Directors and disclosed that the General Manager might have sexually harassed two female employees. On January 7, an article in the *Napa Valley Register* reported these charges against the General Manager and quoted two NSD Directors. *This article appeared prior to any formal investigation of these matters by the NSD Board of Directors or District employees.*

At its regularly scheduled meeting during the afternoon of January 7, the Board of Directors ordered an internal investigation headed by the newly appointed Acting General Manager.

The *Napa Sentinel*, owned by a NSD Board Member, published a long, scathing article on these matters on January 9, prior to the completion of the investigation.

The Grand Jury carefully reviewed this investigation and the preceding events to determine whether the Board of Directors properly dealt with this personnel issue. The Jury sought to determine whether the Board reached accurate conclusions and then took appropriate actions. To this end, the Grand Jury interviewed all NSD Board members and District personnel connected with these matters and reviewed credit card bills, expense reports, receipts, and other documentation. The Grand Jury also interviewed the former General Manager.

Regarding the charge of sexual harassment, the Grand Jury determined that the former General Manager asked two female employees out on dates after he had submitted his resignation but while he was still an active employee. There was no physical harassment or abuse. When the employees declined the invitations, he backed off. Since both employees considered the matter relatively minor, it was dropped.

The Grand Jury's detailed review of the former General Manager's expense reports, credit card bills, and other records, along with interviews with all involved employees and Directors, indicates the following:

- NSD staff used proper and thorough procedures during this internal investigation and the conclusions reached by the District accurately represent the facts of the situation.
- Most of the former General Manager's personal expenses were associated with business trips and were for items such as telephone calls or movies charged on a hotel bill.
- He used poor judgment in charging non-business related personal expenses to the District credit card.
- He always brought his personal charges to the attention of NSD staff and promptly reimbursed the District for these expenses.
- Shortly after he retired, he reimbursed NSD for all outstanding personal charges.

The Grand Jury concluded that there is no evidence to suggest that the former General Manager had any intention to deceive or defraud the agency or the public.

The articles in the *Register* and the *Sentinel* also mentioned that the former General Manager had received a salary advance. The Grand Jury determined that this advance resulted from a decision by the Board of Directors to align his annual performance review with the NSD fiscal year instead of the anniversary of his date of hire. Under the terms of an agreement with the District, he is in the process of reimbursing this \$2,500 advance on a monthly payment schedule.

The Grand Jury concluded that a member of the NSD Board inappropriately shared personnel information regarding the former General Manager with the press prior to the Board of Directors' investigation to determine the facts. As a result, this issue was blown out of proportion, and the General Manager and the District were unnecessarily embarrassed.

The Grand Jury also notes that the District's employees believe that this same Board Member has on numerous occasions used his newspaper, the *Napa Sentinel*, to unjustifiably criticize the District and its management team. This has had and continues to have a negative impact on morale.

Citizen Complaints

Complaint 1

In early February of 2004, the Grand Jury received an anonymous complaint alleging that management had used scare tactics to prevent NSD personnel from candidly sharing information with a prior Grand Jury. The Grand Jury interviewed every employee in the District to determine whether or not attempts at intimidation had occurred during either the 1998–1999 or the current investigation. No evidence was found that any intimidation had occurred during either investigation.

Complaint 2

In late March of 2004, the Grand Jury received a complaint alleging that the District was not purchasing chemical treatment materials from the lowest cost vendor. To investigate this complaint the Jury interviewed District personnel and examined extensive documentation from 1977 to the present.

Prior to completing the Soscol wastewater treatment plant, NSD was able to negotiate favorable long-term vendor contracts for treatment chemicals. When the Soscol plant came online it provided many options for wastewater treatment, and over the past four to five years the District experimented with these options to determine the most effective treatment methods. Changing climatic conditions, wastewater composition, wastewater treatment regulations, and treatment methods has made testing and selecting appropriate chemicals very difficult for both NSD and vendors. NSD management is now stabilizing the wastewater treatment process and treatment method constancy should enable the District, once again, to negotiate a favorable long-term contract with a chemical supplier. To pursue this objective, NSD recently reached agreement with four chemical suppliers to test their products in the lab as a precursor to field tests, and this testing has begun. The testing protocol emphasizes both cost and performance criteria.

