



RECEIVED

AUG 09 2018

SAN DIEGO
COUNTY GRAND JURY

County of San Diego

HELEN N. ROBBINS-MEYER
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
(619) 531-6226
FAX: (619) 557-4060

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

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

DONALD F. STEUER
ASST. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER/
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER
(619) 531-4940
FAX: (619) 557-4060

August 7, 2018

The Honorable Peter C. Deddeh
Presiding Judge, San Diego Superior Court
220 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Judge Deddeh,

The 2017-2018 San Diego County Grand Jury recently completed its term and filed four reports with recommendations requiring a response from the County of San Diego. On August 7, 2018, the County Board of Supervisors approved responses to these four reports and directed me to forward the responses to your office, as required by the California Penal Code.

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

- The San Diego Hepatitis A Epidemic: (Mis)Handling A Public Health Crisis
- San Diego County Detention Facilities—Condition and Management
- Citizens' Law Enforcement Review Board (CLERB)
- Graffiti Reporting and Mitigation Report

I thank the Grand Jury for their commitment to this process. If you have questions or need additional information, please contact me at (619) 531-5250.

Sincerely,

HELEN N. ROBBINS-MEYER
Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment

cc: Board of Supervisors

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RESPONSES
TO
2017-2018 GRAND JURY REPORTS

The San Diego Hepatitis A Epidemic: (Mis) Handling A Public Health Crisis	Page 1
San Diego County Detention Facilities—Condition and Management	Page 4
Citizens' Law Enforcement Review Board (CLERB)	Page 6
Graffiti Reporting and Mitigation Report	Page 8

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RESPONSE TO 2017-18 GRAND JURY REPORT
"The San Diego Hepatitis A Epidemic: (Mis) Handling A Public Health Crisis"
Filed May 17, 2018

FINDINGS

Finding 01: An earlier declaration of a local public health emergency would have provided the authority to direct the implementation of more effective measures to deal with the epidemic.

Response: The County of San Diego Chief Administrative Officer disagrees with this finding. The Centers of Disease Control and Prevention has expressed, in a letter regarding the San Diego County hepatitis A outbreak¹, that the most effective and demonstrated measure to stop the outbreak (one of the largest nationally to-date) was mass vaccinations. Despite public perception, the Public Health Officer's authority to direct the response, in particular the effort to vaccinate at-risk individuals, does not increase as a result of declaring a local health emergency. The County of San Diego (County) implemented mass vaccinations for the at-risk population upon identification of the outbreak.

The declaration of a local health emergency had the positive effect of increasing the attention of the general public, partner entities, and the media; but it also had the negative effect of creating a climate where some not in the at-risk population (also known as the "worried well") utilized resources and vaccines needed for the targeted at-risk population. Declaring earlier could have diverted vaccine and nursing resources away from the critical at-risk population at the onset and hampered the urgent ability to reach the targeted population. The County procured additional supplies of vaccine out of an abundance of caution due to production shortages from the available pharmaceutical sources at the time to enable us to expand our vaccination efforts to include lower risk needs including the "worried well" without jeopardizing our ability to vaccinate the high priority at-risk population.

Finding 02: The Emergency Operations Plan failed to establish an incident command structure in a health emergency which led to confusion and jurisdictional conflict.

Response: The County of San Diego Chief Administrative Officer disagrees partially with this finding. The County recognizes that communication is a vital component to the efficiency of a response to an emergency. When the outbreak was identified, communication lines were established with critical stakeholders. These included the health care community, the cities and service providers who serve the identified at-risk community. In addition, during this time, Public Health Services

put a command structure in place to work with stakeholders and respond to the outbreak.

A formal incident command structure is identified in the County's Emergency Operations Plan and was implemented during the outbreak. However, consistent with the County's Hepatitis A After Action Report issued on May 10, 2018, the County is looking to enhance its use of incident management structures to coordinate regional actions.

¹ County of San Diego. (2018). *Hepatitis A After Action Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/cosd/SanDiegoHepatitisAOutbreak-2017-18-AfterActionReport.pdf>

Finding 03: The lack of early cooperation between County and City resulted in unnecessary delays in installation of handwashing stations and other public health measures.

Response: The County of San Diego Chief Administrative Officer disagrees partially with this finding. The County implemented a three-pronged strategy to address the hepatitis A outbreak. The primary focus of responding to this outbreak was mass vaccinations, which is a demonstrated and effective way to stop the transmission of hepatitis A. The City and County were fully cooperative with vaccination and education measures to address the outbreak.

