



SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE FINAL REPORTS OF THE 2014-2015 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

[Background](#) | [Summary of Responses](#) | [Appendix A](#) | [Appendix B](#)

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(c) 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. Governing bodies of public agencies are required to respond no later than 90 days after the Grand Jury submits a final report, elected county officers and agency heads no later than 60 days.

All Civil Grand Jury reports and the responses can be reviewed on the following website:
http://www.sanmateocourt.org/court_divisions/grand_jury.

Each year, the responses and comments submitted concerning reports issued by the prior year’s Grand Jury are evaluated by the then-current 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. Has been implemented, with a summary of the action taken
2. Will implement the recommendation, with a timetable for the implementation
3. Requires further analysis, with an explanation and a timeframe for the response of up to six months from the release of the report
4. Will not implement because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

2014-2015 Responses:

The 2014-2015 Grand Jury issued seven Final Reports, which required responses from a total of 49 Respondents. There were 34 recommendations, and a total of 265 responses were requested. The majority of responses stated that the Grand Jury’s recommendation had been implemented, would be implemented, or required further analysis. *Appendix A: Summary of Responses* contains more specific content from the responses.

The 2015-2016 San Mateo Civil Grand Jury reviewed the Final Reports issued by the 2014-2015 San Mateo Civil 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 whether or not the affected agencies are responsive to the recommendations of the Grand Jury.

This review provides continuity for successive Grand Juries to track the responses made by the affected agencies to the recommendations of each report. The expanded content in this report provides a tool for residents to help understand the activities of their government. Specific responses provide Respondents an avenue for explanation and clarification to the people they serve.

The 2015-2016 Grand Jury thanks all the Respondents for their careful consideration of the Grand Jury's work on behalf of the residents of San Mateo County.

2013-2014 Supplemental Responses:

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury issued nine final reports that required responses from a total of 60 individual elected bodies or agencies (Respondents).

On March 26, 2015, the 2014-2015 Grand Jury mailed follow-up letters requesting updates from the Respondents to those 2013-2014 reports who indicated "Further Study" or "Will Implement" when responding to the recommendations. There was no response to 32 of those recommendations. "No Response" indicates that the recipient did not respond to the Grand Jury's March follow-up letter requesting an update.

The following responses were received in September 2015 and are attached at the end of this report in *Appendix B: Summary of Responses*:

The San Mateo County Harbor District provided supplemental responses to two reports: *Partly Cloudy with a Chance of Information: Investigating the Transparency of Independent Special Districts' Websites* and *What Is the Price of Dysfunction? The San Mateo County Harbor District*.

The San Mateo County Sheriff's Office responded to *Inmate Welfare Trust Fund* and *San Mateo County Detention Facilities: An Overview*.

The San Mateo Union High School District responded to *Educational Frenemies: Can Charter Schools Inspire Better Student Outcomes in Public Schools in San Mateo County?*

The San Mateo County Mosquito and Vector Control District followed up with *Partly Cloudy with a Chance of Information: Investigating the Transparency of Independent Special Districts' Websites*.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE 2014-2015 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORTS

<i>Athletes at Risk: Are San Mateo County High Schools Safeguarding Athletes from Serious Head Trauma?</i>				
The San Mateo County Grand Jury recommends that all San Mateo County high school districts and unified districts:				
R1. Require neurocognitive testing on all high school student athletes (pre- and post-injury) and provide full-time certified athletic trainers at all high school sporting events.				
R2. Seek all funding sources in order to provide for the neurocognitive testing of athletes and for the hiring of full-time certified athletic trainers at all high schools.				
R3. Collect and maintain data on head injuries sustained by high school athletes at the district level; report such data to PAL for summary and analysis, keeping all names of injured athletes confidential.				
RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
Cabrillo Unified School District	R1	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R3	Implemented in Part	Y	Y
Jefferson Union High School District	R1	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R3	Implemented in Part	Y	Y
La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District	R1	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R3	Implemented in Part	Y	Y
San Mateo Union High School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R3	Implemented in Part	Y	Y
Sequoia Union High School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R3	Will Implement	Y	N
South San Francisco Unified School District	R1	Requires More Data	Y	Y
	R2	Will Consider Implementing	Y	N
	R3	Partially Implemented	Y	Y

