

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

APPROVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

For the Agenda of:
September 20, 2005
Timed: 2:15 p.m.

To: Board of Supervisors

From: County Executive

Subject: Response To The 2004-2005 Grand Jury Final Report

Contact: Kimberly Dahl 874-1638

SEP 20 2005
Cindy W. Turner
By _____
Clerk of the Board

Overview

The 2004-2005 Grand Jury Final Report identified several issues involving several County departments as well as several of the other cities within the Sacramento region. This report responds only to those issues involving departments within Sacramento County. The attached reports respond to the findings and recommendations of the Grand Jury.

Recommendations

1. Adopt this report as Sacramento County's response to recommendations contained in the 2004-2005 Grand Jury Final Report.
2. Instruct the Clerk of the Board to forward a copy of this report, Response to the 2004-2005 Grand Jury Final Report, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.
3. Instruct the Clerk of the Board to forward copies of this report, Response to the 2004-2005 Grand Jury Final Report, to the Grand Jury Foreman, to the Administrator of the Countywide Services Agency, to the Sheriff's Department, and to the Administrator of the Internal Services Agency.

Measures/Evaluation

Not applicable.

Fiscal Impact

The costs of responding to this report are approximately \$11,771. Staff from the Civil Service Commission, the County Executive's Office, the Office of Communication and Information Technology, The Department of Human Assistance, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Sheriff's Department, the County Health Office, the Sacramento Regional Office or Homeland Security, and the Countywide Services Agency contributed to this effort. These costs were absorbed by each entity.

BACKGROUND:

Each year the Sacramento County Grand Jury concludes its work and releases its Final Report, typically the last week in June. The report, which can address a variety of activities, functions, and responsibilities of government, typically contains findings and recommendations. State law requires the affected governing bodies to respond to each of these findings and recommendations with a response specifically directed to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court. This response is required by September 30, 2005.

The form of the County's responses as required by law is as follows:

As to each Grand Jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:

1. The respondent agrees with the finding.
2. The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons.

As to each Grand Jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

1. The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
2. The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.
3. The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of the publication of the Grand Jury Report.
4. The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation.

The responses contain all the applicable components as defined above.

DISCUSSION:

The Grand Jury Final Report for the fiscal year 2004-2005 required several responses from Sacramento County on the following topics:

1. Findings 1 – 6 related to the adequacy and appropriateness of the processes and procedures of the County Civil Service Commission in considering appeals by County employees for disciplinary actions taken against them.
This response was prepared by the Sacramento County Civil Service Commission.

2. Findings 1 – 4 related to the determination of whether the Sacramento Independent Taxi Owners Association (SITOA) uses fair, equal and non-discriminatory practices when hiring new drivers.
This response was prepared by the Sacramento County Director of Airports.
3. Findings 1 – 3 related to the adequacy and appropriateness of oversight of the Galt Concilio contract and other contracts for social, mental health, and alcohol and drug treatment services. Accountability of the Galt Concilio contract was also questioned.
This response was prepared by the Department of Human Assistance and Health and Human Services for the Agency Administrator of the Countywide Services Agency and the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors.
4. Findings 1 – 3 regarding security of inmate correspondence in accordance with established policies of the Sacramento County Main Jail.
This response was prepared by the Sheriff of Sacramento County.
5. Findings 1 – 3 related to supplementary programs to assist foster children.
This response was prepared by the Department of Health and Human Services for the Agency Administrator of the Countywide Services Agency.
6. Findings 1 – 11 regarding the extent of the coordination and preparation of Sacramento County and its political subdivisions to respond to an incident in which a weapon of mass destruction is involved.
This response was prepared by The Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, The Public Health Officer, and the Sacramento County Office of Communication and Information Technology. The County Executive's Office prepared the response on behalf of the Sacramento County board of Supervisors. These responses were developed through a collaboration with the Sheriff's Department as a member of the Sacramento Regional Office of Homeland Security.

RESULTS/MEASURES:

Not applicable.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The estimated costs of responding to this report are \$11,771. Staff from the Civil Service Commission, the County Executive's Office, the Office of Communication and Information Technology, The Department of Human Assistance, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Sheriff's Department, the County Health Office, the Sacramento Regional Office of Homeland Security, and the Countywide Services Agency contributed to this effort. These costs were absorbed by each entity.

Respectfully submitted,

TERRY SCHUTTEN
County Executive

Attachments

Cc: Sheriff Lou Blanas, Sheriff's Department
Penelope Clarke, Agency Administrator, Countywide Services Agency
G. Hardy Acree, Director of Airports
Jim Hunt, Director, Health and Human Services
Bruce Wagstaff, Director, Human Assistance
Pat Groff, Chief information Officer
Dr. Glennah Trochet, County Health Officer
Leslie Leahy, Executive Officer, Civil Service Commission
Lieutenant, Sacramento Regional Office of Homeland Security