Unfortunately, there is a perception that handwashing stations are a routine response to such an outbreak. However, deploying handwashing stations regionally to address an outbreak was an unprecedented and untested idea developed by San Diego County public health officials in Spring 2017 based on the method of transmission among the impacted population. The coordination of logistics between the County and the City was impacted by the experimental nature of this intervention.

Finding 05: City administrators and County health officers had different concerns in responding to the crisis and failed to appreciate each other's perspectives.

Response: The County of San Diego Chief Administrative Officer disagrees partially with this finding. As with any government entity, the County and the City had the same concern which was the protection of the public health and safety. This shared concern was evident in the cooperation between both jurisdictions with vaccination and education measures to address the outbreak.

Roles and responsibilities between County Public Health and other local municipalities are sometimes different during public health emergencies. Enhancements in communication and a clarification of roles and responsibilities is required.

Finding 07: The County has not designated a project manager with sufficient expertise to understand the administrative concerns of City staff in responding to public health directives.

Response: The County of San Diego Chief Administrative Officer disagrees with this finding. The County determined at the onset of this infectious disease outbreak that an appropriate representative to the City of San Diego was necessary. Thus, the County assigned the Deputy Public Health Officer as the primary liaison

to the City. This liaison continues to work collaboratively and regularly with City staff to coordinate cross-jurisdictional public health activities.

The Deputy Public Health Officer and the City of San Diego began communicating in April 2017 and had the first formal meeting in early May 2017. These routine communications allowed for coordination of vaccination, sanitation, and education efforts. One of the City's main concerns was in regards to sanitation. The Deputy Public Health Officer assisted with coordinating discussions between the City of San Diego, the County of San Diego's Land Use and Environment Group, and the City of Los Angeles, which had established effective sanitation efforts that could be replicated.

The County subsequently led efforts to set up a site visit with Los Angeles and coordinated a sanitation meeting with Los Angeles representatives that all San Diego County cities were invited to attend. In addition, the Deputy Public Health Officer presented to City's senior managers and to the Mayor's Homeless Solutions Committee. Ultimately weekly meetings were conducted between leadership from both jurisdictions, including the Public Health Officer and the Deputy Public Health Officer. These meetings further enhanced coordination and were conducted until the end of the emergency.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2017/2018 San Diego County Grand Jury recommends that the Health and Human Services Agency for the County of San Diego:

18-06: Declare a local public health emergency much sooner when confronted with a similar outbreak in the future.

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable. In order to declare a local health emergency, a health officer must take into account all clinical and environmental factors present during an outbreak. These factors cannot be known with any certainty in advance of an outbreak.

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 101080, "whenever there is an imminent and proximate threat of the introduction of any contagious, infectious or communicable disease, chemical agent, non-communicable biologic agent, toxin, or radioactive agent ...the local health officer may declare a local health emergency in the jurisdiction or any area thereof affected by the threat to the public health." Therefore, the County is unable to bind its health officer before the fact.

The 2017/2018 San Diego County Grand Jury recommends that the Chief Administrative Officer for the County of San Diego:

18-07: Direct that the County Emergency Operations Plan be revised to establish a command structure during a health emergency, facilitating the affected agencies' ability to recognize and implement their duties within this structure.

Response: This recommendation will be implemented. The County's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) currently contains a defined incident command structure for

a public health emergency as detailed in Annex E of the EOP. The County is currently in the process of updating the EOP to be consistent with the County's Hepatitis A After Action Report issued on May 10, 2018. Any enhancements that are identified regarding the command structure will be addressed.

18-08: Clearly establish lines of authority to prevent misunderstandings regarding departmental responsibilities.

Response: This recommendation will be implemented.

Annex E of the EOP establishes an incident command structure, which defines lines of authority. However, consistent with the County's Hepatitis A After Action Report issued on May 10, 2018, the County is looking to enhance its use of incident management structures to coordinate regional actions. Within the next six months, it is anticipated that the County will develop a protocol that will direct the convening of a policy group, upon use of an incident command system, for a public health threat with other jurisdictions.

18-09: Designate a project manager who can communicate effectively with City officials and medical personnel to take necessary actions quickly during a health emergency.

Response: This recommendation will be implemented. Although the Deputy Public Health Officer was designated as a liaison to the City during the outbreak, consistent with the County's Hepatitis A After Action Report, for future public health outbreaks with the potential for regional impacts, the County will enhance its use of incident management structures by convening a policy group of County and regional executive leadership from affected jurisdictions. This policy group will convene regularly during the outbreak.

**COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RESPONSE TO 2017-18 GRAND JURY REPORT
"San Diego County Detention Facilities Condition and Management"
Filed May 29, 2018**

(Findings 01 through 03 and Recommendations 18-21 through 18-23 will be separately responded to by the Sheriff)

FINDINGS

Finding 04: The East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility needs to develop programs aimed at reducing violence in the facility.

Response: The San Diego County Probation Department disagrees partially with this finding. The Probation Department has already developed several programs designed to prevent and reduce violence among youth, including at East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility, which houses youth with the most extensive criminal justice histories. However, we will continue to develop and add to these programs. Probation is currently working with the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University as part of their Youth in Custody Practice Model technical assistance program. This effort is aimed at adopting an approach that is focused on the development of youth in our detention facilities. One of the expected outcomes of this effort is a reduction in violence among youth.

Finding 05: Kearny Mesa Juvenile may need additional equipment to facilitate a better and more productive physical exercise program.

Response: The San Diego County Probation Department agrees with this finding. In the coming years, the Probation Department plans to replace the 1950s-era Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility with a modern facility featuring enhanced athletic components. In the meantime, youth there engage in a range of outdoor recreational activities, including basketball, soccer, kickball, handball, calisthenics, wiffle ball and running. In addition, we secured a three year contract to provide outdoor recreation and leadership opportunities to youth. The Probation Department will continue to seek out additional equipment and programs that will build on the facility's current opportunities for productive physical exercise.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2017/2018 San Diego County Grand Jury recommends that the San Diego County Probation Department:

18-24: Improve programs aimed at reducing violence in the East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility.

Response: This recommendation has been implemented. The Probation Department takes a multifaceted approach towards reducing violence among youth in custody. We operate several programs focused on both preventing and curtailing violence, and will continue to develop and add to these. Below is a summary of some of our current efforts.

First, the County contracts evidence-based program providers to teach youth violence-prevention skills, including through: Aggression Replacement Training, Moral Reconciliation Therapy, and Thinking for a Change.

Second, research shows that detained youth who receive regular family visits are involved in fewer incidents of violence and demonstrate improved academic achievement compared with their peers (Villalobos, Agudelo, 2013¹). Based on this, the Department has taken several steps to increase visitation. We have increased the likelihood of youth visits by expanding our definition of a family. In addition, we extended East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility's regular visitation hours, and our family engagement activities around holidays and graduations have been a success. We plan to build upon these family activities in Fiscal Year 18-19.

Third, positive behavior programs can lead to significant decreases in youth violence, major rule violations, restraints, seclusion, and disciplinary removals in jurisdictions (Gagnon & Richards, 2008²). So the Probation Department is in the

¹ Villalobos Agudelo, S. (2013). The Impact of Family Visitation on Incarcerated Youth's Behavior and School Performance. Issue Brief. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

² Gagnon, J. C., and Richards, C. (2008). Making the Right Turn: A Guide about Improving Transition Outcomes of Youth Involved in the Juvenile Corrections System. Washington, DC: National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth, Institute for Educational Leadership.

process of implementing a positive behavior system. We expect to have it in place during Fiscal Year 18-19.

Finally, in 2017, a committee formed to address violence at East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility recommended the addition of coaches during youth recreation time. The group suggested that the coaches teach athletic and physical activities on a rotating basis to keep youth engaged with the program. Our partners at the San Diego County Office of Education subsequently pursued and received a grant to fund an extended education program. This will include new physical education opportunities for youth in custody.

18-25: Consider increasing the amount of exercise equipment available at Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility to enhance the exercise program.

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. By the end of 2018, the Probation Department will purchase additional equipment for youth at the Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility to use for physical activity, including yoga mats, exercise steps, foosball tables, ping pong tables and hula hoops. We also anticipate adding recreational and other enrichment opportunities as a result of a Federal 21st Century Community Learning grant recently awarded to our partners at the San Diego County Office of Education on behalf of Court and Community Schools, including the juvenile institutions. The grant will be effective July 1, 2018 and will provide funding over the next five years. A three year contract also begins on July 1 with Outdoor Outreach to provide outdoor recreational and leadership opportunities to youth. Additionally, over the next several years, the County will begin building a new Juvenile Justice Campus at the Kearny Mesa site. The new facility is being designed to include athletic facilities similar to a typical school and will offer increased recreational opportunities.

**COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RESPONSE TO 2017-18 GRAND JURY REPORT
“Citizens’ Law Enforcement Review Board (CLERB)”
Filed May 31, 2018**

(Findings 03 through 04 and Recommendation 18-27 through 18-32 will be separately responded to by the CLERB Board and Executive Officer)

FINDINGS

Finding 01: It is CLERB’s mission and responsibility to investigate, review and recommend policy changes to the Sheriff’s or Probation departments respectively.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors and Chief Administrative Officer for the County of San Diego both agree with this finding.

Finding 02: The position of Executive Officer remained vacant at times, impeding the ability of remaining staff to handle investigative workloads.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors and Chief Administrative Officer for the County of San Diego both agree with this finding.

Finding 03: Board and Investigative Unit shortages contributed to death cases not being investigated within POBOR time limitations. A responsibility CLERB did not meet resulting in 22 death cases being dismissed.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors and Chief Administrative Officer for the County of San Diego defer to CLERB on this response.

Finding 04: Lack of Board oversight of the Investigative Unit contributed to death cases remaining uninvestigated well beyond POBOR time limitations.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors and Chief Administrative Officer for the County of San Diego defer to CLERB on this response.

Finding 05: There exists a potential for bias toward the selection of Board membership when the Executive officer is involved in the selection process.

Response: The County of San Diego County Board of Supervisors and Chief Administrative Officer for the County of San Diego agree with this finding.

Finding 06: Removing CLERB from the Public Safety Group will provide additional independence from those departments that CLERB reviews.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors and Chief Administrative Officer for the County of San Diego disagree with this finding. The County's Public Safety Group has no operational oversight over CLERB. The group's executive office provides only administrative support. The Public Safety Group is best suited to provide administrative support services to CLERB such as Human Resources and Finance because of the group's deep experience and knowledge in the subject areas addressed by CLERB. For example, Public Safety Group Human Resources staff members currently assist in the hiring of investigators to work in law enforcement-related areas for several County departments and are familiar with advising staff on recruiting and evaluating candidates.

Finding 07: County Counsel may have a conflict of interest when CLERB investigates issues that may raise liability to the County.

Response: The Office of County Counsel disagrees partially with this finding. Although we acknowledge that the potential for a conflict of interest exists, the Office of County Counsel observes numerous safeguards to avoid such conflicts. The office observes all ethical requirements and rules of professional responsibility. Appropriate measures are taken to ensure that no impermissible conflicts exist where the Office of County Counsel advises CLERB, and CLERB engages independent outside counsel in all instances in which it is appropriate to do so.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2017/2018 San Diego County Grand Jury recommends that the San Diego County Board of Supervisors consider:

18-26: Funding another Special Investigator position thus allowing the Executive Officer more time to supervise the Special Investigators and conduct more community outreach.

Response: This recommendation has been implemented. The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors approved funding for an additional Special investigator position in the Fiscal Year 18-19 budget. The County hired and added this investigator to the Citizens' Law Enforcement Review Board staff.

The 2017/18 San Diego County Grand Jury recommends that the Chief Administrative Officer for the County of San Diego consider:

18-33: Moving CLERB from the Public Safety Group to another Group in the County to separate oversight from the same group that supervises the Sheriff and Probation Departments to avoid the possibility of a conflict of interest.

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. As mentioned above, the County's Public Safety Group does not provide operational oversight to CLERB. The group's executive office provides only administrative support. The Public Safety Group is best suited to provide administrative support services to CLERB such as Human Resources and Finance because of the group's deep experience and knowledge in the subject areas addressed by CLERB. For example, Public Safety Group Human Resources staff members currently assist in the hiring of investigators to work in law enforcement-related areas for several County departments and are familiar with advising staff on recruiting and evaluating candidates. The Public Safety Group also has the capability to provide the trainings required for new CLERB members on the policies, procedures and expectations related to their roles, per Sec. 340.13 of the County's Administrative Code.

**COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RESPONSE TO 2017-18 GRAND JURY REPORT
"Graffiti Reporting and Mitigation in San Diego County"
Filed June 5, 2018**

FINDINGS

Finding 01: There is no easily available information to guide the public on reporting graffiti.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. The County of San Diego is always looking for additional ways to assist citizens, and we currently offer tips on how to report the crime of graffiti in the County's unincorporated area through several channels. First, citizens can call the County's graffiti reporting hotline at 858-694-2705. Second, citizens can visit the County of San Diego's website and click on "I Want To Report Graffiti" at the top of the homepage. This will take them to a graffiti abatement webpage, which offers

a quick and informative guide on the topic, with links and phone numbers of how to report graffiti to other local cities and agencies. Third, citizens can report graffiti in the unincorporated county through the County's smartphone application called, "Tell Us Now!" under the code compliance category. Fourth, citizens can report graffiti in the unincorporated county in person at the County's Department of Planning & Development Services' Code Compliance Division at 5510 Overland Avenue, San Diego. Fifth, to report graffiti in progress in the unincorporated areas or incorporated cities serviced by the Sheriff's Department, citizens can call 858-565-5200. Finally, citizens can report graffiti through 2-1-1 San Diego by calling or filling out a form on the organization's website. 2-1-1 then passes along complaints to relevant jurisdictions.

Each jurisdiction has the legal authority and responsibility to design methods of reporting the crime of graffiti, as well as managing the information and handling the response in ways that align with strategies and priorities in their jurisdictions.

Finding 02: Residents trying to report graffiti find it difficult to locate information explaining reporting procedures.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. As described above, the County offers several channels for the public to report graffiti in the County's unincorporated area, and citizens file dozens of graffiti complaints with the County each year. The County has not seen any evidence that residents find it difficult to locate information on graffiti reporting in the County's unincorporated area.

Finding 03: There is little effective effort by county, city and mass transit agencies to increase public awareness on how to report graffiti.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. The County of San Diego has worked to increase public awareness related to graffiti reporting in the County's jurisdiction. The County provides several methods for members of the public to report graffiti. As noted above, there is a link to report graffiti located at the top of the County's website. In addition, the County has taken several steps to increase public awareness of the "Tell Us Now!" mobile application where graffiti can be reported. Outreach has included preparing a media article on the County News Center Website, as well as links to it on other various County websites, posting it on the County Facebook page, and sending notifications via the County's GovDelivery service. In addition, County staff share various options for reporting graffiti, among other code complaints, at various community meetings on a regular basis.

Finding 04: It is extremely difficult to determine which agency has jurisdiction over a graffitied area in order to report it properly since often there is a very fine line between what is in the mass transit right-of-way and what is in state, county or city jurisdictions.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. To help citizens determine which agency to contact to report graffiti, the County provides on its graffiti abatement webpage contact information for several local agencies, including cities, as well as utilities, the United States Postal Service,

and others. The goal of providing this information is to help citizens navigate where to go with their graffiti complaints.

Within the unincorporated area, there is minimal overlap of transit agency facilities and County jurisdiction.

Each year, the County receives graffiti complaints pertaining to the unincorporated area, and does not have evidence to suggest that citizens find it difficult to determine where to report such complaints.

Finding 05: Graffiti in high-volume areas sometimes may be overlooked because of jurisdictional issues.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. In the County's unincorporated areas, there are no known high-volume graffiti areas. However, all graffiti reported in the County's jurisdiction is addressed by County staff. County staff assists citizens by posting contact information for other jurisdictions on its graffiti abatement webpage and passing along graffiti complaints to counterparts in other jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction has the legal authority to design methods of reporting crime and managing that information in ways that align with strategies and priorities in their jurisdiction.

Finding 06: There is very little coordination among agencies in San Diego County to pass on graffiti reports.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. The County of San Diego uses the Graffiti Tracker reporting and case management service and manages this contract on behalf of several jurisdictions and agencies. This system is utilized by most of the region's incorporated cities, the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and the San Diego Unified Port District. The system allows jurisdictions and agencies to share information and detect patterns and trends regarding the investigation and prosecution of those responsible for the crime of graffiti. County Code Compliance division staff members also relay graffiti complaints to counterparts in the appropriate jurisdiction, and provide the reporting party with the contact information for that agency. Internally, County staff members from various departments also cooperate and share information on graffiti complaints, such as information sharing by the Planning & Development Services and the Sheriff's Departments.

Finding 07: County residents wishing to report graffiti may become discouraged because there are multiple reporting systems requiring different means for reporting.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. The County offers several ways for the public to report graffiti, and citizens file dozens of graffiti complaints with the County each year. County staff members share complaints with counterparts in the relevant jurisdiction if the case does not fall within the unincorporated area. To help citizens navigate the process of determining the responsible agency, the County provides contact information for dozens of local agencies, including cities, as well as utilities including AT&T, Time Warner Cable, Cox Cable, SDG&E, the United States Postal Service, and others on the graffiti abatement web page. The County has not seen any evidence of residents

having difficulty navigating the reporting systems. 2-1-1 San Diego also receives graffiti complaints from residents around the region by phone and through an online form, and staff shares the information with the appropriate jurisdiction.

