



SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE 2012-2013 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORTS

[Background](#) | [Summary of Responses](#) | [Recommendations](#) | [Attachments](#)

BACKGROUND

California Penal Code Section 933(a) requires the Grand Jury to “submit to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court a final report of its findings and recommendations that pertain to county government matters during the fiscal or calendar year” ...Section 933(e) requires comments from the governing body, elected county officers or agency heads to the presiding judge of the Superior Court on the Findings and Recommendations within the required period of time.

All civil Grand Jury reports and the full responses can be obtained from the following website:

http://www.sanmateocourt.org/court_divisions/grand_jury/

The responses and comments submitted for FY 2012-13 Grand Jury reports were evaluated by the 2013-2014 Grand Jury in light of California Penal Code Section 933.05(b), which requires the agency head, county officer, or governing body to provide one of four possible responses to each Recommendation:

1. Have implemented the Recommendation
2. Will implement the Recommendation
3. Will study the Recommendation, and
4. Will not implement the Recommendation

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The 2013-2014 San Mateo Civil Grand Jury (2014 Grand Jury) reviewed the Final Reports issued by the 2012-2013 San Mateo Civil Grand Jury (2013 Grand Jury) and the formal responses filed by the affected agencies. This practice provides the succeeding Grand Jury the ability to track the responses made by the affected agencies and the opportunity to follow up with non-responsive agencies and agencies indicating study is necessary for a substantive response. The information gathered also provides the general public a method by which to determine if the affected agencies are responsive to the recommendations of the Grand Jury.

The 2013 Grand Jury issued 13 Final Reports that required responses from a total of 118 elected bodies, agencies and districts (Respondents). The 2013 Grand Jury made 106 recommendations. A total of 328 responses were requested. The majority of responses stated that a recommendation had been implemented, would be implemented, or would not be implemented.

California Penal Code Section 933.05(b) (3) requires that respondents indicating that ‘further study’ would be necessary conclude such study within “six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report”. Initially, 11 respondents stated that further study of 16 recommendations would be required. None of the respondents stating further study of a recommendation was required updated its response within this six-month period.

On April 29, 2014, the Grand Jury mailed follow-up letters requesting updates from the 11 respondents indicating that further study would be necessary. Of the Respondents who answered these letters, 5 Recommendations have been implemented, 2 recommendations will be implemented, and 4 will not be implemented. The “Requires Further Study” figure in the table below results from the failure of 2 Respondents to reply to the follow-up letters regarding 2 recommendations. This is highlighted in the Summary of Responses following this report.

The table below indicates the overall responses:

RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATIONS	% OF TOTAL
Implemented	117	35.5
Will Implement	117	35.5
Requires Further Study	2	2.0
Will Not Implement	92	27.0
TOTALS	328	100.0

RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the Recommendations made during the 2012-2013 term were constructive and relevant. The 2014 Grand Jury does not consider additional actions necessary for any of the 2013 Final Reports.

The 2014 Grand Jury agreed with and continued the recommended format for Final Reports established by the 2013 Grand Jury.

We recommend that the Summary of Responses to the Grand Jury Report continue to expand its content to include specific responses to the recommendations to improve the reports’ relevance. Expanded content in this report provides a tool to San Mateo County residents with which to better gauge the activities of their government. Specific responses provide Respondents an avenue for explanation and clarification to the people they serve. The 2014 Grand Jury believes that overt transparency of the results of their investigations should be the hallmark of all grand juries.

We also recommend that the Summary of Responses to the Grand Jury Report be issued by a subsequent grand jury prior to the end of January so as to conclude in an orderly and timely manner the work of the previous grand jury.

The responses received to the Final Reports were well considered and responsive and the 2014 Grand Jury thanks all the Respondents for their careful consideration of the Grand Jury's work on behalf of San Mateo County residents.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE 2012-2013 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORTS

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	# ¹	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>Water Recycling – An Important Component of Wise Water Management</i></p> <p><i>The 2012-2013 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that, the City Councils of Daly City and Redwood City do the following, on or before June 30, 2014:</i></p> <p>R1. Study expansion of their programs into other non-potable uses of recycled water.</p> <p>R2. Study geographic expansion of their recycled water distribution systems.</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the City Councils of Brisbane, Foster City, Pacifica, San Bruno, South San Francisco, and San Mateo do the following, on or before June 30, 2014:</i></p> <p>R3. Finalize current feasibility studies.</p> <p>R4. Actively pursue partnerships for producing and distributing recycled water.</p> <p>R5. Develop educational programs designed to highlight the need for recycled water, while addressing public health risk concerns.</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the County Board of Supervisors and the City/Town Councils of Atherton, Belmont, Burlingame, Colma, East Palo Alto, Half Moon Bay, Hillsborough, Menlo Park, Millbrae, Portola Valley, San Carlos, and Woodside do the following, on or before June 30, 2015:</i></p> <p>R6. Engage in active dialogue with water</p>	County Board of Supervisors	Yes	2				R6, R7 should be left to cities as County does not have areas consistent with criteria studied
	Atherton	Yes	2		R6, R7 – will be implemented in the future		
	Belmont	Yes	2				R6, R7 Does not have own water supply
	Brisbane	Yes	3		R3-after CEQA review R4-actively seeking partnerships R5-will be implemented after completion of R3 and R4		
	Burlingame	Yes	2	R6 – conducted study in 2011 ²			R7-based on R6 results recycling not feasible
	Colma	Yes	2				R6, R7-No water treatment facility. NSMCSD ³ studying re-cycled water for cemeteries
	Daly City	Yes	2	R1, R2-completed 2009 with second study begun in 2012 with BAWSCA ⁴			
	East Palo Alto	Yes	2	R6 –being studied through East Palo Alto Sanitation District			R7-No water treatment facility
	Foster City	Yes	3	R3-feasability study completed and recycling being integrated into Master Plan. R4-pursuing through Master Plan	R5-will implement upon finalization of recycling plan		