The Grand Jury concluded that the District's current approach for selecting a chemical supplier is reasonable and should result in purchasing the lowest cost and best performance chemistry available. The Grand Jury further concluded that the District has complied with regulations and polices requiring vendor price quotations and bids for chemical purchases and contracts.

User Fees

It was brought to the Grand Jury's attention that NSD might be violating regulations requiring the District to charge users the same fee for equivalent

service.¹ It was specifically suggested that restaurants in NSD's service area are paying a lower connection fee than they should, and that this puts other users at a disadvantage.

Reclaimed Water

NSD produces high quality recycled water meeting Title 22 unrestricted use standards and is capable of providing more recycled water than can be delivered to potential users with the current pipeline system.

In 2003, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) completed a study of the Napa Sanitation District reclamation program.² In reviewing infrastructure needs or deficiencies, LAFCO concluded:

- 1. The Napa Sanitation District's reclamation program is well designed and has adequate capacity to meet existing service demands. The wastewater treatment plant's reclamation facilities can be expanded to meet additional capacity requirements as new users are brought on-line.*
- 2. The Napa Sanitation District's Soscol Wastewater Treatment Plant produces tertiary-level treated wastewater. This level of reclaimed water offers the greatest range of beneficial uses, including agricultural, landscaping, industrial, wetlands maintenance and enhancement, and greenbelt preservation.*
- 3. The Napa Sanitation District's reclamation program is a beneficial and efficient use of existing water resources by lessening the demand for potable water within its service area.*

Present recycled water users include:

- Somky Reclamation Site
- Jameson Canyon Reclamation Site
- Chardonnay Golf Course
- Chardonnay Vineyards
- Napa Corporate Park
- Kennedy Golf Course
- Napa Airport Area
- Dey Laboratories
- Fagundes Reclamation Site
- Kohnan Sake Factory
- Kohnan Vineyards
- Giles Vineyard

¹ See California Health and Safety Code, Division 5 and provisions of California Proposition 218.

² LAFCO of Napa County, Comprehensive Water Service Study, Napa Sanitation District, October 2003.

Larry Walker Associates and the Napa Sanitation District have prepared a five-year plan for recycled water use. The plan suggests the following potential new users for recycled water.³

- Napa Valley Country Club
- Silverado Country Club and Resort
- Cultivated parcels along the route to the Silverado Country Club and Resort
- Parks and ball fields
- Cemeteries
- Napa State Hospital
- Commercial and industrial landscaping
- Los Carneros agricultural and pasture irrigation
- Industrial users

The District is exploring various options for increasing the availability of recycled water, including aquifer storage, raising levees of existing oxidation ponds, and constructing new storage ponds. In addition, NSD is considering methods to maximize recycled water availability using existing storage facilities.

One of NSD's biggest challenges is funding pipeline construction to reach potential large users such as Silverado Country Club and Los Carneros. Most of these potential users now have their own wells or other water sources. While funding options such as loans and formation of a special district are under review, funding will be very difficult without contractual upfront commitment from potential users.

Without exception, the District's Board of Directors and management team strongly support the growth of recycled water service and recognize the vital contribution of this resource to our community. As LAFCO recommended, the District recently created and staffed the position of Reclamation Director to focus attention on this important issue. NSD is keeping the Board and other members of the community informed about progress in this area. To this end, the District designed a new website (www.napasanitiationdistrict.com) and made it available to the public in January of 2004.

The District is engaged in an extensive planning process for the delivery and sale of reclaimed water. The first phase, currently underway, identifies potential users, explores the technologies for expanding capacity and delivery, and determines capital budgeting needs and options for this expansion. The second phase will result in a plan to contact potential users directly, inform them of the

³ Napa Sanitation District Strategic Plan for Recycled Water Use Status Report, Larry Walker Associates, February 18, 2003 presentation to Napa County Board of Supervisors.

benefits of using reclaimed water, and solicit their agreement to use reclaimed water when it is made available.

Collections Department Operations

The NSD Collections Department is charged with maintaining the District's extensive sewer system and responding to public emergencies. Its facilities are located on Hartle Court in Napa and appear to be well managed. Collections Department employees take pride in providing service to the public and receiving feedback from satisfied customers.

Plans have been developed to relocate the Collection Department facilities to the Soscol Plant location. Employees are looking forward to this move, although several expressed the concern that the new location's distance from North Napa might increase the time to respond to customer calls.

