

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE 2018-2019 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORTS AND SUMMARY OF FOLLOW-UP AS TO REMAINING UNRESOLVED REPSONSES TO THE 2017-2018 GRAND JURY REPORTS

[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.

The Grand Jury’s practice is that each year, the responses and comments submitted in response to reports issued by the prior year’s Grand Jury are reviewed 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

2018-2019 Responses

The 2018-2019 Grand Jury issued eleven Final Reports directed to a total of 77 responding agencies. There were 54 recommendations, and a total of 242 responses required. The 2020-2021 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury reviewed final reports and the formal responses filed by the affected agencies. The majority of responses stated that the Grand Jury’s recommendation had been implemented, will be implemented, or requires further study.

[Appendix A](#) contains more detail regarding these responses. The Appendix lists the final report title, followed by the recommendations. Responses are organized by responding agencies, applicable recommendations, and responses. The last column of the Summary Report indicates whether future follow-up is indicated by the 2020-2021 Grand Jury. Information gathered in [Appendix A](#) provides the public a method by which to evaluate whether and to what extent affected agencies have responded to recommendations of the Grand Jury.

The table below indicates the overall responses:

<i>2018-2019 Responses</i>		
Response	Recommendations	% of Total
Implemented	43	17.80%
Will Implement	131	54.10%
Requires Further Analysis	19	7.90%
Will Not Implement	39	16.10%
Follow Up Sent With No Response	10	4.10%
Totals	242	100%

Follow-up on Remaining Unresolved 2017-2018 Report Responses:

There were 40 recommendations in the 2017-2018 Final Reports whose responses to the reports and to the follow-up inquiries by the 2020-2021 Grand Jury indicated either that they would be implemented but had not yet been, or that further analysis was required but the study had not yet been completed.

Appendix B contains more specific content from these responses. The Appendix lists the final report title, followed by the recommendations. Responses are organized by responding agencies, applicable recommendations, and responses. The last column of the Appendix indicates whether further follow-up is indicated by the 2020-2021 Grand Jury. Information gathered in Appendix B provides the public a method by which to determine whether or not the affected agencies are responsive to the recommendations of the Grand Jury.

The table below indicates the updated status:

<i>2017-2018 Responses</i>		
Response	Recommendations	% of Total
Implemented	10	25%
Will Implement	13	33%
Will Not Implement	14	35%
Follow-Up in 2021-2022	1	2%
No Response to Follow-Up	2	5%
Totals	40	100%

The 2020-2021 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.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE 2018-2019 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORTS

***Concussions and San Mateo County High School Sports:
More To Learn, More To Do***

- R1. By September 2020, the San Mateo County Office of Education (SMCOE), with input from each high school district and unified school district, should establish a common “San Mateo County Concussion Protocol” that will:
- Identify the specific responsibilities of those involved who carry out the steps of the concussion protocol as well as the timing of those actions.
 - Establish a county-wide database of concussions by sport - to include number of students by gender participating in each sport, frequency of head injuries, circumstances of head injuries (e.g., whether incurred at a formal game or at practice), timing, and completion of RTL/RTP steps.
 - Make neurocognitive testing (NCT) an option, not a requirement. If a school or district does use NCT at baseline or after injury, it should be made clear which test is used, who administers the test, how the results are reported, and who interprets the results.
 - Specify that at a minimum, football games and full-contact practices should be attended by certified athletic trainers (CATs).
 - Establish a process for tracking compliance with the San Mateo County Concussion Protocol.
- R2. Beginning with the 2020-2021 school year, each high school district and unified school district should supply its statistics for the database to the SMCOE annually.
- R3. By September 2021, the SMCOE should publish an annual summary of the database on its website (excluding personally identifiable information), so that parents, students, and educators can be better informed on concussion risks for high school students’ sports of choice.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
San Mateo County Office of Education	R1	Supports recommendation, but it requires further analysis and possible additional funding to support this work. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	Will implement; no date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R3	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
Cabrillo Unified School District	R1	Supports recommendation. Requires further analysis. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	Will implement; no date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R3	N/A	
Jefferson Union High School District	R1	Supports recommendation. Requires further analysis. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	Will implement. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R3	N/A	
La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District	R1	Supports recommendation. Requires further analysis. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	Will implement. No date provided.	
	R3	N/A	
San Mateo Union High School District	R1	Will implement by September, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement beginning with 2020-21 school year. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R3	N/A	
Sequoia Union High School District	R1	Supports recommendation. Requires further analysis. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	Will implement. No date provided.	
	R3	N/A	

**Concussions and San Mateo County High School Sports:
More To Learn, More To Do**

South San Francisco Unified School District	R1	Supports recommendation; requires further analysis will bring stakeholders to review the recommendation. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	Will implement.	
	R3	N/A	

Crystal Springs Regional Trail – Where Do We Go From Here?