¹ Represents the number of responses requested from each entity

² Technical Memorandum –Summary of Recycled Water Supply and Demand Evaluation, March 25, 2011 (EKI, 2011)

³ North San Mateo County Sanitation District

⁴ Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#1	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p>purveyors and wastewater treatment providers, as applicable, about the feasibility of developing a program for producing a distributing recycled water.</p> <p>R7. Conduct any studies that may be required to develop a program for recycling water.</p>	Half Moon Bay	Yes	2		R6-resolving jurisdictional issues with Coastside Water District and Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside R7-will participate in all studies		
	Hillsborough	Yes	2				R6, R7 Does not have water treatment facility, infrastructure to support or need.
	Menlo Park	Yes	2	R7-Participated in feasibility study with Redwood City Water Recycling Plan	R6-will participate in studies and outreach		
	Millbrae	Yes	2		R6, R7 — city owns waste water treatment facility and continues to study recycled water alternative		
	Pacifica	Yes	2				R6, R7 Does not have access to water treatment plant.
	Portola Valley	Yes	2		R6, R7– will discuss recycling with CalWater and participate in all studies		
	Redwood City	Yes	2	R1, R2 are being implemented			
	San Bruno	Yes	3	R4, R5 are partnering with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, CalWater, Millbrae, Burlingame and SFO.	R3 -Feasibility studies conducted 2007 and 2011		
	San Carlos	Yes	2				R6, R7 Does not have access to water treatment plant.
	San Mateo	Yes	3	R3-Survey completed 2013.			

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/ N	#1	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
				R4-partnering with Foster City R5-flyer developed addressing water recycling			
	South San Francisco	Yes	3	R3-feasibility study completed 2007 and 2011 R4-partnering with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, CalWater, Millbrae, Burlingame and SFO. R5-conduct site tours and outreach with schools.			
	Woodside	Yes	2		R6, R7-will dialogue with CalWater and if water recycling becomes a feasible option, develop outreach.		

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>Can We Talk? Law Enforcement and Our Multilingual County</i></p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that:</i></p> <p>R1. The cities of Atherton, Colma, Daly City, East Palo Alto, Hillsborough, Pacifica, Redwood City, and San Bruno develop a written policy/procedure for language access based on the guidelines set forth by the United States Department of Justice 22 and customized for California Law by Lexipol in Policy 368 (See, e.g., Appendix E)</p> <p>R2. The cities of Brisbane and Hillsborough subscribe to a telephonic translation service that provides immediate access for dispatchers and officers in the field.</p> <p>R3. Every County policing agency examine the feasibility of providing smart phones to patrol officers so that they can access free translation services such as Google Translate 23.</p> <p>R4. Every County policing agency encourage and financially support participation in POST24 language skills classes.</p>	SMCSO ^{5 6}	Yes	2				R3-R4 – not fiscally reasonable
	Atherton	Yes	2		R4- officers continuing educational opportunities	R3 – being studied	
	Belmont	Yes	2		R4-officers continuing educational opportunities		R3-not fiscally reasonable
	Brisbane	Yes	2		R4-will send officers to POST language training		R2-will continue to use San Mateo Police Department
	Burlingame	Yes	2	R4-officers are attending language classes			R3-city provides in-car computers for this purpose
	Colma	Yes	3	R1, R3,R4 have been implemented			
	Daly City	Yes	3	R1-implemented 11/3/2013 R4-officers are attending language classes			R3-not fiscally reasonable
	East Palo Alto	Yes	3	R4-officers are attending language classes			R1-will continue to use current form R3-not fiscally reasonable
	Foster City	Yes	2	R4-officers are attending language classes			R3-not fiscally reasonable
	Hillsborough	Yes	4	R1-R4 implemented			R2-remains with SMC ⁷ Safety Dispatch R3-deemed not warranted
	Menlo Park	Yes	2				R3-deemed unwarranted and too expensive R4-no response
	Pacifica	Yes	3	R1-R4 implemented			R3-deemed too expensive
	Redwood City	Yes	3	R1,R4 implemented			R3-too expensive
	San Bruno	Yes	3	R1,R4 implemented			R3-deemed not warranted or necessary
	San Mateo	Yes	2	R3-R4 implemented			
So. San Francisco	Yes	2				R3-deemed too expensive R4-not responsive	

