

COUNTY OF NEVADA
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



Nathan H. Beason, 1st District
Edward C. Scofield, 2nd District
Chair Dan Miller, 3rd District
Vice-Chair Wm. "Hank" Weston, 4th District
Richard Anderson, 5th District

Julie Patterson Hunter,
Clerk of the Board

August 9, 2016

The Honorable Thomas Anderson
Presiding Judge of the Nevada County Grand Jury
Nevada County Courthouse
201 Church Street
Nevada City, CA 95959

Rec'd + Reviewed
8/11/16
TMA

Re: Board of Supervisors' Responses to the 2015-16 Nevada County Civil Grand Jury Report, *Carl F. Bryan II Regional Juvenile Hall, Is It Worth the Cost?*

Dear Judge Anderson:

As required by California Penal Code Section 933, the Board of Supervisors hereby submits its responses to the 2015-16 Nevada County Civil Grand Jury Report, dated July 20, 2016 entitled *Carl F. Bryan II Regional Juvenile Hall, Is It Worth the Cost?*

These responses to the Grand Jury's Findings and Recommendations were approved by the Board of Supervisors at their regular meeting on August 9, 2016. The Responses are based on either personal knowledge, examination of official County records, and information received from the Board of Supervisors and County staff members.

The Board of Supervisors would like to thank the members of the 2015-16 Grand Jury for their participation and effort in preparing their Reports, and their participation in the Grand Jury process.

Sincerely,

Dan Miller, Chairman
Nevada County Board of Supervisors

cc: Douglas M. Wight, Foreman, Grand Jury
Rick Haffey, County Executive Officer
Michael Ertola, Chief Probation Officer

950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 200, Nevada City CA 95959-8617
phone: 530.265.1480 | fax: 530.265.9836 | toll free: 888.785.1480 | email: bdofsupervisors@co.nevada.ca.us
website: <http://www.mynevadacounty.com/nc/bos>

NEVADA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESPONSES TO

2016/2017 Nevada County Civil Grand Jury Report

**Carl F. Bryan II Regional Juvenile Hall
Is It Worth the Cost?**

DATED: 07/20/2016

Responses to findings and recommendations are based on either personal knowledge, examination of official county records, review of the responses by the County Executive Officer, Chief Probation Officer, or testimony from the Board of Supervisors and county staff members.

A. RESPONSES TO FINDINGS

F1. The average daily cost of housing detainees in Juvenile Hall for Fiscal Year 2014-15 averaged \$377 per day or \$137,481 per year, per detainee.

Agree

F2. Decreasing numbers of local detainees are housed in the facility.

Agree

F3. Regardless of the decreasing number of detainees, overall costs of Juvenile Hall are not commensurably reduced because of the high cost of Title 15 mandated staffing.

Agree

F4. Contracting for Nevada County's juvenile detention needs with a neighboring county juvenile facility is estimated to be approximately 65% less expensive maintaining a full service juvenile hall in Nevada County.

Partially Agree

Statement F4 does not take into account the cost and impact to the overall budget of the probation department to pay for a Deputy Probation Officer to transport to and from the neighboring county facility at time of booking and for scheduled court appearances. Added, the cost of staff time for Deputy Probation Officers to travel to and from neighboring county facilities to interview youth.

- F5. Substantial savings for the county general fund would be achieved by closing Juvenile Hall and contracting with a neighboring county for detention of Nevada County detainees.

Agree

B. RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1. By the end of Fiscal Year 2016-17, the Nevada County Board of Supervisors and the Nevada County Probation Department, in collaboration with the Nevada County Superior Court and other stakeholders, should negotiate a contract at the lowest rate possible for all of Nevada County's juvenile detention needs with neighboring county juvenile facilities to reduce Nevada County's general fund costs.

The recommendation will not be implemented at the present time.

The County believes the benefit to house Nevada County youth locally in our therapeutic rich and proven environment compared to neighboring facilities that do not value such a rehabilitative vision supersedes the cost benefit philosophy.

Resolution No. 00-427, dated September 5, 2000, passed by the Nevada County Board of Supervisors, to receive the Construction Grants Program Grant Contract between the State Board of Corrections and County of Nevada, funding to build the Carl F. Bryan II Juvenile Hall stipulates in Exhibit D, page 1 of 4, "The Grantee assures and certifies that it: will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title, or other interest in the site or facilities, or lease the facility for operation by other entities, without permission and instructions from the Office of Juvenile Programs, U.S. Department of Justice."

- R2. Once favorable contract arrangements with neighboring county juvenile facilities are secured, the Nevada County Board of Supervisors and the Nevada County Probation Department, in collaboration with the Nevada County Superior Court and all other stakeholders, should study and determine the cost effectiveness of alternative uses for the current Carl F. Bryan II Regional Juvenile Hall and repurpose all of the facility for other public programs and services.

The recommendation will not be implemented at the present time.

Resolution No. 00-427, dated September 5, 2000, passed by the Nevada County Board of Supervisors, to receive the Construction Grants Program Grant Contract between the State Board of Corrections and County of Nevada, funding to build the Carl F. Bryan II Juvenile Hall stipulates in Exhibit D, page 1 of 4, "The Grantee assures and certifies that it: will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title, or other interest in the site or facilities, or lease the facility for

operation by other entities, without permission and instructions from the Office of Juvenile Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.”