- R1. By March 31, 2020, the Parks Department should present a report to the County Board of Supervisors at a public hearing assessing the options for completing the gap between the Sawyer Camp and Crystal Springs segments of the CSRT.
- R2. By March 31, 2020, the Parks Department should present a report to the County Board of Supervisors at a public hearing assessing the options for providing additional access points along the CSRT north of the Crystal Springs Road entrance to the Sawyer Camp segment.
- R3. By March 31, 2020, the Parks Department should present a report to the County Board of Supervisors at a public hearing assessing the options for providing additional off-street parking at all intersections as well as at existing and any proposed new entrances along the CSRT north of Highway 92.
- R4. By September 30, 2019, the County Planning Department, the County Parks Department, the County Office of Sustainability and C/CAG should establish a means of coordinating their planning efforts related to the CSRT, including planning related to the intersection of Highways 92 and 35, just east of the reservoirs, as well as closing the CSRT gap and providing additional access and parking along the Trail.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors	R1	Will not implement this recommendation within the current two-year budget period. The Parks Department will consider this issue in the FY 2021-23 budget priority setting discussions.	2021-22
	R2	Will not implement this recommendation within the current two-year budget period. The Parks Department will consider this issue in the FY 2021-23 budget priority setting discussions.	2021-22
	R3	Will not implement this recommendation within the current two-year budget period. The Parks Department will consider this issue in the FY 2021-23 budget priority setting discussions.	2021-22
	R4	Will be implemented by March, 2020.	2020-21
City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)	R1	N/A	
	R2	N/A	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	Implemented.	

Demystifying The Plea Bargaining Process

- R1. The San Mateo County District Attorney’s Victim Services Division should revise the form letter it initially sends to victims to include:
- a. A basic summary of victims’ rights, including the right to deliver a statement.
 - b. A basic description and timeline of early hearings in criminal cases in a manner sufficient to communicate to victims that important rights may be lost if they do not act, including to deliver written impact statements, early enough in the process. (Appendices A and B are not intended for this purpose.)
 - c. A link to the Victim Services website.

This information should be written in a manner that the general public can easily understand. This recommendation should be implemented by December 31, 2019.

- R2. The County District Attorney’s office should develop its own explanation of the County’s plea-bargaining process in a manner that the general public can easily understand (Appendices A and B are not intended for this purpose), and make it available to the public in brochure form and on its website. This explanation should include at least the following: a description of routine court hearings in criminal cases relevant to the plea-bargaining process, a timeline of these hearings, a description of the roles and responsibilities of participants at each of these hearings, and a description of the critical stages where participants, including victims, have a role to play that could influence a case’s outcome. A link to this website should be included in the initial form letter that Victim Services sends to victims. This recommendation should be implemented by March 31, 2020.

- R3. The San Mateo County District Attorney, using input from Victim Services, should develop and place on the District Attorney’s Office’s website a video showing a simulation of the portion of the plea-bargaining process that takes place in the judge’s chambers. As an alternative, the District Attorney’s Office could consider using a video such as “Victims of Violence: A Guide to Help Bring Justice” produced by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), or some similar video, as a resource to share with victims. This recommendation should be implemented by June 30, 2020.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
San Mateo County District Attorney	R1	Will implement by December 31, 2019.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Will implement by June 30, 2020.	

