

FILED

JUN 28 2007

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF TRINITY
BY: DONNA REGNANI, DEPUTY CLERK**

DR

**TRINITY COUNTY GRAND JURY
2006-2007**

**HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT**

YOUTH SERVICES

**This Report was Approved
On June 5, 2007**

**2006-2007 Trinity County Grand Jury
Health & Human Services Committee
Final Report
Youth Services**

Purpose:

The Trinity County Grand Jury is charged each year with reviewing county operations and reporting about the effectiveness of these programs.

Background:

The Health and Human Services Committee was interested in reviewing the function of "Youth Services" last investigated in a 1990-91 Trinity County Grand Jury report. Specifically, members of the committee wondered what services the county provides children ages 12-17. How effective are the services which are currently provided?

Method of Investigation:

The Committee used interviews and search options to determine what services were available.

Finding 1:

There is no single entity within county government called "Youth Services." While many different entities within the county (both public and private) provide a variety of programs for youth ages 12-17, these programs are run quite independently of each other. There are only minimal county services for youth and virtually no coordination of these services.

Recommendation 1:

A percentage of property tax revenues should be designated for coordinated and increased services for youth. Investment now will save dollars later.

Finding 2:

While county departments work with the Office of Education, State of California and private sources to fund projects, the existing revenue sources for prevention programs for this age group is quite elusive at best and is most often at risk of being terminated. Grant monies are difficult to find and the programs last only short periods of time.

Recommendation 2:

Provide consistent funding for pre-judicial youth programs. Also, support more generously the few programs that are in place and expand the range of services.

Conclusion:

If the county invested amounts now, directly, for pre-judicial youth programs, it will save the taxpayers measurable tax dollars in the future and result in more productive young adults.

Responses Required:


<u>Entity</u>	<u>Finding</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Respond in</u>
Board of Supervisors	1,2	1,2	90 days
County Office of Education	2	2	60 days
CAO	1	1	60 days



TRINITY COUNTY
Office of the County Administrator
LARRY A. LAYTON
County Administrative Officer
P.O. BOX 1613, WEAVERVILLE, CALIFORNIA 96093-1613
PHONE (530) 623-1382 FAX (530) 623-8365

RECEIVED
AUG 29 2007
TRINITY COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT

TO: The Honorable Anthony C. Edwards,
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: Larry A. Layton, County Administrative Officer 

CC: Kelly Frost, Deputy Clerk of the Board

SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2006-07
Grand Jury Health & Human Service Committee Final Report
Youth Services

DATE: August 24, 2007

The Grand Jury Health & Human Services Committee has requested a written response to their final report on youth services. In my capacity as County Administrative Officer, my response is as follows:

Finding #1: *There is no single entity within county government called "Youth Services." While many different entities within the county (both public and private) provide a variety of programs for youth ages 12-17, these programs are run quite independently of each other. There are only minimal county services for youth and virtually no coordination of these services.*

Response: I agree with this finding.

Recommendation #1: *A percentage of property tax revenues should be designated for coordinated and increased services for youth. Investment now will save dollars later.*

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented. Current property tax revenues do not supply sufficient funding for all mandated county services, i.e., law enforcement officers, district attorney, etc. It would not be appropriate to reduce this funding even further by designating a percentage for youth services.

Finding #2: *While county departments work with the Office of Education, State of California and private sources to fund projects, the existing revenue sources for prevention*

programs for this age group is quite elusive at best and is most often at risk of being terminated. Grant monies are difficult to find and the programs last only short period of time.

Response: I agree with this finding.

Recommendation #2: *Provide consistent funding for pre-judicial youth programs. Also, support more generously the few programs that are in place and expand the range of services.*

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented. Once again, the County lacks sufficient revenues to fund additional services.

LAL:wt