⁵ Includes Half Moon Bay, San Carlos, Millbrae, Woodside and Portola

⁶ San Mateo County Sheriff's Office

⁷ San Mateo County

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>Sam CERA's Unfunded Liability: The Elephant in the Room</i></p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that SamCERA's Board of Retirement do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Adopt a policy to reduce SamCERA's assumed rate of return by 0.25% per year until such time as it has achieved a funded ratio of 90%.</p> <p>R2. Once a funded ratio of 90% has been achieved, establish SamCERA's assumed rate of return each year by taking into consideration the guaranteed nature of its participants' benefits and relevant macro-economic factors while disregarding (i) the effect, if any, the assumed rate of return will have on required contributions to SamCERA and (ii) the assumed rates of return of other public pension funds.</p> <p>R3. Include in the SamCERA CAFR and SamCERA PAFR, the following information in tabular form:</p> <p>a. For each of the past one, three, five, and ten fiscal years:</p> <p>i. Its annual investment earnings (or losses) stated as a percentage and in dollars, both net of investment costs</p> <p>ii. Its actual rates of return as compared with its assumed rates of return</p> <p>iii. Its peer rankings</p> <p>iv. The peer rankings of each of its investment managers for which such rankings are available</p> <p>b. The unfunded liability amount for each of the past 10 years</p> <p>c. The amount contributed by the County to SamCERA attributable solely to its unfunded liability for each of the past 10 years</p> <p>d. The number of beneficiaries receiving annual benefits for each of the past five years in the following amounts:</p>	County Board of Supervisors	Yes	10	<p>R7-Board exceeds the mandated requirements for qualifications of electors.</p> <p>R11-County will achieve a 89% funded ratio by 2020.</p>	R6-to be implemented by June 30, 2015		<p>R8-quarterly meetings not necessary as information posted on Sam CERA website</p> <p>R9-County committed to structural deficit but limitations will limit new or expanded programs without a specific funding source.</p> <p>R10-current programs are within reasonable standards</p> <p>R12-fluctuations in the unfunded liability are dependent of investments returns.</p> <p>R13-County has already adopted lower benefit formulas for new employees, obtained PERPA plans for members, and has reduced 500 positions.</p> <p>R14-liability is in accordance with the standards set by GASB⁸.</p> <p>R15-not a reasonable calculation.</p>
	Sam CERA Board of Retirement	Yes	7				<p>R1-too arbitrary</p> <p>R2-not warranted</p> <p>R3-current information is thorough and accurate</p> <p>R4-not warranted as currently available on SamCERA website</p> <p>R5-current review policies are effective.</p> <p>R14- liability is in accordance with the standards set by GASB.</p> <p>R15-not a reasonable calculation.</p>

⁸ Governmental Accounting Standards Board

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/ N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p>i. \$100,000 - \$149,999 ii. \$150,000 - \$199,999 iii. \$200,000 and up e. The average and median annual benefit paid to SamCERA beneficiaries for the past five years</p> <p>R4. Replicate on SamCERA's website, modified to apply to SamCERA, CalPERS "Facts at a Glance."</p> <p>R5. Employ only investment managers for its alternative assets that rank in the top 10% of their peer group for at least the past five years.</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the County's Board of Supervisors do the following:</i> R6. Implement GASB Statement 68 for FY2014.</p> <p>R7. Appoint to the Board of Retirement only individuals who possess substantial experience in managing or overseeing investment portfolios, either by professional training, or by business or personal experience.</p> <p>R8. Formally review in open session on a quarterly basis the investment performance of SamCERA.</p> <p>R9. Give higher priority to funding SamCERA's unfunded liability, an obligation that already exists, than to other new or expanded programs it may contemplate.</p> <p>R10. Adopt the goal that SamCERA's funded ratio should be 100% and that its minimum funded ratio is 90%.</p> <p>R11. At a minimum, set the County's annual contribution to SamCER attributable solely to the unfunded liability to the amount necessary to achieve a funded ratio of at least 90% on or before June 30, 2023.</p> <p>R12. Once the minimum funded ratio of 90% is achieved, at a minimum each year thereafter, set the County's annual contribution attributable solely to the unfunded liability to the amount</p>							

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/ N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p>necessary to maintain a funded ratio of at least 90%.</p> <p>R13. If they withstand judicial challenge, take all steps necessary to implement pension changes similar to those passed by San Jose's voters.</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that SamCERA's Board of Retirement and the County's Board of Supervisors do the following:</i></p> <p>R14. Acknowledge that the reported unfunded liability of \$962,282,000 is materially understated if either a risk free rate of return or SamCERA's actual rate of return over the past 10 years is used in its calculation.</p> <p>R15. Annually compare SamCERA's unfunded liability calculated in accordance with GASB Statement 68 with its unfunded liability calculated utilizing a risk free rate of return and SamCERA's actual rate of return over the past 10 years.</p>							

