



**COUNTY OF LAKE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Courthouse - 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, California 95453
TELEPHONE (707) 263-2368
FAX (707) 263-2207

Moke Simon
District 1

Bruno Sabatier
District 2

Eddie Crandell
District 3

Tina Scott
District 4

Jessica Pyska
District 5

August 31, 2021

The Honorable Michael S. Lunas
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

RE: Response to the 2020/2021 Civil Grand Jury Final Report

Dear Judge Lunas:

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933 et seq., the Board of Supervisors submits this response to the FY 2020/2021 Civil Grand Jury's Final Report.

Our Board's responses are presented in the same sequence as the Recommendations appear in the Grand Jury's Final Report. We have provided responses to all items for which the report indicated a response was required by the Board of Supervisors.

Where applicable, responses from County Department Heads are likewise attached.

The Lake County Board of Supervisors recognizes the oversight role played by the Civil Grand Jury is tremendously valuable in ensuring just governance within the State of California. The commitments of time, energy and creativity made by each member of the FY 2020-21 Grand Jury, particularly in the face of highly complex conditions brought by the COVID-19 pandemic, are commendable. Our Board appreciates the persistence of this Grand Jury in dutifully executing their civic role in a manner consistent with State Law.

As you would expect, our Board could not agree with every Recommendation made by the Grand Jury. We nonetheless value the general intention of the members to ensure Lake County residents are well served by their local government. Our Board shares that goal, and we seek to continually improve our services, within resource limitations.

RESPONSE TO CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

“POTENTIAL FINANCIAL IMPROPRIETIES AND RESULTANT ACTIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS – MIDDLETOWN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT”

No response was required or requested of any agency, and our Board has no comment. We reached out to the District Attorney's office regarding this report, and were informed Ms. Krones likewise did not intend to submit any response.

“COUNTY OF LAKE COVID-19 MANDATE ORDINANCE”

This report presumes the reason greater enforcement of Ordinance No. 3097 did not occur was a lack of effective communication surrounding implementation. That is simply not the case.

At the time the Ordinance was passed, Tuesday, August 18, 2020, enhanced enforcement of Health Orders was thought to be among the most effective available tools to keep Lake County residents safe. It should be noted, at this juncture, the timeline for deployment of a COVID-19 vaccine was uncertain. Our Board voted 3-2 in favor of the Ordinance, as it was thought to be in the public interest.

It was also highly controversial. As stated in the Grand Jury’s report, County residents brought a Referendum, blocking effectuation of the Ordinance at the customary interval (*30 days following the 2nd Reading*). Although the Referendum was ultimately unsuccessful, by the time that process had played out, preparation for the vaccine rollout in Lake County had become the dominant priority in our work to contain COVID-19.

Because efforts toward the Ordinance had proven highly divisive, upping enforcement just as vaccination awareness and distribution campaigns were set to begin was likely to frustrate, rather than support, the ultimate aim of protecting as many Lake County residents as possible from the virus. Therefore, enforcement was not prioritized; vaccination was, instead.

With that preface, here are our responses to the Grand Jury’s specific Recommendations.

R1. All future county-wide Ordinances which designate multi-departmental involvement are discussed in advance with the specific departments including feasibility studies, staffing needs, training needs, and additional departmental budgeting to support the efforts. (F1)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: It is always this Board’s goal to promote policies that are feasible and appropriately staffed and funded. Speed is prioritized in emergency situations

R2. The current Ordinance be amended to accurately represent what the County is willing and prepared to follow through on and then reissued to be on public record.

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: We do not foresee amending this Ordinance, at this time.

R3. An adaptive and workable set of guidelines in dealing with unforeseen emergencies be developed to aid future county Boards, staff, and departments in addressing governmental leadership, regulations, and public conformity.

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: The County of Lake employs the Incident Command System (ICS).