Wastewater Treatment Plant

The Soscol wastewater treatment facility is a highly automated, flexible, near state-of-the-art sludge-activated treatment plant. NSD and Carollo Engineers recently received the California Association of Sanitation Agencies 2003 Associates Achievement Award in recognition of continued technological advancement, effective wastewater management, and outstanding service.

Lawsuit

NSD has been embroiled for some time in a dispute with the Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding discharge limits. This dispute is holding up renewal of NSD's permit to discharge into the Napa River. After failing to reach an agreement with the Regional Board, the District filed a lawsuit requesting relief from what management and the Board feels are unreasonable requirements. This lawsuit is now in the appeal stage. If NSD is unable to secure renewal of its discharge permit, plant operations will have to change significantly. This would result in higher operating costs that would ultimately be passed on to consumers.

NSD Pollution Prevention Activities

NSD takes pollution prevention seriously and has assigned a manager specific responsibility for this area. Since the public can beneficially impact pollution levels by exercising caution in using the sewer system, this manager is engaged in a variety of public outreach activities.

One specific area of concern is that fats, oils, and grease in drains can solidify around the inside wall of transmission pipelines, causing flows to be restricted and leading to backed-up pipes and overflows. In addition to being costly to repair, overflows can create a health hazard and result in fines from regulatory

agencies and increases in sewer rates. The District would prefer that customers keep grease and oils out of drains, but the only other option is to place them in a container and then put the container in the garbage. This grease eventually makes its way to a landfill. District staff notes that, unlike some municipalities, Napa doesn't have a "Can the Grease" recycling program.

The District stresses pollution prevention during visits to businesses, particularly restaurants, which must properly maintain grease traps. In January 2003, the District implemented a "Pretreatment Program Enforcement Response Plan" and a computer database to store records of visits to businesses and actions taken. In the future, NSD intends to monitor additional businesses, such as dental offices, for polluting elements such as copper.

In addition, NSD publishes the *Pipeline*, a newsletter encouraging pollution prevention and providing news of District activities. The District distributes this newsletter to approximately 25,000 ratepayers but not to all residents in the District's service area.

NSD also has a well-designed educational program for school age children. This program includes visits to classrooms and field trips to the plant and emphasizes pollution prevention, as does the District website.

Finance and Accounting Procedures

The Grand Jury noted the following NSD finance and accounting issues:

- As a result of employee turnover, NSD's accounting staff is relatively inexperienced, and the District currently lacks the expertise required to develop and analyze financial statements and reports.
- Since 2001, District accounting personnel have had difficulty making appropriate year-end adjusting entries and following auditor recommended year-end closing procedures. These difficulties have delayed preparation of yearly audits.
- In 2002, in response to the yearly auditor management letter, NSD indicated they would commission an independent auditor to review and assist with year-end closing entries for the 2003 fiscal year. They did not obtain the promised outside assistance and were unable to close the books and present financial statements to the external auditors until seven months after the end of the fiscal year.
- There has not been a physical count of fixed assets in recent years.
- NSD bookkeeping procedures do not provide for proper tracking of purchase returns, raising the possibility that returns to vendors might not be credited to the District.

Over a five year period, the independent external auditors have never identified a material breach of accounting control procedures and view the above issues

as relatively minor, "non material" items. The Grand Jury concurred with this view but concluded that these difficulties indicate that the District is deficient in finance and accounting experience and expertise.

Administration

NSD extensively documents policies and procedures in loose-leaf notebooks such as the Employee Handbook; Accounting and Purchasing Procedures Manual; and the NSD Budget, Audit, & Sample Agreements Manual. However, changes to manuals are not documented with page and revision dates, making it difficult to determine when policies and procedures were adopted or revised.

The NSD Employee Handbook includes a requirement for written annual employee performance evaluations. In examining personnel files, the Grand Jury found that 11 evaluations were overdue, some for as long as two years. These employees have since been evaluated, and procedures have been put in place to ensure that this does not happen again.

In anticipation of labor negotiations later this year, NSD has employed a consultant to update all employee job descriptions.

In May of 2003, the NSD Board of Directors approved a policy regarding credit card use. This policy provides reasonable guidelines for appropriate credit card use by managers. However, the Grand Jury noted that the Board of Directors does not regularly receive and review the General Manager's expense reports.

