



County of San Diego

WALTER F. EKARD
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
(619) 531-6226
FAX: (619) 557-4060

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, STE. 209, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-2472

RECEIVED
JUN 29 2011
SAN DIEGO
COUNTY GRAND JURY

HELEN N. ROBBINS-MEYER
ASST. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
(619) 531-4940
FAX: (619) 557-4060

June 28, 2011

The Honorable Kevin Enright
Presiding Judge, San Diego Superior Court
220 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Judge Enright,

The 2010-11 San Diego County Grand Jury issued six reports during their tenure that addressed findings and recommendations to the County of San Diego. Today, the County Board of Supervisors approved responses to these six reports and directed me to forward these responses to your office, as required by the California Penal Code.

The responses, which are enclosed, correspond to the following reports:

- In-Home Supportive Services: An Open Door for Abuse and Fraud
- Oh, For Critters' Sakes!
- County Supervisor Discretionary Funds: More Transparency Needed
- Detention Facilities Inspection
- Pertussis (Whooping Cough) Epidemic: Let's Get Educated!
- Hitting Back at Domestic Violence

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact me at (619) 531-5250.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. EKARD

Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment

cc: Board of Supervisors



COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

AGENDA ITEM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

GREG COX
First District

DIANNE JACOB
Second District

PAM SLATER-PRICE
Third District

RON ROBERTS
Fourth District

BILL HORN
Fifth District

DATE: June 28, 2011

TO: Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO 2010-11 GRAND JURY REPORTS (DISTRICT: ALL)

SUMMARY:

18

Overview

The 2010-2011 San Diego County Grand Jury recently completed their term and issued 7 reports that address County programs under the purview of the Board of Supervisors. Six of those reports contained recommendations and one contained only commendations.

According to the California Penal Code Section 933(c), agencies that are the subject of Grand Jury reports must respond in writing to Findings and Recommendations addressed to them. Therefore, this is a request for your Board to review and approve the draft Finding and Recommendation responses prepared by the Chief Administrative Officer and authorize the Chief Administrative Officer to transmit your Board's responses to the Grand Jury, via the Superior Court Presiding Judge. The proposed responses address the recommendations and findings contained in following reports:

- In-Home Supportive Services: An Open Door for Abuse and Fraud
- Oh, For Critters' Sakes!
- County Supervisor Discretionary Funds: More Transparency Needed
- Detention Facilities Inspection
- Pertussis (Whooping Cough) Epidemic: Let's Get Educated!
- Hitting Back at Domestic Violence

Recommendation(s)

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Approve the proposed responses and authorize the Chief Administrative Officer to transmit the responses to the Grand Jury via the Superior Court Presiding Judge.

Fiscal Impact

This recommendation will have no fiscal impact.

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO 2010-11 GRAND JURY REPORTS (DISTRICT: ALL)

Business Impact Statement

N/A

Advisory Board Statement

N/A

BACKGROUND:

The 2010-2011 San Diego County Grand Jury recently completed their term and issued 7 reports that address County programs under the purview of the Board of Supervisors. Six of those reports contained recommendations and one contained only commendations.

According to the California Penal Code, agencies that are the subject of Grand Jury reports must respond in writing to Findings and Recommendations addressed to them. Therefore, this is a request for your Board to review and approve the draft Finding and Recommendation responses prepared by the Chief Administrative Officer covering these six reports and authorize the Chief Administrative Officer to transmit your Board's responses to the Grand Jury, via the Superior Court Presiding Judge.

The proposed responses address the recommendations and findings contained in following reports:

- "In-Home Supportive Services: An Open Door for Abuse and Fraud"
- "Oh, For Critters' Sakes!"
- "County Supervisor Discretionary Funds: More Transparency Needed"
- "Detention Facilities Inspection"
- "Pertussis (Whooping Cough) Epidemic: Let's Get Educated!"
- "Hitting Back at Domestic Violence"

The seventh report the County received was titled "Civic Successes: Public Service at its Best" and commended the County's Child Welfare Services, Commission on Children and Families, Polinsky Children's Center, Planning and Land Use Department, Medical Examiner, and Sheriff's Office Crime Lab. Commendations do not require a written response.

Individual elected officials who received Grand Jury recommendations, such as the San Diego County Sheriff and District Attorney, submit their responses separately, under the Penal Code. However, copies of all Grand Jury reports and the subject agencies' responses to them are posted on the Grand Jury website.

Linkage to the County of San Diego Strategic Plan

The Grand Jury reports listed above and the County's corresponding responses address issues associated with all three of the County of San Diego's 2011-16 Strategic Initiatives, which are to Improve Opportunities for Children and Families; Preserve and Protect the Environment and Promote Safe and Livable Communities. They also link to the County's eight Required Disciplines, which focus on the organization's commitment to: Fiscal Stability; Customer Satisfaction; Regional Leadership; a Skilled, Adaptable and Diverse Workforce; Essential

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO 2010-11 GRAND JURY REPORTS (DISTRICT: ALL)

AGENDA ITEM INFORMATION SHEET

REQUIRES FOUR VOTES: Yes No

WRITTEN DISCLOSURE PER COUNTY CHARTER SECTION 1000.1 REQUIRED
 Yes No

PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOARD ACTIONS:
N/A

BOARD POLICIES APPLICABLE:
A-43 Response to Grand Jury Reports

BOARD POLICY STATEMENTS:
N/A

MANDATORY COMPLIANCE:
N/A

ORACLE AWARD NUMBER(S) AND CONTRACT AND/OR REQUISITION NUMBER(S):
N/A

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: Chief Administrative Office

OTHER CONCURRENCE(S): Community Services Group
 Health and Human Services Agency
 Public Safety Group
 Finance and General Government Group

CONTACT PERSON(S):