“EMERGENCY EVACUATIONS IN RESPONSE TO WILDFIRES”

R2. If the EOC phone cannot practically be utilized as a consistent information portal for the public 24 hours/day during declared emergencies, another phone line (such as 3-1-1) should be designated for emergency information and made available by the County, perhaps manned by CERT team members. (F-11, F-12)

NEUTRAL, requires further analysis to be completed by December 20, 2021.

Explanation: As described in the Sheriff's Departmental Grand Jury Response, 2-1-1 dialing is active in Lake County, and has been used in our COVID-19 emergency response. Evaluation of the capacity of 2-1-1 to augment means of communication typically used during wildfire disaster events (e.g., Nixle/Everbridge, LakeCoAlerts and Lake County Sheriff's Office and/or County of Lake Facebook pages) is ongoing.

“WASTEWATER – GETTING IT RIGHT”

R1. A specific program be developed – that provides information and tours (methods of operation and environmental impact) for appropriate secondary school science classes – between the Lake County Office of Education and Lake County Special Districts Department.

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Our Board followed up with Special Districts Administrator, Scott Harter, who reported his Department agrees with the Grand Jury's Recommendation, and “will continue to work with the [Lake County Office of Education] regarding opportunities for collaboration when conditions permit that to be safely accomplished.” Interagency partnership in areas of mutual interest is consistent with our Board's Vision 2028 Priorities, and we support Administrator Harter's interest in and efforts toward implementation of such a program.

“NO-BID CONTRACTS”

R1. A system of regular and scheduled reviews of on-going contracts and supplier usage be instituted to ensure optimal efficiency in expenditure of county funds. (F1)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Ordinance 3109, which amended Purchasing requirements of the Lake County Code, was introduced August 3, 2021, and passed by our Board August 10. Adopted changes included a requirement competitive bidding be undertaken every three (3) years for ongoing Agreements. Please note, this Ordinance is to be effective Thursday, September 9, 2021.

R2. No bid contracts/purchase orders for Board of Supervisors review and approvals to have specific references on the formal meeting agendas indicating accurately as to an actual unique good or service or as to when the last competitive analysis was performed on this category of good or service (F2)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Ordinance 3109 likewise requires more specific documentation of the reasons goods or services are unique. Our Board is committed to ensuring the efficient expenditure of public funds, and revisiting governing policies, in partnership with County Administration, as needed.

“LAKE COUNTY NEEDS ITS OWN COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY”

R1. Lake County Behavioral Health Services should explore opportunities to establish a small, 24-hour inpatient mental health facility in Lake County or in concert with programs in Mendocino County. (F1, F2)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Our Board recognizes Behavioral Health Services Director, Todd Metcalf, has already engaged local stakeholders around creation of such a facility. We expect Director Metcalf will continue to bring any such opportunities to our attention, as they emerge.

R2. The Director of Lake County Behavioral Health Services should report to the Lake County Board of Supervisors his finding and recommendations regarding establishment of a 24-hour inpatient service facility for Lake County mental patients in either Lake or Mendocino County within six months.

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: As noted above, our Board expects Director Metcalf will bring such opportunities to our attention, as they arise. However, because this intention is consistent with recent practice, our Board finds it is unnecessary to impose a six-month reporting interval (i.e. no later than December 20, 2021), at this time.

“WE THE PEOPLE”

Our Board directs readers to the Response provided by Anita L. Grant, County Counsel, attached hereto, with which we fully concur. The tone of this report is deeply concerning, and we sincerely hope members of future Grand Juries will forego such sensationalism and ask clarifying questions, where needed.

R1. The Board of Supervisors should direct responsible County departments to fulfill their commitments to ensure the safety of the Lake. (F1)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Our Board finds this is normative practice. No additional action is required.

R2. Commitments from elected officials to the public, even implied ones, should be based on practical procedural realities and a willingness to ensure those commitments are met.

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Our Board finds this is normative practice. No additional action is required.

R3. A procedural review and periodic independent inspections should be conducted of the retained out-of-county arbiter service to ensure full compliance to the California Government Code laws as pertains to claims against the County. As claims are filed with the Board of Supervisors, their responsibility for proper handling does not go away by assigning the task to a staff department.