Finding 1:

NSD has not reached agreement with the Regional Water Quality Control Board to renew the District's wastewater permit.

Recommendation 1:

NSD should place the highest priority on reaching a settlement with the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Response requested:

NSD General Manager
NSD Board of Directors

Finding 2:

NSD may be in violation of regulations that require that all ratepayers pay the same fee for equivalent service.

Recommendation 2:

Management and the Board of Directors should determine the extent to which NSD violates regulations and then take appropriate actions.

Response requested:

NSD General Manager
NSD Board of Directors
Napa County Board of Supervisors
Napa City Council

Finding 3:

It was inappropriate for a member of the Board of Directors to leak charges against an employee to local newspapers before an investigation determined the validity of those charges.

Recommendation 3:

District Counsel should brief the Board of Directors regarding their responsibilities to keep personnel matters confidential. Violations of this policy should result in censure and/or dismissal.

Response requested:

NSD Board of Directors
District Counsel
Napa County Board of Supervisors
Napa City Council

Finding 4:

As a result of management and employee turnover, the District lacks in-depth finance and accounting expertise.

Recommendation 4:

NSD can remedy this problem in a variety of ways, including providing additional training for existing staff, hiring outside consultants, or hiring more experienced staff.

Response requested:

NSD General Manager
Board of Directors

Finding 5:

The Grand Jury observed the following shortcomings in NSD's accounting practices:

- The Board does not review and approve the General Manager's expense reports.
- NSD has not conducted a physical inventory of fixed assets in several years.
- NSD does not have a formal system to ensure that vendors properly credit the District for returned merchandise.
- District accounting personnel have had difficulty making appropriate year-end adjusting entries and following auditor recommended year-end closing procedures, which indicates a need for further training of accounting staff.

Recommendation 5:

NSD should take the appropriate steps to address these issues.

Response requested:

Board of Directors
NSD General Manager

Finding 6:

The City and County of Napa do not have a recycling program for household grease and oil.

Recommendation 6:

The City and County of Napa should expand their recycling programs to include household grease and oil.

Response requested:

Napa County Chief Executive Officer
Napa County Board of Supervisors
American Canyon City Manager
Calistoga City Council
Napa City Council
St. Helena City Council
Yountville Town Council

Finding 7:

NSD doesn't distribute the "Pipeline" newsletter to all residents in its service area.

Recommendation 7:

NSD should distribute the "Pipeline" to all residents in its service area.

Response requested:

NSD General Manager

Finding 8:

The pages in District policy manuals and handbooks are not marked with revision numbers and dates.

Recommendation 8:

NSD should mark manuals and handbook pages with revision numbers and dates.

Response requested:

NSD General Manager

Napa County Grand Jury 2003-2004 Responses to 2002-2003 Grand Jury Final Report

Summary

The 2003-2004 Grand Jury examined all agency responses required by last year's Grand Jury Report. If agencies failed to respond or responses required clarification, the Grand Jury further investigated and collected information from those agencies. Agencies whose response had not been received were sent a notice to comply.

Background

A recent change in statute requires the Grand Jury to determine if all agencies cited in the prior Grand Jury Report received that report and responded as required by the Penal Code. Agencies must respond to Grand Jury findings and recommendations within a prescribed time period.

Methodology

The Grand Jury evaluated agency responses to the previous Grand Jury's findings and recommendations to ensure that all agencies complied with the requirements of California Penal Code Section 933.05, "Responses to findings." Specifically, the following response criteria were considered:

- The appropriate agency responded to findings and recommendations in the 60 or 90-day period required by statute.
- The respondents indicated agreement with the finding or, in the case of whole or partial disagreement, specified the portion of the finding disputed and included an explanation of the reasons therefore.
- If a recommendation was implemented, the respondent so indicated and provided a summary regarding the implemented action.
- If a recommendation had not been, but would be implemented within six months, the respondent provided a timeframe for implementation.
- If a recommendation required further analysis, respondent provided an explanation of the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by appropriate agency personnel.
- If respondent indicated that a recommendation was not to be implemented because it was not warranted or was not reasonable.

In the event that an agency failed to satisfy one or more of the above applicable criteria, the Grand Jury investigated and collected additional information from respondents.

