To: Board of Supervisors  
From: County Executive  
Subject: Response To The 2005-2006 Grand Jury Final Report  
Contact: Kimberly Dahl 874-1638

**Overview**
The 2005-2006 Grand Jury Final Report identified issues involving several county departments as well as other cities and entities 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**
2. Instruct the Clerk of the Board to forward a copy of this response to the 2005-2006 Grand Jury Final Report, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.
3. Instruct the Clerk of the Board to forward copies of this response to the 2005-2006 Grand Jury Final Report, to the Grand Jury Foreman, to the Administrator of the Countywide Services Agency, and to the Sheriff’s Department.

**Measures/Evaluation**
Not applicable.

**Fiscal Impact**
The costs of responding to this report are approximately $5,341. Staff from the County Executive’s Office, the Department of Compliance, The Department of Human Assistance, the County Health Office, Child Protective Services, and the Mental Health Divisions within the Department of Health and Human Services, the Sheriff’s Department, and the Sacramento County Office of Emergency Operations 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 are 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 2005-2006 required several responses from Sacramento County on the following topics:

1. **Main Jail Health Care** - Findings 1 – 4 spoke to the understaffing of nurses, the lack of quality assurance, data collection and accreditation, the security of nurses during sick call, and concerns about the system for dispensing medications. This response was prepared by the Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department.
2. **Flood Disaster Evacuation of the Medically Infirm** - Findings 1 – 10 found missing flood and mass evacuation annexes to the plan, an inability to identify the special needs populations, and the possibility of challenges presented by HIPAA toward this end. Concern was focused on the perceived lack of care facilities and handicapped accessible transportation for the special needs populations, the lack of knowledge of hospital surge capacities, shelter for the medically or physically infirm, and contacts or monitors to assist the special needs populations. Also of concern was training for County, City and other local agency employees for disaster preparedness, and the desire to see more done related to public education. This response was prepared by the Sacramento County Office of Emergency Operations, the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, the Department of Human Assistance, The Public Health Office within the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Compliance.

3. **Goals and Objectives of Mental Health Services in Sacramento County Under the Mental Health Services Act** - Findings 1 – 4 related to the lack of resources for the Asian Pacific Islander communities, the African American community, and the Latino populations. Also included was the instruction to keep the Grand Jury informed of the effectiveness of the Mental Health Services Act programs over the next three years. This response was prepared by the Division of Mental Health within the Department of Health and Human Services.

4. **Child Protective Services Intake Procedures** – One finding found support for the changes made to Child Protective Services intake procedures and a recommendation to maintain them. This response was prepared by the Child Protective Services Division within the Department of Health and Human Services.

**RESULTS/MEASURES:**

Not applicable.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

The estimated costs of responding to this report are $5,341. Staff from the County Executive's Office, the Department of Compliance, The Department of Human Assistance, the County Health Office, Child Protective Services, and the Mental Health Divisions within the Department of Health and Human Services, the Sheriff's Department, and the Sacramento County Office of Emergency Operations contributed to this effort. These costs were absorbed by each entity.
Respectfully submitted,

TERRY SCHUTTEN
County Executive

Attachments

cc: Sheriff John McGinnis, Sheriff’s Department
Penelope Clarke, Agency Administrator, Countywide Services Agency
Rick Martinez, Director, Office of Emergency Operations
Lynn Frank, Interim Director, Health and Human Services
Bruce Wagstaff, Director, Human Assistance
Judy McGarry, Director, Department of Compliance
Dr. Glennah Trochet, County Health Officer