*Education of Incarcerated Juveniles:
How Are We Meeting the Challenge?*

- R1. The COE should create a system to ensure that all academic credits earned while a juvenile is in detention are accurately transferred to that student's correct course and school upon the juvenile's release from detention.
- R2. Probation, BHRS, and the COE should work together to develop a more comprehensive transition plan to ensure necessary contact with a student's family and school before the student is released from detention.
- R3. Probation and the COE should collaborate to set up an online computer education system.
- R4. Probation and BHRS should evaluate together the merits of creating a full-time position at Camp Glenwood to ensure that boys with mental health issues are receiving the complete and effective care they require, and that families could more frequently be involved in the child's progress.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
Board of Supervisors	R2	Requires Funding to Implement	Y	N
	R3	Technical Issues to Address	Y	N
	R4	Collaborative Effort	Y	N
Office of Education	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R3	Requires Further Study Identification of Funding Sources	Y	Y

Flooding Ahead: Planning for Sea Level Rise

The Grand Jury recommends increased public education about SLR:

- R1. The County, each city in the county, and relevant local special agencies should conduct a public education effort to increase awareness of SLR and its potential effects on this county.

The Grand Jury recommends identifying a single organization to undertake SLR planning:

- R2. The County, each city in the county, and relevant local special agencies should identify a single organization, such as a new joint powers authority or an expanded SMC Flood Control District, to undertake countywide SLR planning. It should be structured to ensure that:
- The organization is countywide in scope
 - The organization is able to focus on SLR
 - Both the County and cities (and possibly relevant local agencies) are able to participate in the organization’s decision-making
 - The organization is sustainably funded
- R3. The organization’s responsibilities should include:
- Adopt consistent SLR projections for use in levee planning countywide
 - Conduct and/or evaluate vulnerability assessments
 - Provide a forum for inter-jurisdictional coordination and exchange of information related to SLR
 - Undertake grant applications for SLR-related planning and projects
 - Facilitate raising funds on a countywide basis for SLR-related projects, to be passed through to agencies with direct responsibility for project construction
 - Monitor actual SLR over time and any changes in SLR projections, based upon the latest federal, State, or regional government reports and scientific studies
 - Through the CEQA environmental review process, comment on major new developments proposed in the SLR floodplain
 - Advocate on behalf of the member jurisdictions with federal, State, and regional agencies regarding SLR issues
 - Assist the County and cities in public awareness efforts, as described in R1
- R4. The County, cities and two relevant local special agencies should consider expanding the role of the organization beyond SLR to include planning and coordination of efforts to address existing flooding problems along the Bay, coast, and creeks that are subject to tidal action. It may be cost-effective to integrate SLR protection with other levee-improvement programs.
The County and cities may also consider expanding the role of the new organization to include potentially compatible functions such as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), currently managed by C/CAG, and the new (2014) State requirements for local sustainable groundwater planning.
- R5. The organization—its administration, staffing, and program expenses—should be funded on a sustainable basis by:
- Member contributions
 - Contributions solicited from parties threatened by SLR, including corporations and agencies that operate public facilities such as wastewater treatment plants
 - Grants solicited from available potential sources such as the California Climate Resilience Account
 - Reducing administrative costs by contracting for services with the County or another agency

The Grand Jury recommends that SLR be addressed in local land use planning:

- R6. The County and each city should amend its General Plan, as needed, to address the risk for SLR. The Safety Element should include a map of any areas vulnerable to SLR, as determined by measurements in the countywide Vulnerability Assessment [R3]. Further, it should identify policies that apply to areas threatened by SLR.

The Grand Jury recommends that local governments champion SLR issues before regional, State, and federal governments and agencies:

- R7. The County, cities, and relevant local special agencies, through their representatives on regional agencies, membership in state associations, lobbyists, and elected State and federal legislators, should pursue SLR-related issues with government bodies outside SMC.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
Board of Supervisors	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R3	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R4	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R5	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
	R7	Implemented	Y	Y
C/CAG	R4	Requires Further Analysis	Y	N
San Francisquito Creek JPA	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Not Reasonable	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Not Reasonable	Y	Y
	R4	Will Not Implement/Not Reasonable	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement/Not Reasonable	Y	Y
	R7	Implemented	Y	Y
Atherton	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Further Analysis	Y	N
	R4	Will Not Implement/Further Analysis	Y	N
	R5	Will Not Implement/Further Analysis	Y	N
	R6	Will Implement by end of FY 15-16	Y	Y
	R7	Requires Further Study	Y	N
Belmont	R1	Will Implement/Currently Studying	Y	Y
	R2	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R4	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement/Requires Sustainable Revenues	Y	Y
	R6	Will Implement Early 2016	Y	Y
	R7	Will Implement/ Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
Brisbane	R1	Agrees/Non-Responsive	Y	N
	R2	Agrees/Non-Responsive	Y	Y
	R3	Disagrees/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R4	Strongly Disagrees/Non-Responsive	Y	Y
	R5	Agrees/Needs Funding Strategy	Y	N
	R6	Agrees/Non-Responsive	Y	N
	R7	Agrees	Y	N
Burlingame	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R4	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R6	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R7	Implemented	Y	Y