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>San Mateo County Financial Reporting: Toward Clarity and Transparency</i></p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the County's Board of Supervisors do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Direct staff to prominently disclose in table and/or graph form in one location in the proposed and adopted Budget the following information for the budget year and the actual amounts for the previous four fiscal years:</p> <p>a. Total sources of funds, including, without limitation, Excess ERAF and any other so-called "one time" revenues</p> <p>b. Total requirements (expenditures)</p> <p>c. Total increase or decrease in General Fund Reserves</p> <p>d. Identify non-recurring revenues or expenditures in excess of \$3 million (individually or in the aggregate) from one source or for one project</p> <p>e. Budget amount per San Mateo resident, i.e. total requirements divided by the most current official estimate of County population</p> <p>f. Ten largest County expenses by category (expenditure object) e.g., employee payroll, employee benefits, amortization of unfunded liabilities, debt service, etc.</p> <p>g. Ten largest County expenses by department, e.g., Sheriff's Office, Behavioral Health and Recovery Services, Human Services Agency, etc.</p> <p>h. Total number of workers providing services to the County in each of the following categories</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classified 2. Unclassified 3. Temporary/Extra Help/Intern 4. Volunteers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The total payroll for all County employees j. The total cost to the County of all benefits to all County employees k. Total payments to contractors 	County Controller	Yes	15		<p>R2a, R2b, R2c, R2d, R2e, R2f, R2i, R2j, R2m, R2n, R2o-will be represented in revised government-wide Statement of Activities in the PAFR⁹.</p> <p>R2g, R2h, R2k, R2l,- will include after future system enhancements.</p>		
	County Board of Supervisors	Yes	15				R1a-the County will continue to meet the State Controller's guidelines which do not require special revenue graphs.
						<p>R1b, R1c, R1d, R1e, R1f, R1g, R1j -will be implemented in the recommended budget but not the adopted budget.</p> <p>R1h, R1i-partial implementation for current (not previous) years to the recommended budget only.</p> <p>R1lii, R1liii, R1lm-will be implemented.</p>	

⁹ Popular Annual Financial Report

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p>providing services to the County, excluding contractors making capital improvements</p> <p>I. The following unfunded liabilities:</p> <p>i. SamCERA, both as calculated by SamCERA's actuary and calculated using a "risk free" rate of return</p> <p>ii. Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB)</p> <p>iii. Any other unfunded liabilities not associated with bonded indebtedness</p> <p>m. The amount paid solely to amortize each of the unfunded liabilities listed in the preceding subparagraph</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the County Controller do the following:</i></p> <p>R2. Prominently disclose in table and/or graph form in one location in the PAFR the following information, on an accrual basis, for the current and previous four fiscal years:</p> <p>a. Total sources of funds, including, without limitation, Excess ERAF and any other so-called "one time" revenues</p> <p>b. Total requirements (expenditures)</p> <p>c. Total increase or decrease in the combined total of the following General Fund accounts: Committed, Assigned, and Unassigned</p> <p>d. Identify non-recurring material (as defined by the Controller and individually or in the aggregate) revenues or expenditures from one source or for one project (expenditure object)</p> <p>e. Total "general revenues, extraordinary item, and transfers" per San Mateo resident, i.e. the sum of these items divided by the most current official estimate of County population</p> <p>f. Ten largest County expenses by category (expenditure object), e.g., employee payroll, employee benefits, amortization of unfunded liabilities, debt service, etc.</p> <p>g. Ten largest County expenses by department, e.g., Sheriff's Office, Behavioral Health and Recovery Services, Human Services Agency, etc.</p> <p>h. Total number of workers providing services to the County in each of the</p>							

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/ N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p>following categories</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classified 2. Unclassified 3. Temporary/Extra Help/Intern <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The total payroll for all County employees j. The total cost to the County of all benefits to all County employees k. Total payments to contractors providing services to the County, excluding contractors making capital improvements l. The following unfunded liabilities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. SamCERA, both as calculated by SamCERA's actuary and calculated using a "risk free" rate of return ii. Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) iii. Any other unfunded liabilities not associated with bonded indebtedness m. The amount paid solely to amortize each of the unfunded liabilities listed in the preceding subparagraph n. The combined total of the end of year amounts of the following General Fund accounts: Committed, Assigned, and Unassigned. o. Total increase or decrease in net assets 							

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>Sequoia Healthcare District – How Are Your Property Tax Dollars Spent?</i></p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that LAFCo do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Contract with a consultant experienced in conducting service reviews of health care districts to assist in conducting the next SHD service review.</p>	Sequoia Healthcare District	Yes	7	<p>R5-has a program to respond to community concerns.</p> <p>R6-is updating website promptly.</p> <p>R7-has requested the County to correct website information.</p>	<p>R2-agrees to separate reviews for SHD¹⁰ and PHD¹¹</p> <p>R3, R4-will published information being gathered when completed.</p>		R1- deferred to Lafco
	Lafco ¹²	Yes	1				R1-informaton required for the service review is available from the Districts.
<p>R2. Perform separate service reviews for SHD and PHD.</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that SHD do the following:</i></p> <p>R3. Develop a mechanism to track and publicize on its website (i) how many of its residents the Ravenswood Clinic serves and (ii) the percentage of those the Ravenswood Clinic serves that reside within SHD’s boundaries.</p> <p>R4. Develop a mechanism to track and publicize on its website how many and what percentage of the SFSU Nursing Program graduates become and remain employed at (i) Sequoia Hospital and (ii) elsewhere within the County.</p> <p>R5. Seek opportunities to make public presentations in order to ensure that residents are well informed, heard, and represented by programs.</p> <p>R6. Continually update its website with current information.</p> <p>R7. Request that the County Treasurer/Tax Collector correct the information referring to SHD as a hospital district on its website and property tax insert.</p>							

