

# JUVENILE HALL

## REASON FOR INVESTIGATION

The Nevada County Civil Grand Jury may investigate the incorporated cities within the County. During various interviews with the personnel of the cities of Grass Valley and Nevada City, the Grand Jury's efforts focused on the problems within the juvenile population.

## PROCEDURES FOLLOWED

The Grand Jury interviewed the following listed personnel:

Grass Valley Police Department officers.

John Foster - Chief, Grass Valley Police Dept.

Lou Travato - Chief, Nevada City Police Dept.

John Wardell - Chief, Juvenile Probation Office

Dennis Salter - Project Manager/Construction Juvenile Hall

The Grand Jury acknowledges receipt of letters dated January 11, 2000; "Three options of Juvenile Hall Operations," and "New Juvenile Assessment Center Financing," written by Roy Pederson, Interim County Administrator.

## FINDINGS

1 - The various police departments emphatically stated that an expanded Juvenile Hall is critical.

2 - Due to inadequacies of the current Juvenile Hall, the State Board of Corrections has awarded a 5.4 Million-dollar grant to Nevada County for replacement.

3 - The commitment to start construction is scheduled with the Board of Corrections for April 3, 2000. This 5.4 Million Dollar grant has been stated to be a "One-time Only" grant and would be lost if not acted upon by April 3, 2000.

4 - The cities in Nevada County are in the process of change. Juvenile delinquency is on the rise led by the increase in auto theft. Law enforcement reports that much of the increase is due to youth that feel assured of very light or no penalties--They have learned that the Hall is up to capacity.

5 - The consistent overcrowding of Juvenile Hall makes it difficult for the police to detain juvenile offenders.

6 - Juvenile Hall is the only locked mental health facility in Nevada County for juvenile offenders.

7 - Approximately 20 - 30 juveniles are cited each week. Many of these would have been detained in Juvenile Hall had it not been for overcrowding.

8 - Expansion of the Juvenile Hall was recommended in the 1993/94- 1994/95 -1995/96 - 1996/97 Grand Jury reports.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

- 1 - The need to provide an expanded Juvenile Hall is critical and long past due.
- 2 - The Board of Supervisors now has the opportunity to correct the Juvenile Hall problem.
- 3 - The loss of the State grant of 5.4 Million Dollars will eventually shift the total construction amount to Nevada County taxpayers. The Courts could eventually mandate the corrections to the Juvenile Hall, giving the County no choice in funding this project.
- 4 - After inspection, the Board of Corrections has stated that the Juvenile Hall is inadequate, antiquated and under-staffed.
- 5 - Due to the over-population at Juvenile Hall the Courts and law enforcement have serious difficulties in dealing with juvenile delinquents.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1 - The Grand Jury strongly recommends to Nevada County Board of Supervisors that it take immediate steps to build a new and modern Juvenile Hall.
- 2 - Nevada County Board of Supervisors should comply strictly with the timetable schedule of the Board of Corrections for State grant monies.
- 3 - The Grand Jury strongly recommends that the Nevada County Board of Supervisors seriously consider the negative impact on the community should the 5.4 Million Dollar State grant be lost or forfeited with the expense then shifting to the Nevada County taxpayers.

## **REQUIRED RESPONSES**

Board of Supervisors

Requested DUE -30 Days

John Wardell - Chief Probation Department Requested Due - 30 Days

NEVADA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESPONSES TO  
1999-2000 CIVIL GRAND JURY INTERIM REPORT NO.4  
DATED MAY 23, 2000

RE: CONSTRUCTION OF NEW JUVENILE HALL FACILITY

*Responses to findings and recommendations are based on either personal knowledge, examination of official county records, review of the response by the probation department, and testimony from the board chairman and county staff members.*

I. GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION:

Juvenile Hall

A. RESPONSE TO FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS:

Findings:

1. **The Juvenile Hall was built in 1955, and has been modified several times. Some of the modifications have been made as the result of prior Grand Jury findings and Board of Corrections recommendations.**  
Agree
2. **The facility's maximum capacity is nineteen.**  
Agree
3. **As of April 4, 2000, there were sixteen detainees. Three were in pre-adjudication stage and thirteen had been adjudicated.**  
Agree
4. **As of April 4, 2000, there were six juveniles on the waiting list to be committed to Juvenile Hall and six juveniles on electronic monitoring.**  
Agree
5. **Juvenile Hall provides basic education for all wards and the school hours meet the minimum state standards.**  
Agree

6. **Juvenile Hall provides rehabilitative programs such as Alcoholics and Narcotics Anonymous, Anger Management, and group and individual therapy. There is also an art program available to those interested.**

Agree

7. **The cost of housing a juvenile detainee is \$67.00 per day. There is a contract with the California Youth Authority (CYA) to house a juvenile at a cost of \$3,300 per month, or \$110.00 per day. There were no Nevada County juvenile placements at the CYA as of April 4, 2000.**

Disagree with the first sentence. The cost to house a juvenile detainee is \$112.00 per day. Agree with sentences two and three.