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Our Board takes very seriously our obligation to properly handle claims against the County. As noted in Ms. Grant's response, the utmost care is taken to ensure full compliance with the California Government Code while safeguarding County taxpayer interests. The County does not routinely employ an arbiter service, and has no plans to do so.

R4. County staff, when dealing with claims, should provide the Board members with accurate and complete information to allow them to make informed and deliberative decisions. (F10, F11)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Our Board finds this is normative practice. No additional action is required.

R5. County departments and staff should be directed to comply with legal requests, and 'best practices,' [sic] and fulfill commitments in the utilization of publically financed documents. (F7, F8, F9, F10, F12, F13)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Our Board finds this is normative practice. No additional action is required.

R6. To forego a new spillage problem occurring, but with deference to the legal complexities surrounding a final resolution, a temporary solution comprised of:

- a) Reclassify the multi-property lateral as 'public' pending final outcome (as concluded by the 3rd party independent engineering report). A sunset date can be placed on this action.
- b) Assign responsibility for dealing with back-ups/overflows of this lateral to the Special Districts [sic] that has the equipment and trained staff to deal with such issues. This should be tied to the final outcome. A sunset date can be placed on this action.
- c) Obtain written approval for 24/7 access to the lateral manhole/maintenance opening on Park A property from the property owner.
- d) A means of stopping backflow leakage from the lateral access point to the affected storm drain (as simple as sized metal plates held in place by sand bags) should be planned and developed for potential future lake pollution occurrences at this site.

The County, and – as necessary – the several property owners should work towards a final plan and proposal to be met before the expiration of the sunset date.

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board finds this Recommendation is outside of the scope of the Grand Jury.

“PUBLIC SAFETY IN THE TIME OF COVID – INSPECTION OF THE LAKE COUNTY DETENTION AND HOLDING FACILITIES 2021

TEHAMA COUNTY JUVENILE HALL

R1. Due to its exceptional facility and programs, the County should continue to contract with Tehama County for detaining troubled youths. (F-5)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: The Lake County Probation Department reports they have “no plans to terminate [their] contract with Tehama County for juvenile ward placement.”

LAKE COUNTY JAIL

R1. The County and the Sheriff's Office consider formal periodic on-site group training for correctional officers to increase their understanding of the manifestations and management of mental disorders.

NEUTRAL, requires further analysis, to be completed by December 20, 2021.

Explanation: As discussed in Sheriff Martin's departmental response, training is already provided surrounding mental and behavioral health disorders. Additional training will be considered if funding and staff availability allow, and curriculum conforms to BSCC standards.

R2. The Sheriff's Office and Behavioral Health examine whether additional mental health workers could provide more comprehensive psychological treatment of the inmates.

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: This has been implemented, in concept, for several years. As referenced by Sheriff Martin, recruitment and retention of qualified staff has been the greatest challenge in sustaining more comprehensive treatment provision. Lake County Behavioral Health Services staff regularly collaborate with law enforcement.

R3. The County should negotiate a higher hourly rate for correctional officers and aides in accordance with the Class & Comp survey findings and supplement their health-care benefit costs on a par with the patrol officers.

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: This Recommendation touches on areas that are subject to confidential Labor Negotiations, and is not within the purview of the Grand Jury.

Our Board greatly appreciates the dedication of our correctional officers and aides, and we are committed to strengthening our workforce, and partnering with all labor groups to achieve the best possible total compensation for all employee classifications, in accordance with the principles of our Classification and Total Compensation Study.

No further comment is appropriate in this forum.

"COUNTY OF LAKE LABOR DEVELOPMENTS 2020-21"

Please note, our Board and Administration/Human Resources staff have general concern this report, in its entirety, treads on subject matter that is outside of the purview of the Grand Jury. After much consideration, we collectively find it is not appropriate to agree to implement many of the Recommendations made by the Grand Jury, simply because they are not matters most appropriately considered through this forum.