Discussion

A notice of non-response was sent to eight agencies from which the Grand Jury did not receive a response. It was subsequently found that responses from all but two of the agencies were received by Napa Superior Court but had not been forwarded to the Grand Jury. Once the Superior Court became aware of this situation, the responses were promptly forwarded to the Grand Jury. The Grand Jury reviewed all agency responses and determined that follow-up investigations were not required, with the following exceptions:

1. The Circle Oaks Water District failed to respond to Recommendations #1 and #2 in the 2002-2003 Napa County Grand Jury Water Report. In a meeting with District staff on December 19, 2003, the Grand Jury was told that the District planned to comply. By the end of February, the Grand Jury had not received a response. On March 1, 2004 the Grand Jury notified the Napa Superior Court via letter that Circle Oaks Water District was in non-compliance of Penal Code 933.05.
2. The Los Carneros Water District failed to respond to Recommendations #1 and #2 in the 2002-2003 Napa County Grand Jury Water Report. The Grand Jury queried the District and was told that the District had not received the Report. The Grand Jury sent a second copy of the report to the District via USPS - return receipt requested. The Grand Jury received a response on February 26, 2004.
3. The Grand Jury sought clarification concerning the progress made on Finding and Recommendation #3 in the 2002-2003 Napa County Grand Jury Training and Education Center Report. The Grand Jury met with the Chair of the Napa County Workforce Investment Board and learned that positive changes had taken place in the operation of the Board.
4. The Grand Jury sought additional information concerning the progress made on Findings and Recommendations #5 and #6 in the 2002-2003 Napa County Grand Jury Audit Report. The Grand Jury found constructive changes had been implemented in procedures and training for staff.
5. The Grand Jury sought additional information concerning the progress made on Finding #2 and Recommendation #3 in the 2002-2003 Napa County Grand Jury Health and Human Resources Report. In August 2003, Napa County successfully converted all food stamp customers to Electronic Benefit Transfer.

Napa County Grand Jury 2003-2004 Water Report

"Every month 30,000 people are entering California and not one of them brings a gallon of water." California Governor Earl Warren spoke these words at the start of the Lake Berryessa project on September 25, 1953.

Summary

As a follow-up to the 2002 - 2003 Grand Jury investigation on water utilization in Napa County, the 2003 - 2004 Grand Jury focused on the degree to which the County and its water districts are prepared to deal with infrastructure and population growth, drought and other natural disasters, and recycled water utilization. The Grand Jury also looked at service and cost differences between larger and smaller water districts.

Napa County's water issues can be characterized as follows:

- Demand continues to increase as the County's population grows.
- A prolonged drought could reduce supply below the level required to meet demand.
- Water needed to fight major forest fires could temporarily exhaust local water supplies.
- Recycled water utilization is limited to agricultural and recreational uses.
- Excepting the Milliken-Sarco-Tulocay (M-S-T) Creeks area, supply is adequate to meet current demand. There is little or no reserve capacity.
- A major earthquake could wreak havoc with the water pipeline infrastructure.
- Capacity for delivering water along the valley floor is constrained by pipeline capacity and allocation.

The Grand Jury concluded the following:

- Extending the use of recycled water is the best method to meet some of the ongoing water needs of Napa County.
- The smaller water districts are at a severe disadvantage in their ability to meet the needs of an increasing population.
- Water users in the M-S-T Creeks area need immediate assistance.

Background

Napa County Water Districts

City of Napa (Water Service Population 79,959): Because the City of Napa benefits from a large revenue base, they are able to adequately maintain pipelines and water storage tanks. The water delivery system is designed to assure continued service to a maximum population in the event that any source fails or a pipeline ruptures. The City had the foresight to request an increased allotment of water from the State, delivered by the North Bay Aqueduct (NBA). This will continue to serve the City of Napa's consumers well as the population grows or in times of extended drought.

The Napa Sanitation District, which currently has a surplus of recycled water, provides all recycled water in and around the City of Napa. If adequate infrastructure were built, this surplus water could be utilized by area golf courses, schools and vineyards.

American Canyon (Water Service Population 12,283): Three separate sources of imported water furnish the needs of American Canyon, thereby reducing the City's dependence on any single source. The City also has plans for building recycled water infrastructure to meet the demands of future population growth, including state-mandated public housing.

Calistoga (Water Service Population 4,752): Caught between the high costs of maintaining the local system and a citizenry reluctant to pay those costs, Calistoga relies heavily on the NBA water that is treated and wheeled (delivered at wholesale prices), by the Napa Water Department. However, the size of the pipeline that carries this water limits the supply, and there is no redundancy in this system.