8. **The facility has only one "caged vehicle" for transportation of juveniles. This is a two-wheel drive 1989 Dodge with an inoperable police radio.**

Partially agree. The 1989 Dodge 4-door Sedan is one of two vehicles used to transport juvenile detainees. The other vehicle is a caged van used to transport all detainees and is not always available for transportation of juveniles.

9. **The Grand Jury found the facility to be clean and orderly in appearance.**

Partially agree. The Board has no knowledge of the condition of the facility when inspected by the Grand Jury. The Chairman of the Board conducted an inspection at 10:30 A.M. on Wednesday, May 10, 2000, and found the facility to be clean and orderly in appearance.

10. **The Senior Group Supervisors assumed additional responsibilities, which enhance the overall smooth running of the facility.**

Agree with the response by the Probation Officer. Additional responsibilities previously assumed by any Senior Group Supervisor have now been assigned to specific supervisors.

11. **On February 10, 2000, the Civil Grand Jury submitted Interim Report No. 1 recommending the construction of a new Juvenile Hall Facility.**

Agree

12. **On March 7, 2000, the Nevada County Board of Supervisors responded and agreed to the need for a new facility. The Board gave their approval for solicitation of bids to construct an expanded juvenile detention center. They further acknowledged the importance of obtaining the Board of Corrections grant of \$5.4 million dollars.**

Agree

13. On March 14, 2000, the Board of Supervisors approved a final bid.

Agree

14. On March 29, 2000, groundbreaking ceremonies for the new detention facility took place.

Agree

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The existing "caged" transportation vehicle should be replaced with a four-wheel drive vehicle with an operable police radio.

The recommendation has been implemented. On June 27, 2000 in conjunction with adoption of the Final County Budget for 2000-01, the Board of Supervisors approved the purchase of a four-wheel drive vehicle with a police radio as a replacement for the 1989 Dodge 4-door Sedan assigned to Juvenile Hall. The new vehicle should be ordered in the near future and available for use by the end of the year.

#### **B. OTHER RESPONSES REQUIRED:**

John Wardell – Chief Probation Department (Submitted June 7, 2000)



## NEVADA COUNTY

# PROBATION DEPARTMENT

JOHN M. WARDELL  
Chief Probation Officer

Second Floor Courthouse, 201 Church St., Suite 10  
Nevada City, California 95959-2504  
(916) 265-1200  
Fax: (916) 265-1556

February 28, 2000

Honorable Carl F. Bryan II  
Presiding Judge  
Nevada County Superior Court  
201 Church Street  
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Judge Bryan:

The following is in response to a Grand Jury report dated February 10, 2000.

Pursuant to Section 933(c).

- (1) The respondent agrees with the finding.
- (2) The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the findings, in which case the respondent shall specify the portion of the findings that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor

Section 933.05(b) For the purpose of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

- (1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
- (2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.
- (3) The recommendation requires further analyses, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. The timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.
- (4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.

Attached is a copy of the Grand Jury report and a letter from the Board of Corrections dated December 2, 1998. The following is my responses to each of the Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations.

## FINDINGS

1. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
2. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
3. This Respondent disagrees with a portion of this finding. Further clarification is necessary. It is my understanding after speaking to Board of Correction staff that Nevada County needs to have entered into a contract to begin construction with the Board of Corrections by the April 3, 2000. Weather delays maybe considered as a reason to delay the start of actual on sight construction. This grant is believed to be the only time in the foreseeable future that funds will be available through the State of California.
4. This Respondent disagrees with a portion of this finding. Further clarification is necessary. Between 1998 and 1999 there was a 27% increase in those minors booked into the Juvenile Hall for Burglary followed by a 21% increase in minors booked for Assault and/or Battery. Minors booked for vehicle theft was actually down by 12%. Over the past ten years juvenile bookings have increased on an average of 22%.
5. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
6. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
7. This Respondent disagrees with a portion of this finding. Further clarification is necessary. It is estimated that on an average there are at least 10 to 12 additional minors that could be housed in the Juvenile Hall, each week, if there were room. This would bring the total of minors housed to a minimum of 30. This statement is based on an ongoing waiting list and. Juvenile Hall staff who receives numerous phone calls from law enforcement personnel inquiring as to the availability of bed space. This does not take into account those law enforcement personnel who simply do not call the Juvenile Hall based on the Hall being historically full.
8. This Respondent agrees with this finding.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Pursuant to Section 933(c) of the California Penal Code, this respondent agrees with the findings of the Grand Jury. Pursuant to Section 933.05(b) the Respondent does not believe further response is warranted.

Sincerely,



John M. Wardell  
Chief Probation Officer