However, as referenced in response to R3 of the previous report, we are committed to strengthening our workforce, and partnering with all labor groups to achieve the best possible total compensation for all employee classifications, in accordance with the principles of our Classification and Total Compensation Study.

Considerable efforts have been undertaken in recent years to correct longstanding inequities in employee compensation, and develop more positive working relationship with labor groups. There have been some successes, and there is much more work ahead.

Our workforce is the engine of everything we do, and our Vision 2028 Priorities Statement includes a commitment to, “Support the County workforce, through targeted training, retention and recruitment initiatives.”

We will continue to work to fully honor that commitment, and we deeply appreciate each County employee devoting their most precious resource, their time, to furthering the community’s and our Board’s priorities through work in local government.

R1. The County should regularly, at least every three years, review its employees [*sic*] salaries and benefits and benefits levels to ensure they are competitive and reasonable for employees and within the County’s labor market. (F-1, F-8, F-9)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Pursuit and maintenance of competitive total compensation are significant priorities. No further comment is appropriate.

R2. The Board of Supervisors and County administrators should take care not to suggest by any action or statement lack of appreciation for the concerns of staff employees.

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: It is the long-standing intention of our Board and County Administration to honor the richly diverse and meaningful contributions of County employees. Listening to the concerns and needs of staff is a priority. We encourage sharing of concerns through appropriate channels, and rely on communication with Department Heads, for example, to ensure our Board and Administration are fittingly responsive.

R3. Every County employee’s contract/work agreement should include an annual COLA. (F-1)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: This is a clearly a matter subject to Labor Negotiations. We are committed to partnering with employee groups to achieve the best possible total compensation for all employee classifications, and appreciate needs may differ among labor groups, over time.

R4. The Board of Supervisors and County administrators must remain cognizant of and avoid the appearance of self-dealing, unfairness or disregard of their employees in all their activities, especially when setting their own remuneration.

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: It has been the constant aim of our Board and Administration to deal fairly with all employee groups, and avoid even the appearance of impropriety.

R5. The County must be more flexible and open to alternatives for salaries and benefits when recruiting managers and professionals.

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: There is insufficient information in the Grand Jury’s report to ascertain what would constitute being “more flexible and open.” Flexibility and openness to creative solutions are, in fact, in evidence in County policy. Two members of our Board serve on

the County's Classification, Compensation, Recruitment and Retention Committee, and this group has brought multiple creative solutions to address recruitment challenges in recent months.

R6. Every department should have its own employee retention plan. (F-13, F-16)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board finds that, while each County department has its own unique demands, and some variation in approaches to employee retention is natural, it is not desirable to have completely distinct employee retention plans and strategies in each County department. This is, in part, because issues of fairness and equity from department to department would undoubtedly result. When new employee retention initiatives are brought forth, it is the standard practice of our Board and Administration to offer all Department Heads the opportunity to provide input and feedback.

R7. The County should conduct an exit interview with every employee who leaves. (F-12)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: It is not practical for this to be required in all cases. Exit interviews were more strongly prioritized in the past, and frequently did not yield helpful information.

R8. The County should provide an array of benefit plans that allow employees to select ones that are within their means and which permit them to maintain a reasonable income. (F-8, F-9)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board finds this is a matter clearly subject to Labor Negotiations. No further comment is appropriate in this forum.

R9. The Board of Supervisors should have more in-person contact with County employees, preferably in the employees' workplaces. (F-2)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board values the opportunity to connect with County staff, and appreciates the work of County departments. Each Department Head directs the work of their staff and serves as appointing authority.

R10. The County should pay attention to the state of employee work sites and break areas to make sure they are comfortable, well-lit, clean and conducive to the employees' duties.

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Department Heads are responsible to attend to their work areas. No specific complaints are provided here that necessitate further response.

R11. Every department head should have a succession plan.