Electric Vehicle Adoption in the Cities and County of San Mateo

- R1. By March 31, 2020, the County of San Mateo and each city within the county should conduct a review of its government fleet procurement policy relating to electric vehicles and present a report at a public meeting. At a minimum, the review should be based on an analysis that includes up-to-date life-cycle costs of commercially available electric vehicles and an up-to-date assessment of whether electric vehicles can meet the performance needs of local jurisdictions for power, range, battery life, and other relevant factors. If an agency has completed such a review within the last three years, then such review should be presented to its governing body at a public meeting on or before December 31, 2019.
- R2. By March 31, 2020, the County of San Mateo and each city within the county should conduct an analysis of the obstacles, if any, to the implementation of an EV government fleet procurement policy and present a report at a public meeting. This could include, for example, the availability of electric vehicle charging stations to serve the vehicle fleet and training of vehicle maintenance staff. If an agency has completed such an analysis within the last three years, then such analysis should be presented to its governing body at a public meeting on or before December 31, 2019.
- R3. By September 30, 2019, the County of San Mateo Department of Public Works and each city within the county should review the “Roadmap for Municipal Green Fleets” toolkit from the San Mateo County Office of Sustainability, including the information on the possibility of adopting an EV First Policy.
- R4. By September 30, 2019, the County of San Mateo and each city within the county, if they have not already initiated such a process, should investigate joining the Climate Mayors EV Purchasing Collaborative to take advantage of aggregate purchasing

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented	
	R4	Will implement by September 30, 2019.	
Town of Atherton	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Has investigated but has not participated.	
City of Belmont	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will implement by December 31, 2019.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
City of Brisbane	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by December 31, 2020.	2020-21
	R3	Implemented	
	R4	Will implement as deemed warranted.	
City of Burlingame	R1	Will implement by March 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
Town of Colma	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2010.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	

Electric Vehicle Adoption in the Cities and County of San Mateo, continued

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
City of Daly City	R1	Will implement, after March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement, after March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
City of East Palo Alto	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Will implement by November 1, 2019.	
	R4	Will be implemented by March 31, 2020.	
City of Foster City	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
City of Half Moon Bay	R1	Will implement.	
	R2	Implemented.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
Town of Hillsborough	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
City of Menlo Park	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
City of Millbrae	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will not implement; funding not currently available due to COVID-19.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented October 2019.	
City of Pacifica	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
Town of Portola Valley	R1	Will implement by June 2020. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	Implemented.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Needs further analysis/investigation; no date provided.	

Electric Vehicle Adoption in the Cities and County of San Mateo, continued

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
City of Redwood City	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
City of San Bruno	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Will implement by September 30, 2019.	
	R4	Will implement by September 30, 2019.	
City of San Carlos	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Will implement by September 30, 2019.	
	R4	Will implement by September 30, 2019.	
City of San Mateo	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
City of South San Francisco	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Implemented.	
	R4	Implemented.	
Town of Woodside	R1	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R4	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	

Fire Safety Inspection Programs on the Road to Recovery

- R1. By no later than January 31, 2020, each fire department within the county should put in place a written policy that sets forth the process for (1) maintaining a comprehensive list of all buildings within its jurisdiction for which annual inspections required under Sections 13146.2 and 13146.3 of the California Health & Safety Code are to be performed, (2) keeping such a list updated on an annual basis, and (3) completing and reporting on all mandated annual inspections.
- R2. By no later than November 30, 2019, each fire department should submit a proposal to its administering authority setting forth the content of the annual report as required under Section 13146.4 of the California Health & Safety Code (former SB 1205) (the “Annual Report”), which at a minimum should propose the inclusion of the following information in the Annual Report:
- The total number of buildings within the fire department’s jurisdiction in each category of building (referred to as a “occupancy type”) subject to mandated annual inspections that year.
 - The number of each occupancy type inspected during the year;
 - The number of each occupancy type, if any, not inspected that year and the reason such inspection did not take place, and
 - The number of each occupancy type, if any, not inspected for two or more consecutive years.
- R3. By no later than January 31, 2020, the administering authority for each fire department should review the proposal for the content of the Annual Report submitted by its fire chief and provide written instructions regarding the required content and due date for submission of the Annual Report.
- R4. By no later than February 28, 2020 (and annually thereafter), the administering authority for each fire department should instruct the fire chief to publish the fire department’s Annual Report on the fire department’s public website.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
Central County Fire Department	R1	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will be implemented. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R3	Will be implemented. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R4	Will be implemented. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
Coastside Fire Protection District	R1	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R3	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R4	Will be implemented by February 28, 2020.	
Colma Fire District	R1	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will be implemented by November 30, 2019.	
	R3	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R4	Will be implemented by February 28, 2020.	
Menlo Park Fire Protection District	R1	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R2	Implemented.	
	R3	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R4	Will be implemented by February 28, 2020.	
North County Fire Authority	R1	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will be implemented by November 30, 2019.	
	R3	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R4	Will be implemented by February 28, 2020.	
City of Redwood City	R1	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will be implemented by November 30, 2019.	
	R3	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R4	Will be implemented by September 30, 2020 based on fiscal year calendar.	