¹⁰ Sequoia Healthcare District

¹¹ Peninsula Healthcare District

¹² Local Agency Formation Commission

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>South Bayside Waste Management Authority Board- Elected Officials or Senior Management Staff?</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>The 2012-2013 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that, each Member Agency of SBWMA do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Disseminate more information to the public about SBWMA's operations, the role of its franchisees, and the rate setting process.</p> <p>R2. Request that Recology prepare a detailed billing statement for its customers that shows all charges imposed by Recology and itemizes all fees charged by the Member Agency.</p> <p>R3. Continue to appoint only senior management staff to the Board as stipulated in the 2005 Agreement.</p> <p>R4. If the Restated Agreement is amended to provide for a Board composed solely of elected officials, then put in place a technical advisory committee consisting of staff with technical experience in waste management.</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the SBWMA Board do the following:</i></p> <p>R5. Disseminate more information to the public about SBWMA's operations, the role of its franchisees, and the rate setting process through a variety of media. □</p>	Board of Supervisors	Yes	4				<p>R1-is the responsibility of SBWMA¹³</p> <p>R2-is currently being provided through alternate means</p> <p>R3-the SBWMA board of directors is now composed of elected officials</p> <p>R4-is the responsibility of the board to determine.</p>
	Atherton	Yes	3		<p>R1-will place information of town's website</p> <p>R2-will support as a matter of Board action</p> <p>R3-the Town's representative will advise the Board</p>		
	Belmont	Yes	4	<p>R1-shares regular updates and informational brochures</p> <p>R2-mailed a billing insert in 2/13</p>	R4-supports election of officials		R3-disagrees and are proponents of a governance change to elected officials
	Burlingame	Yes	4		<p>R1-will consider various methods</p> <p>R2-will work with Ecology to properly inform customers of rates</p> <p>R3-will be considered if the board of directors is to be comprised of members from each agency.</p> <p>R4-are supportive if the advisory</p>		

¹³ South Bay Water Management Authority

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
					committee members are knowledgeable candidates		
	Hillsborough	Yes	4	R1-developed a "Waste Management" page on website to inform citizens	R4-will support the TAC ¹⁴ committee		R2-does not charge additional fees R3-believes citizens are better served by elected officials
	East Palo Alto	Yes	4		R1-regularly provides information explaining rates R2-will request R3-JPA agreement has been changed to reflect R4-Agrees with recommendation		
	Foster City	Yes	4	R1-is ongoing	R4-will be implemented when SBWMA forms the TAC		R2-city has not received any complaints to their current billing practices R3-JPA agreement spells out method
	Menlo Park	Yes	4	R1-currently has information on their 'Environmental Programs, Recycling and Solid Waste' webpage, Facebook and Twitter. R3-has approved the governance change amendment	R4 – will support the TAC committee		R2-city does not establish rates
	San Carlos	Yes	4	R1-provides information at council meetings, newsletter, city web site, Facebook and Twitter.	R4-will support the TAC committee	R2-is studying current and proposed billing notices.	R3-does not support the JPA agreement, offering an alternate
	San Mateo	Yes	4	R1-previously implemented but is improving content R2-previously implemented	R4-will support the TAC committee		R3- believes citizens are better served by elected officials

¹⁴ Technical Advisory Committee

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
	Redwood City	Yes	4		R1-believes change to elected officials will better position information dissemination R4-will support the TAC committee		R2-does not have the information available to respond to this recommendation R3- believes citizens are better served by elected officials
	South Bayside Water Mgmt Authority	Yes	1	R1-has made major effort to better inform rate payers			
	West Bay Sanitation District	Yes	4	R3-approved amendment to change governance to elected officials			R1-believes this is the responsibility of SBWMA R2-does not add fees R4- believes this is the responsibility of SBWMA

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<i>Capital Appreciation Bonds: Ticking Time Bomb</i>	Bayshore School District	Yes	2				R3, R4-have no outstanding bonds
<p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the San Mateo County Office of Education do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Consider issuing a recommendation regarding prudent parameters in the issuance of school bond financing.</p> <p>R2. Collect and make available to the public online data on all CABs issued within the County that do not conform to Education Code parameters.</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that Board of Trustees of each County School District do the following:</i></p> <p>R3. Adopt prudent loan parameters in connection with the issuance of school bond financing.</p> <p>R4. Post on the school district's website basic information on all bonds issued by the district that are outstanding, including date of issue, bond amount, maturity date, interest rate, total debt service, amount due at maturity, and other relevant details. □</p>	Belmont-Redwood Shores School District	Yes	2	R3-has a fiscally sound bond policy in place	R4-will post a link on the District's website to the District's information on the EMMA ¹⁵ website		
	Brisbane School District	Yes	2		R4-will post a link on the District's website to the District's information of the EMMA website		R3-as district has no unissued approved debt will postpone discussion until the District considers issuing new bonds
	Burlingame School District	Yes	2		R3-will set up debt policy of District specifying debt issuance parameters R4-will add links to official statements of each bond issuance		
	Cabrillo Unified School District	Yes	2	R3-governing board has adopted specific policy to ensure bond issuance is within prudent fiscal management	R4-updating website.		
	Hillsborough City School District	Yes	2		R3, R4-will be implemented by 6/30/2014		
	Jefferson Elementary School District	Yes	2		R4-will consider SMCOE ¹⁶ guidelines for updating website if CABs utilized		R3-will continue to abide by state law
	Jefferson Union High School District	Yes	2		R3-awaiting passage of AB182 R4- is considering SMCOE guidelines for updating website		
	La-Honda-Pescadero Unified	Yes	2		R3-will use prudent program for any future		