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Every Department Head is responsible to ensure appropriate considerations are made for continuity of departmental operations, and particularly

mandated functions. While it is certainly prudent and expected that County departments will plan ahead, and empower their employees so they are prepared to assume greater responsibility, when called on, imposition by our Board of a specific requirement for succession planning is impractical. Among other considerations, under County policy, our Board, and not the outgoing Department Head, is the appointing authority for Department Head positions.

R12. County administrators should defer to a department head's succession plan and avoid interrupting training of a successor. (F-16)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: It is not clear what is meant by, "County administrators," in this usage. County Administrative Office staff? Department Heads? Page 132, last paragraph, of the Grand Jury's report notes, "Too often, [employees serving as] 'number twos' have been promoted to other departments, leaving [their] former boss in the lurch, having to start over training a successor." Notably, there is no citation supporting this claim.

It seems improbable the Grand Jury is suggesting our Board should intercede and prevent a talented employee from promoting to a position of greater responsibility, very probably at a higher wage, solely because that position requires a change of County department.

Likewise, it is nearly certain the Grand Jury is not suggesting the County Administrative Officer intervene to inhibit employees' opportunities to pursue job openings of their choosing.

R13. The County should review and, if necessary, revise its decision to Y-rate mission critical employees (i.e., Nurses, Heavy-Equipment Operators). (F-13)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board notes Y-rating rules have been in place for many years, and have been appropriately followed. No County employee's salary was decreased as a consequence of the Classification and Total Compensation Study.

Every County Department Head was given multiple opportunities to review Study findings for their Classifications, and provide feedback, prior to publication of CPS-HR's Total Compensation Study Report in March 2020. Adjustments were made, where appropriate.

R14. The County should ensure that all employees who were Y-rated are currently paid at Level 5 or above. (F-11)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Progression through the County's 5-step Salary Structure is merit-based, and guided by County Personnel Rules and negotiated Labor Agreements.

R15. The County should reconsider whether it should alter its 12-steps for employee advancement as recommended by the Study. (F-10)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board finds this is a matter clearly subject to Labor Negotiations. No further comment is appropriate in this forum.

R16. The County should always negotiate in good faith with its unions.

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Negotiations with all employee groups are always conducted in good faith. No new action is needed to implement this Recommendation.

R17. The County should not make offers in collective bargaining that it knows the union will reject. (F-14)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: While the County cannot possibly assume a labor group's position on an offer before it has been made, our Board is committed to partnering with employee groups to achieve the best possible compensation for all County Classifications. No further comment is appropriate in this forum.

“HOMELESS – NOT HOPELESS”

R2. Lake County – and the cities of Lakeport and Clearlake – should inventory their vacant and surplus property to assess whether any structure/parcel could be realistically modified to provide affordable housing for the chronically homeless. (F-5, F-6, F-7)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board finds similar efforts to that proposed in this Recommendation have been recently undertaken, and there are multiple ongoing efforts to develop new housing resources in Lake County. As a consequence, we are unable to prioritize a new inventory initiative at this time. Should developers approach the County with interest in undertaking new housing projects, information will be provided.

R3. Lake County should sell the former Juvenile Hall to Elijah House, if so requested, so that their vital services can continue to benefit Lake County's vulnerable populations. (F-5)

AGREE, will be implemented or determined infeasible by June 30, 2022.

Explanation: During our August 13 meeting, our Board, with the support of the County's Space Use Committee, appointed a team comprised of County Administrative Office and Behavioral Health staff, to negotiate sale of the former Juvenile Hall facility to Elijah House. Some additional detail and discussion of potential next steps can be found here: <https://countyoflake.legistar.com/ViewReport.ashx?M=R&N=Text&GID=407&ID=4431990&GUID=E26CF560-4CC2-4A99-99F1-38FEDFEBDCF7&Title=Legislation+Text>

R4. The Probation Department should remove its property from Elijah House so that the facility's housing capacity could be increased. (F-5)

AGREE, in concept. Will be implemented if requested by Elijah House, and/or if the facility is sold.