Fire Safety Inspection Programs on the Road to Recovery, continued			
RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
City of San Bruno	R1	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will be implemented by November 30, 2019.	
	R3	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R4	Will be implemented by February 28, 2020.	
San Mateo Consolidated Fire Department	R1	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R2	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R3	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R4	Will be implemented by February 28, 2020.	
City of South San Francisco	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will be implemented by November 30, 2019.	
	R3	Will be implemented by January 31, 2020.	
	R4	Will be implemented by February 28, 2020.	
Woodside Fire Protection District	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will be implemented by November 25, 2019.	
	R3	Will be implemented.	
	R4	Will be implemented.	

Grade Separations – Bypasses to Greater Safety			
<p>R1. By March 31, 2020, the PCJPB should create a Caltrain Peninsula train corridor Grade Separation Master Plan, including all at-grade crossings in the corridor, based on a prioritization that takes into account the needs and special circumstances of the cities and counties through which the corridor passes, with special attention to adjacent at-grade crossings so as not to limit future design alternatives.</p> <p>R2. By September 30, 2019, in support of developing the Grade Separation Master Plan, the PCJPB should study other train corridors worldwide to learn how they implemented similar master plans, including methods developed for securing funding.</p> <p>R3. By September 30, 2019, the PCJPB should engage with all cities on the Caltrain Peninsula train corridor to gain support for the Grade Separation Master Plan.</p> <p>R4. By May 31, 2020, shortly after completing the Grade Separation Master Plan, the PCJPB should offer to support funding and design efforts to the cities in the order determined by the prioritization in the master plan. If a city rejects such support for an at-grade crossing, the PCJPB should then proceed to support the at-grade crossing with the next highest priority in the plan.</p>			
RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	R1	Generally agrees with recommendation but disagrees with the timeframe.	
	R2	Generally agrees with recommendation but disagrees with the timeframe.	
	R3	Generally agrees with recommendation but disagrees with the timeframe.	
	R4	Will not implement – disagrees with conclusion.	

Is San Mateo County at Risk of a Large Measles Outbreak?

- R1. School districts that enrolled students who did not meet state vaccination requirements for the 2018/2019 school year should report to their Governing Board whether overdue vaccinations have been completed by October 1, 2019, and the Governing Boards of these districts should publish updated vaccination data for its schools on the school district's website by November 1, 2019.
- R2. Beginning with the 2019/2020 school year, school districts that enroll students who do not meet vaccination requirements in subsequent school years should report to their Governing Board whether overdue vaccinations have been completed by March 31 of each year, and the Governing Board should publish updated vaccination data for its schools on the school district's website.
- R3. The San Mateo County Health Communicable Disease Control Program should study the feasibility of testing people visiting San Mateo County clinics for their level of measles immunity. The results of the study should be reported to the San Mateo County Health Department Board by January 1, 2020.
- R4. Within three months of this report, the San Mateo County Health Communicable Disease Control Program should request funding for upgrading the resources needed to address outbreaks of measles and other communicable diseases from the Chief of the San Mateo County Health Department. San Mateo County Health should respond within three months of receiving those requests.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors	R1	N/A	
	R2	NA	
	R3	Will not implement as not warranted.	
	R4	Implemented.	
Bayshore School District	R1	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R2	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Belmont-Redwood Shores School District	R1	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R2	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Brisbane School District	R1	Will implement by November 1, 2019.	
	R2	Will implement by March 31, 2020.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Burlingame School District	R1	Will not implement; district reports to State.	
	R2	Will not implement.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Cabrillo Unified School District	R1	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	

Is San Mateo County at Risk of a Large Measles Outbreak?, continued

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
Hillsborough City School District	R1	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R2	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Jefferson Elementary School District	R1	Will not implement but will consider adding link to this data on CDPH website.	
	R2	Will not implement but will consider adding link to this data on CDPH website.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Jefferson Union High School District	R1	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District	R1	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R2	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Las Lomitas Elementary School District	R1	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R2	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Menlo Park City School District	R1	Will implement by December 1, 2019.	
	R2	Will not implement as current reporting practices are legally compliant.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Millbrae School District	R1	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R2	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Pacifica School District	R1	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R2	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	