Finding 08: A single, centralized, user-friendly San Diego County graffiti reporting system would improve graffiti reporting and mitigation.

Response: The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. A centralized, user-friendly system for graffiti reporting currently exists through 2-1-1 San Diego. In the County unincorporated jurisdiction, an effective system for collecting and handling graffiti complaints also exists. The County has found no evidence that citizens find it difficult to locate information on how to report graffiti.

Throughout San Diego County, 2-1-1 San Diego provides a regional mechanism for citizens across the County to report graffiti, either by calling “2-1-1” or by filling out a form on the nonprofit’s website. Staff members then pass along complaints to the jurisdiction legally responsible for responding. 2-1-1’s regional public-facing system is useful for public reporting. For graffiti mitigation, each jurisdiction takes action per their legal responsibility and local processes.

In the County’s unincorporated area, the County has found that the current methods are accessible and effective in supporting graffiti reporting. The County receives few complaints or questions regarding graffiti occurring outside of its jurisdiction, and when such complaints are received, County staff members route them to the appropriate jurisdiction. County staff members also provide the reporting party with the contact information for that responding agency.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2017/2018 San Diego County Grand Jury recommends that the San Diego County Board of Supervisors work with Mayors and City Councils within San Diego County to:

18-37: Improve reporting of graffiti to ensure that the proper jurisdiction receives the report, eliminate confusion and delay in mitigating graffiti, and provide updated information to local law enforcement. The Grand Jury believes that a single, county-wide, user-friendly reporting system (telephone hotline, website, and/or smartphone app) could be effective in achieving these goals.

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The County of San Diego agrees that jurisdictions should collaborate and share best practices when it comes to reporting graffiti within their jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction has the legal authority to design methods of reporting and mitigating graffiti within their boundaries.

In the unincorporated area, the County has found that the current methods are accessible and effective in supporting graffiti reporting and does not believe that a new county-wide system is warranted. The County receives few complaints or questions regarding graffiti outside of its jurisdiction, and when such complaints are

received, County staff members route them to the appropriate jurisdiction. County staff members provide the reporting party with the contact information for that responding agency.

County staff members currently collect graffiti complaints through several methods, including the County's website, phone lines and smartphone app, called "Tell Us Now!" These complaints are managed by the County within a centralized land use permitting and code compliance case management system known as Accela. Within the unincorporated area, there is minimal overlap of transit agency facilities and County jurisdiction.

There are additional methods already in place that allow jurisdictions across San Diego County to work together. First, the County collaborates through the multi-jurisdictional graffiti case management system called Graffiti Tracker. This system allows the County to work with most of the region's incorporated cities, as well as the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and the Port District. Graffiti Tracker users share information and detect patterns and trends when it comes to the investigation and prosecution of those responsible for the crime of graffiti. In 2013, the County of San Diego received a Grand Golden Watchdog Award from the San Diego County Taxpayers Association for this Multi-Discipline Graffiti Abatement Program. Second, law enforcement agencies are also able to share information via the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS). Third, the region currently offers a way for citizens to report graffiti through 2-1-1 San Diego, by calling 2-1-1 or filling out a form on the nonprofit's website. Through this regional public facing system, 2-1-1 staff members then pass along complaints to the jurisdiction legally responsible for responding.

18-38: Find ways to better publicize the use of graffiti-reporting systems throughout the County, via methods such as new agencies, flyers and signage.

Response: The recommendation requires further analysis. The County has the legal authority to design methods of reporting and responding to crime only within its own jurisdiction. Currently, citizens can report graffiti in the unincorporated County through multiple channels, thanks to efforts by County staff. County staff has worked to enhance the County's website with additional graffiti abatement information, created additional online tools to enable communication and submit complaints, and most recently, launched a smartphone mobile application for reporting graffiti. Dozens of graffiti complaints come in through these channels each year. In addition, 2-1-1 is available to residents across the region to report graffiti complaints. Nevertheless, the County is open to exploring additional ways of promoting its graffiti-reporting systems that could be cost-effective and reasonable. By December 1, 2018, staff will review possible education and outreach efforts to increase public awareness of these reporting tools.