Explanation: See R3, above. The County's current Agreement with Elijah House does not necessitate removal of Probation Department property or equipment from the

premises. However, Chief Probation Officer, Rob Howe, has indicated his Department's willingness, should this become a need.

R6. The County should make a concerted effort to arrange for the availability of Section-8 housing (F-6, F-7, F-8)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: There is no County-owned or managed designated Section 8 Housing in Lake County. The Lake County Department of Social Services administers the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program in accordance with United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requirements. Please see Director Crystal Markytan's Departmental response, hereto attached, for further detail.

R7. Subsidized housing that can be made available and affordable for homeless residents should be prioritized by the County for the most frequent users of public services (high-cost, high-need) so as to stabilize the neediest – and most cost – individuals. The Bakersfield approach would be a useful model.

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board recognizes and applauds the success of the Bakersfield model in Kern County. The Lake County Department of Social Services does not administer any subsidized housing or public housing at this time, and we have no direct and immediate capacity to act on this Grand Jury Recommendation.

R8. Targeted supportive services from Behavioral Health and Social Services should continue post-housing to improve housing retention rates and reduce the staffing logistics and cost burdens on the two hospitals, the first responders, and the Jail. (F-3, F-4)

AGREE, has been implemented, and will be expanded, as resources allow.

Explanation: The Lake County Department of Social Services and Lake County Behavioral Health Services work collaboratively and in partnership with community partners, such as Elijah House, Adventist Health and North Coast Opportunities, to promote positive outcomes for individuals that have secured housing placements. Opportunities through programs such as Project Homekey have facilitated enhanced services in recent months. See Departmental responses from Social Services and Behavioral Health, hereto attached, for further detail.

R9. The County and Behavioral Health should focus on the costs of shipping acute psychiatric homeless patients out-of-county and of perpetuating the "revolving door" maintenance of homeless chronic psychiatric patients at the Jail and determine whether providing an in-county facility is economically feasible. (F-4)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: As discussed in our Board's responses to the Grand Jury's report, "Lake County Needs its Own Mental Health Facility," above, Behavioral Health Services Director, Todd Metcalf, has already engaged local stakeholders around creation of such a facility. We expect Director Metcalf will continue to bring any such opportunities to our attention, as they emerge.

R10. Behavioral Health should clarify and communicate its crisis-response protocols to law enforcement and fire/EMS agencies in the County so that all parties know what to expect when dealing with relevant urgent/emergent situations. (F-10)

AGREE, has been implemented.

Explanation: Our Board is informed Director Metcalf has already begun the process to update an existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), initially developed in 2017.

R11. The County should create a specific position dedicated to assessing the needs of – and coordinating the provision of housing to – its homeless residents. (F-6, F-7, F-8)

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: We have no direct and immediate capacity to act on this Grand Jury Recommendation.

R13. Lake County Animal Control and Clearlake Animal Control could consider investigating how safe and secure overnight shelter for pets of those homeless who are seeking their own overnight or long-term sheltering.

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board is aware homeless pet owners are typically unwilling to separate from their animals, even on a temporary basis. Additionally, this is outside of the normative scope of Animal Control agencies.

R14. The County and the Cities of Lakeport and Clearlake should form a taskforce to devise a workable and coordinated method of determining the true costs to law enforcement and the fire/EMS agencies of responding to emergency calls pertaining to the homeless so that limited resources could be allocated and targeted based on a factual understanding. This would be an expansion of R1.

DISAGREE, will not be implemented.

Explanation: Our Board recognizes and values the many recent enhancements to homeless services in Lake County. We do not expect the recommended taskforce would increase our capacity to contribute.

This concludes the Board of Supervisors' Response to the 2020/2021 Civil Grand Jury Final Report.

Sincerely,

LAKE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS


Bruno Sabatier (Sep 3, 2021 13:56 PDT)

Bruno Sabatier
Chair of the Board

cc: 2020-2021 Civil Grand Jury Foreperson
2021-2022 Civil Grand Jury Foreperson