Is San Mateo County at Risk of a Large Measles Outbreak?, continued

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	FOLLOW UP YEAR
Portola Valley School District	R1	Will not be implemented as it is not warranted.	
	R2	Will not be implemented as it is not warranted.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Ravenswood City School District	R1	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Redwood City School District	R1	Will implement by November 1, 2019.	
	R2	Will be implemented by March 30, 2020.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
San Bruno Park School District	R1	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R2	Will not implement but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
San Carlos School District	R1	Will not implement as not warranted.	
	R2	Will not implement as not warranted.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
San Mateo-Foster City School District	R1	Will not implement but will publish data on district website.	
	R2	Will not implement but will publish data on district website.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
San Mateo Union High School District	R1	Will not implement as not warranted; district does comply with state immunization requirements	
	R2	Will not implement as not warranted; district does comply with state immunization requirements	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	

<i>Is San Mateo County at Risk of a Large Measles Outbreak?, continued</i>			
RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	FOLLOW UP YEAR
Sequoia Union High School District	R1	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
South San Francisco Unified School District	R1	Will not implement as it is not warranted but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R2	Will not implement as it is not warranted but district does comply with state immunization requirements.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
Woodside Elementary School District	R1	Needs further analysis as district believes its current reporting practices are legally compliant.	
	R2	Needs further analysis as district believes its current reporting practices are legally compliant.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	

Just Missed It! Fixing Samtrans's "Caltrain Connection"

- R1. SamTrans should study the feasibility of coordinating "Caltrain Connection" bus schedules with existing Caltrain train schedules to facilitate bus/train transfers and minimize wait times. The SamTrans Board of Directors should consider the results of that study at a public hearing by June 30, 2020.
- R2. SamTrans should perform marketing research on existing and potential riders of "Caltrain Connection" buses, including those who use Caltrain, to determine their interest in coordinating "Caltrain Connection" bus schedules with existing Caltrain schedules. The SamTrans Board of Directors should consider the results of that survey at a public hearing by June 30, 2020.
- R3. Caltrain should survey existing riders of Caltrain trains in San Mateo County, including those who use SamTrans, to determine their interest in coordinating "Caltrain Connection" bus schedule arrival times at Caltrain stations with existing Caltrain schedules. The Caltrain Board of Directors should consider the results of that study at a public hearing by June 30, 2020.
- R4. The Boards of Directors of SamTrans and Caltrain should discuss together the value and feasibility of using "Caltrain Connection" buses as a feeder system to Caltrain to reduce traffic congestion. This should be undertaken by December 31, 2019.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)	R1	N/A	
	R2	N/A	
	R3	Will conduct customer surveys by fall 2019; unclear from response if Caltrain connection schedules will be included and also not clear if public hearings will be held.	2020-21
	R4	Caltrain and SamTrans will exchange information but no joint meetings will be scheduled.	
San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	R1	Will conduct outreach with results by summer 2021, with recommendations to their board by 2022.	2022-23
	R2	Will conduct outreach with results by summer 2021, with recommendations to their board by 2022.	2022-23
	R3	N/A	
	R4	Will conduct outreach with results by summer 2021, with recommendations to their board by 2022. Does not anticipate a joint board meeting with Caltrain.	2022-23

Planning for the County's Waste Management Challenges

- R1. The Grand Jury recommends that the San Mateo County Office of Sustainability replace the existing 1999 Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), including the Summary Plan, the landfill Siting Element, and the Non-Disposal Facilities Element (as amended in 2010) with a revised plan by January 1, 2021. At a minimum, the revised plan should address:
- Updated descriptions of solid waste management facilities and programs implemented by the County, local jurisdictions, and their private franchise holders.
 - Goals, objectives, policies and implementation measures that reflect the overall 75 percent waste diversion target contained in AB 341 (2011), the 75 percent organics waste diversion target contained in SB 1383 (2016), the 20 percent edible food diversion target contained in SB 1383 (2016), and consider the more aggressive waste diversion targets contained in the CAPs adopted by several San Mateo County jurisdictions, including the goal of “zero-waste.”
 - Possible policies related to the impact of waste management practices in San Mateo County on the global environment, including emissions of methane from landfills, and the environmental and social impacts that may occur when the county’s recyclables are exported to other nations with the less stringent environmental and worker protection practices than in the United States.
 - Environmental justice concerns as they relate to solid waste management decision-making by local jurisdictions in this county.
 - A strategy and schedule for providing additional landfill capacity after year 2034, when the county’s Ox Mountain landfill is projected to reach its current permitted capacity.
 - A County ordinance banning the disposal of green waste and possibly other organics at the Ox Mountain landfill, in order to support organic waste diversion programs and conserve landfill capacity.
 - Whether the Office of Sustainability should implement additional countywide programs including public education and technical assistance related to waste diversion. The CIWMP should also consider whether the Office of Sustainability should coordinate the rescue of edible food waste at the countywide level.
- R2. The Grand Jury recommends that the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG), in its role as the Local Task Force (LTF), participate with the County Office of Sustainability in revising the CIWMP.
- R3. The Grand Jury recommends that the San Mateo County Office of Sustainability make the existing 1999 CIWMP and all Five Year Reviews available to the public on its website by September 30, 2019 and place the revised CIWMP on its website after it is drafted and adopted by the County Board of Supervisors.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors	R1	The recommendation requires further analysis. The five-year review process is currently underway, with the final review report expected to be sent to the Board of Supervisors for approval in November 2019, which could result in a recommendation to revise the CIWMP.	2020-21
	R2	N/A	
	R3	Implemented.	
City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)	R1	N/A	
	R2	Implemented.	
	R3	N/A	