Local water impounded at Kimball Reservoir provides approximately 40% of Calistoga's water supply, but capacity is limited by silting. Well water is abundant but is contaminated with boron. Until Kimball Reservoir is dredged and Calistoga gains the capacity for treating contaminated well water, the timely and dependable delivery of potable water to residents in Calistoga is at risk.

Reclaimed water is used at the local fairground and the municipal golf course.

St Helena (Water Service Population 8,111): St. Helena relies entirely on local water but has access to NBA water on an emergency basis. The town has experienced water shortages in the past and has local ordinances in place that delineate reduced levels of water usage in times of crisis.

St Helena is seeking funding to upgrade their recycled wastewater to tertiary level for agriculture irrigation. The Grand Jury believes this is an important step.

Yountville (Water Service Population 2,356): Yountville is currently in negotiation with the California Department of Veteran Affairs for a long-term contract for Rector Reservoir water. The Reservoir has sufficient capacity to meet Yountville's current needs. Yountville also receives water from the NBA and sells recycled water to three vineyards.

Napa County negotiates all non-local contracts for water including contracts for water from federally owned Lake Berryessa and California owned NBA water. Napa County Public Works Department also maintains an equipment inventory, which is available to other water departments as well as to neighboring counties. The search for parts and equipment is thus expedited should a disaster occur.

Special Districts

Circle Oaks (Water Service Population 500): Circle Oaks operates entirely independently, pumping and purifying water from the three wells that service the community. One well, the primary source of water, functions at near capacity. Circle Oaks has a building moratorium that will remain in place until water capacity is increased. The community can remove the moratorium by adding a large water storage tank to their infrastructure. However the cost of purchasing and maintaining this storage tank would be the responsibility of the current residents who already pay one of the highest water rates in California. These rates cannot be reduced until the building moratorium is lifted which would allow the creation of a larger consumer base from new residents. In short, the district is in a classic Catch-22 situation.

From the end of January through March 2004, the Circle Oaks Board of Directors had only two Directors and could not conduct official business or issue reports.

Circle Oaks has limited resources and is unable to take advantage of the economies of scale. Further, limited funds and a lack of management, technical and administrative staff makes it almost impossible for them to recover from structural and financial problems. In comparison, installation of a storage tank would be seen as a routine task by the larger cities.

Los Carneros is a dormant district with no pipeline or treatment facilities and has no immediate plans to initiate operations. The district was created to utilize reclaimed water and has the authority to issue bonds.

Congress Valley is the responsibility of the Napa City Water Department.

Three Special Districts receive Lake Berryessa water under a contract held by Napa County. These include: **Lake Berryessa Resort Improvement District** (Water Service Population 564), **Napa Berryessa Resort Improvement District** (Water Service Population 1036) and **Spanish Flat** (Water Service Population 392). These Districts receive "fee for service" support from Napa County Public works. Except for these small Districts on the lakeshore, Napa County has no other access to water from Lake Berryessa.

Approximately 20% of Napa County residents are provided water by private sources, which are outside the purview of the Grand Jury.

Conservation

Cities and towns have commendable conservation programs in operation. The County has a comprehensive water conservation program that, for example, encourages the use of a large variety of drought resistant plants. Compact discs containing pictures and descriptions of these plants will be available for sale at most Napa County city halls.

Methodology

The Grand Jury focused its attention on the degree to which the County and its water districts are prepared to deal with the following issues:

- Natural disasters such as a prolonged drought, major forest fire, or severe earthquake
- The increased demand associated with population growth
- Little or no reserve capacity
- Recycled water utilization
- Water delivery systems

To this end, the Grand Jury interviewed the following people:

- Napa County CEO
- City of Napa Water Division personnel
- Napa County Public Works staff
- City of Napa Public Works staff
- Circle Oaks Water Department staff
- Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) staff
- A Napa County Supervisor
- Yountville Mayor
- Yountville Town staff
- City of Calistoga staff
- Napa Sanitation District manager

An extensive bibliography of documents reviewed by the Grand Jury and a glossary of terms appear at the conclusion of this report.

Discussion

"When the well is dry then you know the value of water." Ben Franklin

With the exception of the City of Napa, there is very little or no capability to reroute water in an emergency. Infrastructure is even more limited for recycled wastewater.