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
Colma	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R3	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R4	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R5	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R6	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R7	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
Daly City	R1	Agrees with Recommendation	Y	N
	R2	Agrees/Needs Sustainable Funding	Y	N
	R3	Agrees	Y	N
	R4	Agrees/Funding Issues	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement	Y	Y
	R6	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R7	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
East Palo Alto	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R3	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R4	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R5	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R6	Will Implement by FY 15-16	Y	Y
	R7	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
Foster City	R1	Will Implement/Current Study	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement/Current Study	Y	Y
	R3	Will Implement/Current Study	Y	Y
	R4	Will Implement/Current Study	Y	Y
	R5	Will Implement/Current Study	Y	Y
	R6	Will Implement/Current Study	Y	Y
	R7	Will Implement/Current Study	Y	Y
Half Moon Bay	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Requires Further Analysis/Funding Issues	Y	Y
	R3	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R4	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R5	Requires Further Analysis/Funding Concerns	Y	Y
	R6	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R7	Agrees/Not Feasible	Y	Y
Hillsborough	R1	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Not Warranted	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Not Warranted	Y	Y
	R4	Will Not Implement/Not Warranted	Y	Y

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
	R5	Will Not Implement/Not Warranted	Y	Y
	R6	Will Not Implement/Not Reasonable	Y	Y
	R7	Will Implement	Y	Y
Menlo Park	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Requires Other Measures	Y	Y
	R4	Will Not Implement/Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement/Requires Sustainable Funding	Y	Y
	R6	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R7	Will Implement	Y	Y
Millbrae	R1	Agrees with Recommendation	Y	N
	R2	Non-Responsive	Y	N
	R3	Non-Responsive	Y	N
	R4	Non-Responsive	Y	N
	R5	Non-Responsive	Y	N
	R6	Agrees with Recommendation	Y	N
	R7	Agrees with Recommendation	Y	N
Pacifica	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R3	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R4	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R5	Will Implement/Requires Funding	Y	Y
	R6	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R7	Will Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
Portola Valley	R1	Will Implement/Budget Cycle 2016-2017	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R4	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R6	Will Not Implement/Not Reasonable	Y	Y
	R7	Will Implement	Y	N
Redwood City	R1	Will Implement/Requires Regional Effort	Y	Y
	R2	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R3	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R4	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R5	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R6	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
	R7	Will Implement/Requires Regional Effort	Y	Y
San Bruno	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R4	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R6	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R7	Will Implement	Y	Y
San Carlos	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Wants to Control Its Costs	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R4	Wants to Control Its Costs	Y	Y
	R5	Alternative Revenue Sources	Y	Y
	R6	Will Work with Other Agencies	Y	Y
	R7	Will Work with Other Agencies	Y	Y
San Mateo	R1	Will Not Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R4	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R6	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R7	Implemented	Y	Y
South San Francisco	R1	Further Analysis Needed	Y	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R4	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement/Alternative Funding Sources	Y	Y
	R6	Will Not Implement/Requires Regional Cooperation	Y	Y
	R7	Implemented	Y	Y
Woodside	R1	Will Not Implement/Not Reasonable	Y	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Regional Issue	Y	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Regional Issue	Y	Y
	R4	Non-Responsive	Y	N
	R5	Funding Strategies	Y	Y
	R6	Will Not Implement	Y	Y
	R7	Non-Responsive	Y	Y

Review of the County of San Mateo's Procurement of Goods

- R1. The Procurement Division should develop a timeline for the implementation of recommendations from the 2003-2004 Grand Jury and the Controller's 2009 Operational Review, as well as any recommendations resulting from the Controller's Office's and PCC's current reviews. This timeline should include regular updates from the Procurement Division directly to the County Manager.
- R2. The County Manager's Office should strengthen the Procurement Division with full-time procurement-experienced leadership.
- R3. The Procurement Division should provide training and involve procurement staff (both in the Procurement Division and in County departments) in developing, understanding, and implementing professional performance standards.
- R4. The Procurement Division should develop best-practice procedures for purchasing that all County departments must follow.
- R5. The Procurement Division should work closely with the Controller's Office to develop reports necessary to manage and monitor procurement.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
Board of Supervisors	R1	In Process	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R3	Partially Implemented	Y	Y
	R4	In Process	Y	Y
	R5	Partially Implemented	Y	Y