Security of Election Announcements

Protect the Public Trust in Election Communication

- R1. **Incorporate Communications into Election Security Definition:** ACRE should adopt a policy that defines election security to include the security of the ACRE website, ACRE staff email accounts, social media accounts used for ACRE announcements, and other platforms ACRE uses for publishing election announcements. ACRE should implement this recommendation by December 31, 2019.
- R2. **Publish Updated Security Policy:** ACRE should update the ACRE website's written descriptions of the election security to incorporate the policy resulting from R1 on the security of election communications in addition to the current focus on security of (a) registration, (b) vote casting, and (c) results tabulation. ACRE should implement this recommendation by June 30, 2020.

Protect the County's Email

- R3. **Prevent Spoofing with DMARC:** ISD, CMO, and ACRE should improve email security for employees involved in election announcements by configuring and enabling DMARC for at least the smcacre.org and smcgov.org domains. ISD, CMO, and ACRE should implement this recommendation by June 30, 2020.
- R4. **Combat ACRE Email Account Phishing with FIDO Keys:** ACRE should provide FIDO physical security keys to each of its permanent elections employees and require the use of those FIDO keys as part of their multi-factor authentication for accessing their County email accounts. ACRE should implement this recommendation by December 31, 2019.
- R5. **Combat Other Email Account Phishing with FIDO Keys:** ACRE should identify County employees outside of ACRE that have a role in election announcements (e.g., Chief Communications Officer, senior ISD employees, etc.) and ask that the departments of the identified employees provide FIDO physical security keys to each of the identified employees and require the use of those FIDO keys as part of their multi-factor authentication for accessing their County email accounts. ACRE should complete this recommendation by December 31, 2019.

Protect ACRE's Website

- R6. **Combat Website Account Phishing with FIDO Keys:** ACRE should require all County employees whose user accounts allow them to alter the ACRE website to use FIDO physical security keys as part of their multi-factor authentication. ACRE should implement this recommendation by December 31, 2019.
- R7. **Combat Island Hopping with FIDO Key Vendor Requirement:** ACRE and ISD should require employees and contractors of any vendor that hosts the ACRE website to use FIDO physical security keys as part of their multi-factor authentication. ACRE and ISD should implement this recommendation by December 31, 2019.

Protect the Social Media Accounts

- R8. **Stop Sharing Social Media Account Passwords:** ACRE and CMO should implement procedures whereby communications staff manage official County social media accounts with multi-user administration, and no employees share social media account passwords. ACRE and CMO should implement this recommendation by October 31, 2019.
- R9. **Request FIDO Key Feature If Not Available:** ACRE and CMO should jointly draft and send a FIDO-key feature request citing this report to the social media companies used by the County to broadcast election announcements, but that do not currently offer FIDO account security protections—especially Instagram and Nextdoor. ACRE and CMO should implement this recommendation by August 31, 2019.
- R10. **Combat ACRE Social Media Account Phishing with FIDO Keys:** ACRE should require any employee social media accounts capable of administering the official ACRE social media pages listed in Table 1 to use FIDO physical security keys as part of their multi-factor authentication. ACRE should implement this recommendation by December 31, 2019.
- R11. **Combat SMC Social Media Account Phishing with FIDO Keys:** CMO should require any employee social media accounts capable of administering the official San Mateo County social media pages listed in Table 1 to use FIDO physical security keys as part of their multi-factor authentication. CMO should implement this recommendation by December 31, 2019.