¹⁵ Electronic Municipal Market Access

¹⁶ San Mateo Office of Education

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
	School District				bond issuance R4-will update website with bond information by 1/1/2014		
	Las Lomas School District	Yes	2		R3-will use advice from bond counsel and financial advisors R4-will post any future bond issuance on website		
	Menlo Park City School District	Yes	2		R3-will continue to use stated bond issuance policy R4- will continue to publish bond issuance information on their website		
	Millbrae School District	Yes	2		R4-will continue discussions with the Board of Trustees		R3-will continue to abide by all laws governing with prudent parameters
	Pacifica School District	Yes	2		R3-will adopt prudent loan parameters for bond issuance R4-website will contain basic information on all bonds		
	Portola Valley School District	Yes	2		R3-recommendatiion will be implemented in the future R4-bond information will be posted on the website by 11/1/2013		
	Ravenswood City School District	Yes	2		R3-will adopt prudent parameters if a Capital Apperception Bond is issued R4-will post the pertinent information regarding CABs on their website		
	Redwood City	Yes	2	R3- has followed			

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
	School District			prudent loan parameters is the issuance of CABs R4-information regarding CABs is available on the District's website			
	San Bruno Park School District	Yes	2				R3, R4-the District does not have CABs at this time
	San Carlos School District	Yes	2		R3-has requested staff to draft updated parameters ad implementation by 1/11/2014 R4-will implement by 1/11/2014		
	SMC Community College District	Yes	2	R3-has amended issuance policy to define parameters for issuance of bonds R4-information is available on District's website			
	San Mateo-Foster City School District	Yes	2		R3-issuance will be in compliance with all laws and prudence will be considered at time of issuance R4-website will reflect information regarding bond issuance		
	San Mateo Union High School District	Yes	2		R3-will continue to use current parameters R4-will include bond issuance information on the District's website		
	Sequoia Union High School District	Yes	3		R2-will make bond issuance information available to the SMCOE R3-will review and align with AB182		

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
					R4-will post bond issuance information on the District's website		
	SSF Unified School District	Yes	2	R4-has begun posting basic information regarding bonds on the District's website	R3-will continue to use prudent parameters in the issuance of CABs		
	Woodside School District	Yes	2		R3-will continue to use prudent parameters when issuing CABs R4-will provide basic information regarding CABs on the District's website		
	SMCOE ¹⁷	Yes	2		R1-will include recommendations for prudent bond issuance in the three newsletters sent to school districts annually		R2-current staffing resources are not adequate to gather, compile and post such data on the website.

¹⁷ San Mateo County Office of Education

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/ N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>County Lacks Firm Basis for Outsourcing Work: Charter Revision Recommended</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>The 2012-2013 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Submit to the voters for approval a Charter amendment that would allow outsourcing at the County Manager's discretion.</p> <p>R2. Establish clear lines of communication among all parties involved in making the County function as a unit, from managers to employees to unions. □</p>	Board of Supervisors	Yes	2	R2-monthly Labor/Management meeting with all of labor to discuss budget and current topics			R1-is currently implementing the pilot phase of the Agile Organization initiative which introduces work delivery models such as term employees and fellows and expands existing work delivery models, such as self-help, volunteers and contracting consistent with State law. The pilot programs will run for 3 years and are expected to conclude in late 2016 and evaluated by County staff and stakeholders. Any changes will be recommended to be placed before the voters through charter amendments.