Janice Graham	
_____ Name	_____ Name
619-531-6271	
_____ Phone	_____ Phone
619-557-4060	
_____ Fax	_____ Fax
A6	
_____ Mail Station	_____ Mail Station
Janice.graham@sdcounty.ca.gov	
_____ E-mail	_____ E-mail

- Feb. 11: Owners Urged to Microchip Pets Before Fire Season: Ramona Microchipping release
- Jan. 6: County Urges Pet Owners to Microchip for the New Year: Bonita Clinic

Since January 1, 2011, CCO has clipped 12 stories that specifically promote microchipping. These stories were in the *San Diego Union Tribune*, *North County Times* and on TV news websites. They also included Patch.com community news sites. In addition, about 72 “Pet of the Week,” features in *San Diego Union Tribune*, *North County Times* and Patch.com mention that the animals up for adoption will be microchipped. This repetition adds to public awareness that microchipping, like vaccinations and spaying/neutering, is a basic requirement of responsible pet ownership.

In addition, this year Lt. Dan DeSousa, DAS spokesman, has talked to approximately 10 media outlets about microchipping. These interviews included TV channels and KPBS radio. Some of the interviews probably resulted in on-air stories that did not make CCO’s clips, because the stories had no online counterpart, and CCO does not track broadcast stories.

Furthermore, all animals adopted into new homes or lost pets claimed by their owner are microchipped before leaving the shelter. The County Television Network produced a video about our clinics on their website and the County Communications Office uses social media such as Twitter and Facebook to increase public awareness about the clinics. All department brochures recommend that pet owners microchip their pets and include information about our weekly clinics. Staff also talks about the clinics at numerous disaster preparedness presentations throughout the community.

11-19: Divide the complaint logs into two parts, one for problems requesting help and one noting complaints against the department.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented. A file has been developed entitled “complaints against the department and staff” and the file that covers complaints regarding service already exists.

11-20: Provide all Animal Control Officers in the field with laptop computers as soon as fiscally possible.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented. All the computers for animal control officers have been ordered and installation in the vehicles is near completion.

“County Supervisor Discretionary Funds: More Transparency Needed”

Issued April 26, 2011

Finding 01: From the outside, the NRP and CEP programs are perceived by some as Supervisor 'slush funds.' However, the Grand Jury believes recent changes made to the programs should have a positive impact on these outside perceptions.

Response: Agree

Finding 02: Policy B-072 is a significant balance for the negative perceptions of the NRP program, but supervisorial common sense, self-policing and careful vetting of grant applicants by Board staff are still needed as oversight of the NRP program.

Response: Agree

Finding 03: While there is overhead associated with the programs, the administrative costs are reasonable.

Response: Agree

RECOMMENDATIONS - The 2010/2011 San Diego County Grand Jury recommends that the San Diego County Board of Supervisors:

11-30: Amend the NRP and CEP application to include questions on donations made in the past year to Supervisor campaigns from officers and board members of the applicant organization. This transparency will allow members of the public to draw their own conclusions and help polish the image of these programs.

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. The names of individuals who donate money to Supervisors' campaigns are already available to the public through several means, including through an online resource the County Registrar of Voters launched prior to the 2010 Gubernatorial election. Information available through this application includes campaign finance disclosure reports for candidate committees who have raised or spent \$1,000 or more as well as contributions and expenditures.

Names of individuals who serve as officers and/or board members for the non-profit organizations that receive funds are also already public and available on-line.

It should also be noted that County policy and practice is to keep information on election campaigns and government operations separate unless, as in the case of the Registrar of Voters, a department is required to handle campaign information.

11-31: Publish the Tax ID number of each organization which receives funding, improving transparency to watchdog groups, taxpayer advocates and the general public.

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. The County does require organizations to provide their Tax ID number on the application, for the County's records and verification. However, publishing the Tax ID number of each organization online could expose organizations to corporate identity theft and provide

information that could be used for tax abuse. (i.e. false tax deductions). As an alternative, the Internal Revenue Service requires applicants to make exemption information available for public inspection including their exemption application, supporting documentation and exemption letter. This information can be obtained by submitting a request directly to the organization.

11-32: Create an outcome measurement to apply to CEP that will modify the program if it is not efficacious. Require grant recipients to measure their progress toward the goals of the program to give the Board and citizens of the County quality case studies for TOT revenue.

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it's not warranted or reasonable. Given the wide variety of community groups and purposes served by this program, it would not be possible to develop an outcome measurement that could be applied to all CEP applicants and still be meaningful and relevant. However, to be eligible for CEP grants, applicants already do have to specify how the requested funds will be used and how their request will benefit the community. Also, recipients already provide performance outcome information for previous grants including, but not limited to, previous County grants.

11-33: Create an audit trail for CEP and NRP so donations for tangible items can be physically verified.

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it's not warranted or reasonable. Procedures are already in place to document and track equipment and items purchased with CEP and NRP funds. Requiring additional documentation and tracking would duplicate existing measures, increasing administrative expenses without adding new value.

11-34: Create a self-certification process to ensure recipient organizations are in full compliance with IRS regulations, and that board members of recipient organizations are not felons.

Response: This recommendation has been partially implemented. Organizations are already required to certify that they have obtained non-profit status from the IRS and must comply with IRS regulations to obtain their Tax ID number. Board members of recipient organizations are not, however, asked about prior criminal history, nor would a Board member's' prior felony conviction disqualify an organization from receiving funds. In fact, certain groups such as those that run juvenile diversion programs find that individuals with personal experience in the criminal justice system are effective spokespeople and representatives.

11-35: Follow Policy B-072 meticulously, and ensure all Board staff review it annually.

Response: This recommendation has been implemented and is being followed.

“Detention Facilities Inspection”

Issued May 26, 2011