San Mateo County Private Defender Program

The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct the County Manager's Office to:

- R1. Conduct formal evaluations of the indigent defense system at least every five years.
- R2. Include, as a component of such formal evaluations, a determination of whether the County's approach to indigent defense is consistent with state and national guidelines.
- R3. Include, as a component of such formal evaluations, input from community members and organizations. The process of receiving community input should be open to the public and not by invitation only.
- R4. Include, as a component of such formal evaluations, whether the current system continues to be the best model for the County for providing indigent legal defense.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
Board of Supervisors	R1	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R3	Will Implement	Y	Y
	R4	Will Implement	Y	Y

Student Mental Health: Are Schools Doing Enough?

The San Mateo County Grand Jury recommends that all school districts:

- R1. Provide a broad spectrum of mental health services and support—ranging from mental health education to one-on-one counseling—to all students on campus during the school day.
- R2. Provide BHRS full access to campuses to treat publicly insured general education students if the students and their parents so desire.

The San Mateo County Grand Jury recommends that the County Office of Education:

- R3. Work closely with school districts to develop mental health programs and allow for access by BHRS to treat its eligible students. The COE should assist schools in investigating all sources of funds, including Measure A.
- R4. Maintain and prioritize the position of Director of Safe and Supportive Schools. The COE should solidify its independent role as an in-school mental health service facilitator and advocate for increased funding for all students.
- R5. Work with all school districts to set up accurate record-keeping systems of all student mental health issues that surface on campus and CBOs providing services to schools, while protecting student confidentiality. These statistics will provide data to measure the effectiveness of mental health services.

The San Mateo County Grand Jury recommends that the County’s elementary and unified school districts:

- R6. Focus on providing mental health programs and services at the K-8 level. Such early mental health education would have the added benefit of reducing stigma before it develops further.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
Office of Education	R3	Implemented	Y	Y
	R4	Partially Implemented Not Within Scope of Authority	Y	Y
	R5	Will Not Implement Confidentiality of Records	Y	Y
Bayshore Elementary School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Belmont-Redwood Shores School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Brisbane School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Burlingame School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Cabrillo Unified School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Hillsborough City School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
Jefferson Elementary School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Jefferson Union High School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Did Not Address	Y	N
La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Las Lomitas Elementary School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Explore If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Menlo Park City School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Millbrae School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Explore and Implement As Needed	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Pacifica School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Portola Valley School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Ravenswood City School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Redwood City School District	R1	Implemented	N	Y
	R2	Implemented	N	Y
	R6	Implemented	N	Y
San Bruno Park School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
San Carlos School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
San Mateo-Foster City School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
San Mateo Union High School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Not Within Scope of Authority	Y	Y
Sequoia Union High School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Explore If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Not Within Scope of Authority	Y	Y
South San Francisco Unified School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Implement If Requested	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y
Woodside Elementary School District	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Implemented	Y	Y
	R6	Implemented	Y	Y

*Treatment for Adult Mental Illness in San Mateo County
What Exists? What Should Exist?*

The San Mateo County Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors:

R1. Implement AOT, known as Laura’s Law in California.

The San Mateo County Grand Jury further recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct the County’s Health System to:

R2. Implement coordinated and computerized medical records systems across its divisions (including but not limited to the San Mateo Medical Center, BHRS, and the Correction Health Services division) to the extent consistent with existing law.

R3. Design County Health System division websites to be more useful for individuals who need immediate help with behavioral issues and emergencies. Links to all providers should be well-placed and easy to access.

R4. Develop a public awareness campaign regarding mental health services including which services are available to individuals with private insurance. The public should be aware of existing programs such as FAST and SMART as well as other programs under development.

The San Mateo County Grand Jury further recommends that the District Attorney’s Office and the Health System coordinate their efforts to:

R5. Develop a mental health pre-plea jail diversion program. To the extent that such a pre-plea program requires the cooperation of the Superior Court, the Grand Jury recommends that the District Attorney’s Office and the Health System coordinate their efforts to obtain such cooperation.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
Board of Supervisors	R1	Implemented	Y	Y
	R2	Will Be Implemented	Y	Y
	R3	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
	R4	Requires Further Analysis	Y	Y
District Attorney	R5	Will Not Implement Not Warranted or Reasonable	Y	Y

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE 2013-2014 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORTS

<i>Educational Frenemies: Can Charter Schools Inspire Better Student Outcomes in Public Schools in San Mateo County?</i>				
<p>R8. By December 31, 2014, utilize the monthly superintendents' meetings with the County Office of Education to develop and implement a written protocol to create more robust communication among the leaders of charter and traditional public schools, including but not limited to determining a method for including charter school leaders in relevant meetings of leaders of non-charter schools and districts.</p> <p>R9. By December 31, 2014, develop in each County school district a plan to determine the viability of extending the school day.</p> <p>R10. By December 31, 2014, develop in each County school district a plan to determine the viability of extending the school year.</p> <p>R11. By December 31, 2014, develop at a district level detailed mission statements that include quantifiable goals designed to produce better student outcomes. Mission statements will be posted on a publicly accessible website.</p>				
RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
San Mateo Union High School District	R1	Beyond Scope of Authority	N	Y
	R2	Will Not Implement/Not Reasonable	N	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Not Reasonable	N	Y
	R4	In Process	N	Y

<i>Inmate Welfare Trust Fund</i>				
<p>R1. For FY 2013-14 and all future fiscal years, the medical, dental, and prescription fees deducted from inmates' personal accounts should be transferred to the County's general fund, as prescribed by California Penal Code §4011.2.</p> <p>R2. Beginning with the FY 2014-15 contract for the inmate services currently provided by the Service League, the County should more clearly delineate the source of funds for services to released inmates either through more specific contract provisions or by providing for such services in a separate contract altogether.</p> <p>R3. By December 31, 2014, develop a proposal for inclusion as one of the counties in the State's pilot program allowing the County's IWTF to be utilized as a source of funds for services to released inmates.</p>				
RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
San Mateo County Sheriff	R1	Requires Further Analysis	N	Y
	R2	Will Implement	N	Y
	R3	Will Not Implement/Not Warranted	N	Y

Partly Cloudy with a Chance of Information: Investigating the Transparency of Independent Special Districts' Websites

- R1. Each independent special district's website will conform to the accepted criteria listed in the SDLF's transparency checklist on or before May 15, 2015.
- R4. Districts will complete the District of Distinction program offered by SDLF by June 30, 2015.
- R5. Districts will seek to attain the SDLF Transparency Certificate of Excellence by June 30, 2015.
- R6. Districts currently lacking staff or board members who have achieved the SDLF's Recognition in Special District Governance will seek the training available under this program by June 30, 2015.
- R7. District administrators will seek the SDLF Special District Administrator Certification.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
San Mateo County Harbor District	R1	Will Implement	N	Y
	R4	Will Implement	N	Y
	R5	In Process	N	Y
	R6	In Process	N	Y
	R7	Will Implement	N	Y
San Mateo County Mosquito and Vector Control District		Current Status —CSDA Certificates	Y	Y

San Mateo County Detention Facilities: An Overview

The Grand Jury recommends that the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office do the following:

- R1. Document performance results reflecting the effectiveness of the adult programs and services as outlined in the Jail-Based Services and Reentry Programming Strategic Implementation Plan.
- R2. Annually submit a report to the Board of Supervisors for public discussion concerning performance measures for the above-referenced adult services and programs.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
San Mateo County Sheriff	R1	Will Not Implement	N	Y
	R2	In Process	N	Y

*What Is the Price of Dysfunction?
The San Mateo County Harbor District*

- R5. The Harbor District will standardize detailed quarterly financial reporting at commission meetings by March 30, 2015.
- R6. The Harbor District will identify a successor agency to assume control of the West Trail by December 31, 2014.
- R7. The Harbor District will explore transferring or cost-sharing with the City of Half Moon Bay, the co-sponsorship with the Army Corps of Engineers of the Surfer's Beach dredging operation by December 31, 2014.
- R8. The Harbor District will continue to seek interested parties to acquire non-revenue producing surplus properties.
- R9. The Harbor District will explore the outsourcing of management of all commercial real properties to a real estate management firm by December 31, 2014.
- R10. As soon as possible after the November 2014 Harbor Commissioner elections, the Harbor District will form standing and appropriate ad hoc committees, which meet regularly.
- R11. Harbor District commissioners and general manager will earn Special District Leadership Foundation certifications by July 1, 2015.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOM-MENDATION	RESPONSE	PENAL CODE COMPLIANCE	
			TIMELY	CONTENT
San Mateo County Harbor District	R5	Will Implement	N	Y
	R6	Requires Further Analysis	N	Y
	R7	Will Implement	N	Y
	R8	Will Explore	N	Y
	R9	Will Implement	N	Y

Issued: December 21, 2015