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<i>San Mateo County Special Districts: Who Is Really In Charge of the Taxpayer's Money? The Mosquito District Embezzlement: Is it the Tip of the Iceberg?</i>	Board of Supervisors	Yes	1				R8-Lafco is an independent County Commission setting their own budget. The Board of Supervisors has no jurisdiction.
	Lafco	Yes	1				R9-the Cortese Knox Hertzberg Act gives LAFCo authority to adopt budgets, not the County Board of Supervisors
<i>The Grand Jury recommends that the Board do the following:</i> R1. Instruct the Manager to follow the Policies and Procedures manual at all times. R2. Instruct the Manager to provide complete financial reports to the Board on a monthly basis. R3. Improve its oversight of the District through an improved governance structure and hold the Manager accountable for its operations. R4. Evaluate its Policies and Procedures manual on an annual basis and make the manual available to employees and the public. R5. Emphasize the importance of the finance committee's role in ensuring that internal controls and policies are in place and are being followed. R6. Hire a human resources consultant to redesign the Manager's evaluation process in order to better assess the Manager's job performance. R7. Clarify Trustees' roles and reinforce and discuss expectations of the position at an annual meeting.	San Mateo Mosquito and Vector Control District	Yes	7	R1-changes to the manager's evaluation have been made R2-a full financial report is provided at each District meeting R3-a new committee system has been created and the Bylaws revised. Standing committees now include: Finance, Environmental and Outreach, Policy, Strategic Planning, Legislature, And the Manger's Evaluation. R5-the Finance Committee has assumed responsibility for monthly reviews R6-have contracted with RGS ¹⁸ to provide HR support	R4-the District is reviewing options for increasing the evaluation process. R6-have contracted with RGS ¹⁹ to provide HR support R7- a Trustee "Field Day" to increase Trustee understanding is scheduled for 12/2013.		
<i>The Grand Jury recommends that the County Board of Supervisors do the following:</i>	Atherton	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
R8. Provide increased resources to LAFCo so it	Belmont	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports			

¹⁸ Regional Governmental Services Authorities

¹⁹ Regional Governmental Services Authorities

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
can meet state mandates with regard to Service Reviews.				as requested			
<p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that LAFCo do the following:</i></p> <p>R9. Further study the dissolution of the District and evaluate the cost savings that might result from transferring the function to the County Environmental Health Department.</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the City/Town Councils do the following:</i></p> <p>R10. Appoint a council member to the District Board if a representative cannot be found after vetting applicants.</p> <p>R11. Require regular reporting about the District's operations by their representative at a scheduled council meeting. □</p>	Brisbane	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	Burlingame	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	Colma	Yes	2		R10, R11-City Council will actively recruit a Trustee and require regular reports		
	Daly City	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	East Palo Alto	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	Foster City	Yes	2		R10, R11-City Council will actively recruit a Trustee and require regular reports		
	Half Moon Bay	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	Hillsborough	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	Menlo Park	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	Millbrae	Yes	2				R10, R11-deferred to LAFCo
	Pacifica	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	Portola Valley	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
	Redwood City	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	San Bruno	No	2	R10, R11 –Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	San Carlos	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	San Mateo	Yes	2				R10, R11-current quarterly reporting is sufficient
	South San Francisco	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			
	Woodside	Yes	2	R10, R11-Trustee appointed and reports as requested			

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/ N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>An Inconvenient Truth About the County's Structural Deficit</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the County's Board of Supervisors do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Report in the budget as "resources" all revenues it anticipates receiving in a fiscal year, including, without limitation, Excess ERAF.</p> <p>R2. If the Board is concerned that Excess ERAF may be taken away or reduced by the state, it should budget Excess ERAF for only the following purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Capital projects such as acquisition of real property and construction of, or major improvements to, buildings b. Payment of County obligations with a finite life, other than bonded indebtedness, such as SamCERA's unfunded liability or other post-employment benefits. c. Similar "one-time" expenditures <p>R3. Refrain from stating that the County has or will have a deficit, structural or otherwise, unless it has taken into account all resources, including, without limitation, Excess ERAF, in making its calculation.</p> <p>R4. Be completely transparent with regard to any claim that the County has or will incur a deficit, structural or otherwise.</p> <p>R5. Adopt a procedure with respect to a measure it submits for voter approval that proposes to increase, extend, or impose a tax, fee, or other revenue raising means that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Informs the public of the most current assessment of the County's deficit or surplus condition after accounting for all anticipated revenues, including Excess ERAF. b. Requires the Board to exercise its best efforts to adopt a budget argument in favor of the measure and, if approved, submit the same to the County's Chief Elections Officer for inclusion in the appropriate Sample Ballot. <input type="checkbox"/> 	Board of Supervisors	Yes	5	<p>R1-implemented after public input</p> <p>R2-is consistent with use of Excess ERAF²⁰ and authorized budget guidelines</p> <p>R4-County Manager's office does not include Excess ERAF in deficit projections</p>			<p>R3-one-time revenues will never be part of any structural projection.</p> <p>R5-County adheres to accepted methods of proposed tax measure protocol</p>

²⁰ The money generated when Educational Revenue Augmentation Funds exceed school funding requirements

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<i>Strapped Cities That Hired the Sheriff...Is it Working?</i>	Half Moon Bay	Yes	3	R1-contract remains in place			R2, R3-is unwarranted as City pays agreed amount for agreed services.
<p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the cities of Half Moon Bay, Millbrae, and San Carlos do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Continue contracting police services with the SO.</p> <p>R2. Discuss amendments to their contracts to include language addressing the allocation of the funds held by the SO in the trust fund accounts maintained on their behalf.</p> <p>R3. Obtain a current accounting of those trust fund accounts.</p>	Millbrae	Yes	3	R1-contract remains in place	R2, R3-are in discussions with the SMCSO ²¹ to include contract language to define the trust fund		
	San Carlos	Yes	3	<p>R1-contract expires 6/2015 and the City Council will review and evaluate at that time</p> <p>R2, R3-the City Council and the SMCSO have met and agreed how the trust fund account will be maintained</p>			