Wastewater treatment plants produce more recycled water than can be delivered by existing systems. Investment in wastewater infrastructure could permit broader use of recycled water, thus conserving potable water.

A United States Geological Survey study conducted in 2000-2002 confirmed water level declines of 25 to 125 feet in the central and eastern parts of the M-S-T Creeks area. 4,800 area residents along with major water consumers (golf courses, schools, and vineyards) have dramatically reduced water levels. As more wells were constructed the draw on the water table increased, and numerous dry wells were reported. This in-depth study is a clearly documented local example of failed water stewardship.

The County is required by state mandate to increase housing. The availability of potable water is a major consideration in development. While the water supply is adequate to meet current demand in most places within the County, there is little or no reserve capacity. The potential for interruption of water service must be realistically anticipated.

By law, all water districts must have a system in place to collect, treat, and dispose of used water. Wastewater has not been highly prized, but as water tables become depleted, and as the cost of NBA water spirals upward, water districts are beginning to look with favor on converting wastewater to recycled water. Recycled water has a wide variety of classifications, and water quality depends on wastewater treatment levels. Water that meets the standards established for drinking water is classified as potable. Currently, no wastewater treatment facility in the County meets potable water standards. State law currently prohibits the use of recycled water as drinking water. Therefore, recycled water is used only to maintain and irrigate fairgrounds, parks, golf courses, and vineyards.

With no new water sources, the County needs to increase its recycled water utilization. However, two major problems stand in the way of increased utilization of recycled water - infrastructure cost and public acceptance.

Public policy decrees that the residents of each water district shall pay for the construction and maintenance of their water system. The County respects that separation and will breach district autonomy only if requested to do so or if there is an emergency. When a request is honored, a fee for service is imposed. This leaves small districts in a precarious condition. Their insistence on autonomy, on the one hand, and their inability to take advantage of economies of scale on the other, makes them vulnerable to any disruption of water services.

The independent nature of LAFCO makes it uniquely qualified to analyze countywide issues. The 2003 LAFCO Napa County Water Service Study cites historical examples illustrating a lack of effective water service planning. A fragmented, decentralized approach to Napa County water service makes effective long-range planning difficult. LAFCO notes that the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District has local representation from all communities and legislative authority that make it the best existing organization to develop and adopt a countywide water management plan.

Finding 1:

Napa County has finite water resources and growing water needs.

Recommendation 1:

The use of recycled water should be maximized throughout the County. Cities and towns, in concert with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District should intensify efforts to use reclaimed water.

Municipalities should also be encouraged to construct tertiary level wastewater treatment plants and seek funds to construct infrastructure to deliver recycled waters.

Response Requested:

Napa County Board of Supervisors
Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Napa Sanitation District
City of American Canyon
City of St Helena
Town of Yountville
City of Calistoga

Finding 2:

Small water districts have limited resources and inadequate back-up provisions.

Recommendation 2:

Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District should conduct a feasibility study to determine whether or not a countywide authority is needed to support all water districts.

Response Requested:

Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Local Agency Formation Commission

Finding 3:

Residents, private organizations, farms and public entities within the M-S-T area have depleted the aquifer, causing long-term damage.

Recommendation 3:

The Napa Sanitation District and the County should develop a plan for funding the construction of an infrastructure to deliver recycled water to the M-S-T area. This would reduce demand on the aquifer.

Response requested:

Napa County Board of Supervisors
Napa Sanitation District

Bibliography

Bell Canyon Reservoir Watershed Sanitary Survey Update City of St Helena, Archibald & Wallberg Consultants November 2002
Circle Oaks County Water District budget 2003/2004 (no reserves-no projects)
Circle Oaks County Water District budget 2002/2003
Circle Oaks County Water District Preliminary Engineer's Report, Triad Holmes Associates September 2001
City of Calistoga Staff Report, June 3, 2003, Water and Waste Water Study Session - Project Financing and Rates City of Calistoga Municipal Code, Chapter Water Services, Article VII (section 13.04.320)
City of Calistoga Staff Report, October 6, 2003, Consideration of a Resolution Authorizing the Execution of an agreement with Harrison Engineering in an Amount Not to Exceed \$185,000 for Engineering and Environmental Services for the Kimball Reservoir Maintenance Dredging Project
City of Napa Memorandum, Felix Riesenber, 11/21/2003

