

JUVENILE HALL

REASON FOR INVESTIGATION

California Penal Code Section 919(b) requires the Civil Grand Jury to inspect all detention facilities within the County of Nevada.

PROCEDURE FOLLOWED

The Grand Jury inspected the facility on November 9, 1999. Updated information was obtained on April 4, 2000. The following person was interviewed:

Douglas Carver, Superintendent.

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.
2. The facility's maximum capacity is nineteen.
3. As of April 4, 2000, there were sixteen detainees. Three were in pre-adjudication stage and thirteen had been adjudicated.
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.
5. Juvenile Hall provides basic education for all wards and the school hours meet the minimum state standards.
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.
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 \$3,300.00 per month, or \$110.00 per day. There were no Nevada County juvenile placements at the CYA as of April 4, 2000.
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.
9. The Grand Jury 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.
11. On February 10, 2000, the Civil Grand Jury submitted Interim Report No. 1 recommending the construction of a new Juvenile Hall Facility.
12. On March 7, 2000, the Nevada County Board of Supervisors responded and agreed of 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.
13. On March 14, 2000, the Board of supervisors approved a final bid.
 14. On March 29, 2000, groundbreaking ceremonies for the new detention facility took place.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The present Juvenile Hall facility is physically antiquated. The Board of Supervisors has acknowledged the urgent need for a more modern facility in order to meet the needs of Nevada County's growing juvenile problem.
2. The Grand Jury was impressed with Mr. Carver's knowledge in the field of juvenile justice.
3. A "caged" 4 x 4 transportation vehicle with an operational police radio is necessary for the transportation of juveniles to and from Truckee Township.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

GRAND JURY ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The commitment made by the Board of Supervisors to build a new and modern Juvenile Hall is applauded by the Grand Jury.

The Grand Jury believes that the Board of Supervisors served the community well with this forward-looking vision to improve conditions not only for the troubled juveniles but also for the courts and the probation staff.

The Grand Jury considers the expansion of the Juvenile Hall facility as only the first phase to be followed by more intensified and complete programs by the court and the probation organization to rehabilitate the youth.

The decision to expand the Juvenile Hall facility is truly a milestone event marking the beginning of a new era.

REQUIRED RESPONSES

Chief Probation Officer, Due August 30, 2000

Board of Supervisors, Due September 30, 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

June 7, 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 May 23, 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.

FINDINGS

1. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
2. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
3. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
4. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
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. The cost to house a juvenile detainee is \$112.00 per day not \$67.00 per day as indicated.
8. This Respondent disagrees with a portion of this finding. Further clarification is necessary. The 1989 Dodge is one of two vehicles that are used by the Juvenile Hall. However, the second vehicle is a caged van used to transport detainees to and from court (can be daily) and to other appointments. Because this vehicle is usually tied up the transporting of minors to or from Truckee or out-of-county becomes difficult with an unreliable 1989 Dodge.
9. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
10. This Respondent disagrees with a portion of this finding. Further clarification is necessary. Senior Group Supervisors have always enhanced the overall smooth running of the Juvenile Hall. However, assuming "additional responsibilities" needs to be clarified. Recently there has been an organizational realignment of duties within the Juvenile Hall. Job duties that were previously done by any Senior Group Supervisor were assigned to a specific Senior Group Supervisor. This helped to monitor workload assignments and to insure project completions.
11. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
12. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
13. This Respondent agrees with this finding.
14. 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 with the above clarifications. Pursuant to Section 933.05(b) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but on June 5, 2000 the Board of Supervisors tentatively approved the purchase of a replacement vehicle. Final Budget Hearings will take place on June 27, 2000. It is believed that shortly thereafter procurement of a replacement vehicle and radio will begin.

Sincerely,



John M. Wardell

Chief Probation Officer

COUNTY OF NEVADA

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

950 Maidu Avenue • Nevada City, California 95959-8617

Telephone: (530) 265-1480 • FAX: (530) 265-1234

Toll-Free Telephone: (888) 785-1480

E-Mail: www.co.nevada.ca.us/ncbos/clerk

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



Peter Van Zant, 1st District
Karen Knecht, 2nd District
Bruce Conklin, 3rd District
Elizabeth Martin, 4th District
Sam Dardick, 5th District

Cathy R. Thompson
Clerk of the Board

July 19, 2000

The Honorable Carl Bryan
Presiding Judge of the Nevada County Courts
Nevada County Court House
Nevada City CA 95959

Subject: Board of Supervisors' Responses to the 1999-2000 Nevada County Civil Grand Jury Interim Report No. 4 dated May 23, 2000, regarding Juvenile Hall.

Dear Judge Bryan:

The attached responses by the Board of Supervisors to the 1999-2000 Nevada County Civil Grand Jury Interim Report No. 4 dated May 23, 2000, are submitted as required by California Penal Code §933(c).

These responses to the Grand Jury's findings and recommendations were approved by the Board of Supervisors at their regular meeting on July 18, 2000. They 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.

The Board of Supervisors would like to thank the members of the 1999-2000 Grand Jury for their participation and effort in preparing the Interim Report.

Sincerely,

Bruce Conklin
Chairman of the Board

Attachment

bc:pb

cc: Foreman, Grand Jury
Ted Gaebler, County Administrator
County Counsel

**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)