Improve Cyber Hygiene

- R12. **Coordinate Election Security with Interdepartmental Working Group:** ACRE and ISD should create an election security working group that meets periodically and is responsible for evaluating and improving the security of elections (a) registration, (b) vote casting, (c) results tabulation, and (d) communication within San Mateo County. ACRE and ISD should implement this recommendation by December 31, 2019.
- R13. **Evaluate Free DHS Elections Security Assistance Programs:** ACRE and ISD election-security working group should evaluate the benefits of having all members of the election-security working group participate in any of the free DHS elections security assistance programs listed in Table 2. ACRE and ISD should implement this recommendation by February 3, 2020.
- R14. **Offer Behavioral Cyber Hygiene Audits:** ISD and the County Controller's Office should develop a behavioral auditing program consisting of sampling the day-to-day routines and security practices of employees, contractors, and/or vendors and offer to audit each department within the County periodically to (1) evaluate compliance with existing cyber hygiene policies and (2) provide proactive advice on cyber hygiene improvements that could inform new policies. ISD and the Controller's Office should begin to implement this recommendation by offering to audit ACRE and ISD (itself) in time to finish by February 3, 2020.

Security of Election Announcements, continued

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors	R1	N/A	
	R2	N/A	
	R3	Will implement by June 30, 2020.	
	R4	Currently under analysis; recommendation by December 31, 2019, implementation (based on recommendation) to follow.	2020-21
	R5	Requires further analysis by ISD by December, 2019.	2020-21
	R6	Will implement by December 13, 2019.	
	R7	Will implement by December 13, 2019.	
	R8	Will implement by October 31, 2019.	
	R9	Implemented.	
	R10	Will be implemented by December 31, 2019.	
	R11	Will be implemented by December 31, 2019.	
	R12	Implemented.	
	R13	Will be completed by October 31, 2019.	
	R14	Will be implemented by December 31, 2019.	
San Mateo County Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder and Elections (ACRE)	R1	Will implement in coordination with SMC, ISD, and vendor.	
	R2	Will implement.	
	R3	Will implement in coordination with ISD, and County Manager's Office.	
	R4	Will coordinate with ISD implementation.	
	R5	Will implement based on analysis (December 31, 2019) and solution recommended by ISD.	2020-21
	R6	Will implement using a form of MFA.	
	R7	Will implement using a form of MFA.	
	R8	Will implement in coordination with the County Manager's Office.	
	R9	Will be implemented by September 27, 2019.	
	R10	Will be implemented after coordination with ISD by December 31, 2019.	
	R11	Will be implemented following guidance of the County Manager's Office by December 31, 2019.	
	R12	Implemented.	
	R13	Will be completed by October 31, 2019.	
	R14	Will implement by February 3, 2020.	
San Mateo County Controller	R1	N/A	
	R2	N/A	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
	R5	N/A	
	R6	N/A	

Security of Election Announcements, continued

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
	R7	N/A	
	R8	N/A	
	R9	N/A	
	R10	N/A	
	R11	N/A	
	R12	N/A	
	R13	N/A	
	R14	Will implement in cooperation with ISD.	

Wildfire Risk and Response in San Mateo County

- R1. In order to expand the number of county residents receiving emergency notifications, the San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services should use the contact information of utility companies within six months of receiving guidance on implementing SB 821 from the California Office of Emergency Services.
- R2. The San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services should use utility contact information to distribute information on emergency response plans in advance of an emergency to the extent permitted under SB 821.
- R3. The San Mateo County Fire Department, working with individual fire agencies, should develop fire preparedness brochures that include maps of *alternative* evacuation routes from their respective communities (similar to the example in Appendix B) by June 30, 2020.
- R4. The San Mateo County Fire Department should produce a website containing the brochures recommended in R3 by June 30, 2020.
- R5. Periodically, beginning July 2020, the San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services should distribute emergency plans including links to maps with alternative evacuation routes with property tax bills.
- R6. The County Tax Collector should include a one-page insert on emergency response to a wildfire with property tax bills periodically, beginning July 2020.
- R7. The San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services should explore the possibility of providing advance information on alternative evacuation routes in a visual online format, such as the “crisis maps” feature in Google by June 30, 2020.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors	R1	N/A	
	R2	N/A	
	R3	Will implement. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R4	Will implement. No date provided. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R5	N/A	
	R6	N/A	
	R7	N/A – refer to SMCSO response.	
San Mateo County Sheriff’s Office	R1	Will be implemented, but timeframe unclear.	2020-21
	R2	Will not implement per SB 821 restrictions.	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
	R5	Will not be implemented but the OES is working on a county-wide fire evacuation project.	
	R6	N/A	
	R7	Will not be implemented. OES continues to work with fire agencies throughout the County on a county-wide fire evacuation project.	
San Mateo County Tax Collector	R1	N/A	
	R2	N/A	
	R3	N/A	
	R4	N/A	
	R5	Agrees with the finding, can implement if OES provides the information.	2020-21
	R6	Agrees with the finding, can implement if OES provides the information.	2020-21
	R7	N/A	