City of Napa Inter-Office Memorandum, Don Ridenhour, 3/18/2002
 City of Napa Water Shortage Contingency Analysis, Urban Water Management
 Plan 2000, 10/27/00
 City of Napa, The Reservoir, fall 2003
 Ground-Water Resources in the Lower Milliken-Sarco-Tulocay Creeks Area,
 Southeastern Napa County, California, 2000-2002, Water-Resources
 Investigations Report 03-4229, U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological
 Survey
 Howell Mountain Mutual Water Company Watershed Sanitary Survey prepared
 by Adrian Dice
 LAFCO of Napa County, Keene Simonds, Comprehensive Water Service
 Study, 9/9/2003
 Lake Hennessey Watershed and Lake Milliken Watershed Sanitary Survey
 Update
 City of Napa prepared by Archibald & Wallberg Consultants March 2002
 Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Robert J
 Peterson, Response to Grand Jury Finding, 9/16/2003
 Napa Sanitation District Water Reuse Program, NSD, June 1997
 Napa Valley Register, 11/9/2003, Jay Goetting, Recycled water Eyed as Key to
 Coombsville Groundwater Ills
 Napa Valley Register, 11/19/2003, Jay Goetting, State Water Impacted by Napa
 Accord
 New York Times, 4/12/2004, Associated Press, Drought Worsens Across West
 and Threat of Wildfires Grow
 The Press Democrat, 11/9/2003, Ann DuBay, Why the Board of Supervisors
 Shouldn't Water Down Well Regulations
 Presentation to Napa County Forum on Water, Clarion Inn, Napa, 10/20/1990
 Recycled Water Facility Plan, prepared for the City of American Canyon by
 HydroScience Engineers, Incorporated, December 2003
 San Francisco Chronicle, 11/24/2003, Jane Kay, Less Waste of Water Could
 Solve Shortage
 Water Use Data for Circle Oaks County Water District 1998-2001
 Watershed Sanitary Survey for Kimball Canyon Dam Calistoga, California May
 1996
 Watershed Sanitary Survey for Rector Reservoir Yountville, California, prepared
 by the Department of Health Services
 Drinking Water Field Operations Branch Santa Rosa District Office December
 1995
 Watershed Sanitary Survey Update Solano County Water Agency and Napa
 County Department of Public Works January 2001

Glossary

Aquifer - A natural underground layer of porous, water bearing materials usually
 capable of yielding a large amount of water.
 Tertiary - Recycled water for non-potable uses.

CITIZEN COMPLAINTS TO THE GRAND JURY

General

When the Grand Jury Final Report is published, a Citizen Complaint Form is included with it. Every year the Grand Jury receives several completed forms and also complaint letters that describe problems and may request investigations of various government entities. These letters are a valuable source of information for a grand jury, particularly as it begins its term and is deciding on its investigative agenda.

Procedures

In the case of the 2003-2004 Grand Jury, such letters and citizen complaints were considered initially by the full Grand Jury and then, if the Jury decided it was warranted, either routed to the Grand Jury committees that were investigating related subject areas or a new committee was formed to review the matter.

Some complaints were integrated into the investigative work of the various Grand Jury committees. The investigating body reported back with a recommendation for disposition, which was then decided upon by the full Grand Jury. The complaint topics were often addressed, either directly or indirectly, in individual agency findings and recommendations incorporated in the Grand Jury Final Report.

Some complaints and the issues they raised were judged not to fall under the jurisdiction of the Grand Jury. All citizen complaints receive a response from the Grand Jury as to what disposition was decided upon by the whole Grand Jury.

The Citizen Complaint Form appears on the following page. This form, as well as additional information regarding the Napa County Grand Jury, may be found online at the following address:

http://www.napa.courts.ca.gov/GrandJury/GJ_contact.htm

**NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY
CITIZEN COMPLAINT FORM**

Date: _____

**Napa County Grand Jury
P.O. Box 5397
Napa, California 94581-0397**

Dear Members of the Grand Jury:

I wish to bring the following matter to your attention (all matters brought before the Grand Jury are required by law to be kept confidential):

Sincerely,

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

Phone: _____

Note: Name, address and phone number are not required but may be helpful in the Grand Jury's investigation of each complaint.