



TRINITY COUNTY

Office of the County Administrator

WENDY G. TYLER

County Administrative Officer

P.O. BOX 1613, WEAVERVILLE, CALIFORNIA 96093-1613

PHONE (530) 623-1382 FAX (530) 623-8365

RECEIVED

SEP 6 - 2013

TRINITY COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT

TO: The Honorable Elizabeth Johnson,
Judge of the Superior Court

FROM: *WGT* Wendy G. Tyler, County Administrative Officer

CC: Clerk of the Board

SUBJECT: Response to Recommendations of 2012-13
Grand Jury Judicial Committee Final Report
Re Trinity County Detention Facility
JUR-2012-2013-003

DATE: September 5, 2013

The Grand Jury Judicial Committee has requested a written response to their final report number JUR2012-2013-003. In my capacity as County Administrative Officer my response is as follows:

Finding #1: *The County Jail is funded primarily by the County General Fund in a time of diminishing financial resources and many competing needs. This has limited the ability of the County to make the necessary improvements to the facility. Simply not having the funds does not release the county of its obligation to improve the status quo.*

Response: I agree in part. The Jail is funded primarily with General Fund dollars and those resources are indeed diminishing. That being said, the County has invested \$99,000 over the past two fiscal years for maintenance and repairs/improvements to the Jail and Administration wing. Detailed work orders can be obtained from General Services.

Recommendation #1: *In the litigious state we are in, a well thought plan to address the needs of the jail will go a long way to improve the untenable situation that the jail presents. The Board of Supervisors with the Sheriff should convene an advisory committee to explore funding options and develop a five-year plan for the implementation of improvements to address the needs of the jail facility. This plan could do a great deal to not only improve the condition of the*

jail but also reduce the potential liability of the county. Putting forth the effort to procure alternative sources of funding combined with incremental improvements will not only help reduce liability of the county it will also improve the jail.

Create a plan to address Finding 1 and provide an update of progress to each future Grand Jury in December of each year.

Response: Has been partially implemented. The Sheriff has applied for every grant opportunity known to him for a new facility. Several years ago we received a grant that allowed us to replace a portion of the HVAC system on the building. There is a committee meeting currently to assist in preparation of the most recently released grant application for a new jail. As for a plan to make improvements to the current facility, that will not be implemented. There is a preventative maintenance plan in place. The Grand Jury is welcome to request a copy of that plan from General Services as part of its yearly investigation of the facility.

Finding #2: *The new video system has been purchased but is not installed.*

Response: I agree in part. A used system was procured and installation was attempted with volunteer labor. However, installation of the system proved to be more difficult than anticipated, and progress has stalled. The Sheriff has requested General Services to obtain quotes for purchase and installation of a new system.

Recommendation #2: *Putting the video system into operation should be a top priority. The safety and well being of the employees and inmates is dependant (sic) upon it.*

Response: I agree.

Finding #3: *There is not an adequate battery back-up for the computer-aided dispatch system. The emergency dispatch system needs to have a (sic) least two fail safe back-up systems.*

Response: I disagree with this finding. Every system, under the right (or wrong) conditions could fail. If the UPS fails, it will 'fail-safe' and fault to input current going to attached devices. If the generator fails, there will be no power.

Recommendation #3: *Procure an adequate back-up system for the computer-enhanced dispatch system.*

Response: Has been partially implemented. First, the generator switchover has been modified to effect a cleaner and quicker transition when the power fails or during a generator test, which is when the original incident occurred. Second, the UPS at the main station has been replaced with a larger unit. It has the power to easily handle the load attached to it. These two systems provide redundancy for power brownouts. During extended power outages, the generator will provide power to both dispatch systems.

If the Sheriff's office would like to go a step further in assuring the integrity of its power, UPS monitoring cards could be purchased. A smart UPS would need to be purchased for station 2 in order to implement the card on both stations. The cost for this project, including network attachment, would be approximately \$2800 - \$3500. This would allow for preemptive action in the case of UPS battery failure.

In short, if redundancy is considered adequate, the goal has been met. If a little more than basic redundancy is required, then a bit more investment would be needed.

Finding #4: *The oxygen concentrator is too noisy.*

Response: I cannot agree nor disagree with this finding. By the time I was preparing my response, the concentrator had been replaced.

Recommendation #4: *Service or replace it.*

Response: Has been implemented. The oxygen concentrator is provided via a lease arrangement. The equipment has been replaced.

:wt