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE 2017-2018 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

Soaring City Pension Costs – Follow-up on Grand Jury Report of 2017-2018			
R1. Each City include in its published annual or bi-annual budgets a general fund operating budget forecast for the next ten fiscal years.			
R2. Each City include a report in its published annual or bi-annual budgets specifically setting forth the dollar amounts of its annual pension costs paid to CalPERS. The report should include the following:			
a) The City’s total pension contribution costs under all plans, for each of the three preceding fiscal years as well as estimates for such costs in each of the following ten fiscal years (whether developed by City staff internally, or by outside consultants to the City), assuming CalPERS’ actuarial assumptions are met.			
b) The City’s total Unfunded Liabilities under all plans, for each of the three preceding fiscal years as well as estimates for such Unfunded Liabilities in each of the next ten fiscal years, (whether developed by City staff internally, or by outside consultants to the City), assuming CalPERS’ actuarial assumptions are met.			
c) The City’s Funded Percentage across all plans, for each of the three preceding fiscal years as well as estimates for such Funded Percentages in each of the next ten fiscal years, assuming CalPERS’ actuarial assumptions are met.			
d) The percentage of the City’s general fund expenditures, and the percentage of the City’s covered payroll, represented by the pension costs described in (a) above (using estimates of general fund expenditures in future fiscal years).			
RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
Town of Atherton	R1	Will not implement as using different method.	
	R2	Will not implement.	
City of Belmont	R1	Will not implement – not warranted or reasonable.	
	R2	Will not implement – cost burdensome.	
City of Brisbane	R1	Will consider implementation starting July 2020.	2020-21
	R2	Will implement.	
City of Burlingame	R1	Will not implement as using different method.	
	R2	Will not implement – disagrees with method.	
Town of Colma	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will implement in FY 2020-2021 budget.	2021-22
City of Daly City	R1	Will implement in FY 2021-2022 budget.	2021-22
	R2	Will implement in FY 2021-2022 budget.	2021-22
City of East Palo Alto	R1	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
	R2	No response. Follow-up sent with no response.	
City of Foster City	R1	Will not implement at this time - may reconsider.	
	R2	Will not implement – using different method.	
City of Half Moon Bay	R1	Will not implement – not reasonable.	
	R2	Will be implemented in FY 2021 budget.	2021-22
Town of Hillsborough	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will not be implemented – too expensive.	

**Soaring City Pension Costs – Follow-up on Grand Jury Report of 2017-2018,
continued**

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW UP YEAR
City of Menlo Park	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will be implemented in FY 2021 budget.	2021-22
City of Millbrae	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Implemented.	
City of Pacifica	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Implemented.	
Town of Portola Valley	R1	Will be implemented in FY 2021-2022 budget.	2021-22
	R2	Will be implemented in FY 2021-2022 budget.	2021-22
City of Redwood City	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will be implemented in FY 2020-2021 budget.	2021-22
City of San Bruno	R1	Will not implement; city uses 5-year financial forecast.	
	R2	Will not implement; city uses 5-year financial forecast.	
City of San Carlos	R1	Will be implemented in next budget cycle.	2020-21
	R2	Will not be implemented – not reasonable.	
City of San Mateo	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will be implemented in FY 2021-2022 business plan.	2021-22
City of South San Francisco	R1	Will be implemented in FY 2021-2023 budget.	2021-22
	R2	Will not be implemented-already included in regular reports.	
Town of Woodside	R1	Implemented.	
	R2	Will implement in next annual budget.	