²¹ San Mateo County Sheriff's Office

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/ N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>Peninsula Health Care District: Landlord, Real Estate Developer, or Health Care Leader?</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that LAFCo do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Contract with a consultant experienced in conducting service reviews of health care districts to assist in conducting the next PHD service review.</p> <p>R2. Perform separate service reviews for SHD and PHD.</p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that PHD do the following:</i></p> <p>R3. Determine which of its three roles of landlord, real estate developer, and community health care resource has top priority .</p> <p>R4. Retain experts to estimate the reasonable “book value” of MPMC when the lease expires in 50 years, then determine how much to allocate to reserves for its purchase, taking into account debt financing possibilities, in order to avoid an unnecessarily large reserve fund.</p> <p>R5. Adjust its allocation of revenues to enhance PHD’s support of current programs and grants.</p> <p>R6. Restructure the terms of its grants so that only a portion of the grant award amount is distributed upfront, and then if a mid-year report shows that performance is acceptable, distribute the remaining funds.</p> <p>R7. Seek opportunities to make public presentations in order to ensure that residents are well informed, heard, and represented by the programs PHD funds.</p> <p>R8. Continually update its website with current information, including meeting agendas, strategic plans, and budget information</p>	<p>Peninsula Health Care District</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>R4-completed in 2013</p>	<p>R7-will continue with outreach and town meetings to inform the public</p> <p>R8-the website will continue to be updated with pertinent information</p>		<p>R3-all three roles are equally important to preserve the assets of the District</p> <p>R5-current allocation balances community grants and maintains credit-worthiness</p> <p>R6-current practice of full funding annually is working</p>
	<p>LAFCo</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>2</p>				<p>R1-will not be implemented until circumstances indicate a necessity and the Commission’s budget includes resources for that purpose.</p> <p>R2-not warranted as review of both facilitates a broader examination and public dialogue of the County’s residents health care needs</p>

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>High School Diploma: A Ticket To Where?</i></p> <p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that the County's Office of Education do the following:</i></p> <p>R1. Direct Staff to document the fundamental policies for its ROP. The following topics, mentioned in the Instructions and Guidelines for the development of the 2008-2012 Career Technical Education (CTE) Local Plan, California Department of Education, should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of program success • Accountability, and continuous improvement • Leadership at all levels • High-quality curriculum and instruction • Career exploration and guidance • Student support and student leadership development • Industry partnerships • System alignment and coherence • Effective organizational design • System responsiveness to changing economic demands • Skilled faculty and professional development • CTE promotion, outreach, and communication. <p>R2. Take advantage of all ROP-related funding opportunities made available through the state and federal governments.</p> <p>R3. Aggressively pursue potential underwriters for ROP courses.</p>	Cabrillo Unified School District	Yes	2	<p>R4-partial implementation as CUSD²² does not receive ROP²³ funding that flows through COE²⁴. CUSD CTE²⁵ courses funded by federal sources</p> <p>R5-fully implemented with counselors reviews all options for each students</p>			
	Jefferson Union High School District	Yes	2		<p>R4-District is working with COE to explore adding ROP classes</p> <p>R5-the District will district wide meetings to inform counselors that they must discuss all classes with each student.</p>		
	La Honda Pescadero School District	Yes	2				R4, R5-District does not offer ROP classes on campus
	San Mateo Union High School District	Yes	2	<p>R1-SMUHSD²⁶ absorbed the cost of retaining all ROP sections formerly funded by the SMCOE and continues to expand programs.</p> <p>R2-counselors are well informed of the</p>			

²² Cabrillo Unified School District

²³ Regional Occupational Program

²⁴ County Office of Education

²⁵ Career Technical Education

²⁶ San Mateo Union High School District

REPORT TITLE & RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONDING AGENCY	Y/N	#	IMPLEMENTED	WILL IMPLEMENT	WILL STUDY	WILL NOT IMPLEMENT
<p><i>The Grand Jury recommends that each County High School District and Unified School District do the following:</i></p> <p>R4. Work with the COE to add ROP classes to its on-campus curriculum or document its reason for not having such classes on campus.</p> <p>R5. Require that each guidance counselor in high school districts that offer ROP courses be required to confirm they have considered discussing ROP classes as part of each student's coursework</p>				ROP/CTE sections. The District employs a School-to Career Coordinator and CTE curriculum council.			
	Sequoia High School District	Yes	2	<p>R1-District absorbed cost of 23 ROP sections formerly funded by the SMCOE and has a task force to develop CTE.</p> <p>R2-counselors are well informed of ROP/CTE sections.</p>			
	SSF Unified School District	Yes	2	<p>R1-districts work with the SMCOE to add ROP classes or document why classes are not available</p> <p>R2-district requires each counselor confirm they have considered ROP classes as part of each student's course work</p>			
	Board of Education	Yes	3	<p>R1-the SMCOE ROP for CTE 2008-2012 embodies the 11 elements recommended by the California state Plan</p> <p>R3-will continue to seek additional funding from CTE.</p>	R2-fully intend to take advantage of the CTE-related funding if they align with stated goals		

Issued: June 16, 2014