2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury

City and County of San Francisco

CONTINUITY REPORT

HAVE CITY AGENCIES DONE WHAT THEY SAID THEY WOULD DO AFTER THE CIVIL GRAND JURY OF 2005-2006 ISSUED ITS REPORTS?

Released: July 9, 2007

Purpose of the Civil Grand Jury

The purpose of the Civil Grand Jury is to investigate the operations of the various departments, agencies, and officers of the government of the City and County of San Francisco to develop constructive recommendations for improving their operations, as required by law.

Each Civil Grand Jury has the opportunity and responsibility to determine which departments, agencies and officers it will investigate during its one-year term of office. To accomplish this task, the Civil Grand Jury divides into committees. Each committee conducts its research by visiting government facilities, meeting with public officials and reviewing appropriate documents.

The nineteen members of the Civil Grand Jury are selected at random from a pool of thirty prospective jurors. San Francisco residents are invited to apply. More information can be found at: http://www.sfgov.org/site/courts_page.asp?id=3680, or by contacting Civil Grand Jury, 400 McAllister Street, Room 008, San Francisco, CA 94102; (415) 551-3605.

State Law Requirement

Pursuant to state law, reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify the names or provide identifying information about individuals who spoke to the Civil Grand Jury.

Departments and agencies identified in the report must respond to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within the number of days specified, with a copy sent to the Board of Supervisors. For each finding of the Civil Grand Jury, the response must either (1) agree with the finding, or (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why. Further, as to each recommendation made by the Civil Grand Jury, the responding party must report either (1) that the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation of how it was implemented; (2) the recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for the implementation; (3) the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a time frame for the officer or agency head to be prepared to discuss it (less than six months from the release of the report); or (4) that recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation of why that is. (California Penal Code, sections 933, 933.05).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The San Francisco Civil Grand Jury of 2006-2007 wishes to recognize and continue the significant work of prior grand juries. Compliance with the recommendations of the grand jury is an integral part of the grand jury process and can be achieved if subsequent juries monitor the responses to the reports and make follow-up inquiries, in cooperation with the Board of Supervisors and the Office of the Mayor.

SUMMARY

The San Francisco Civil Grand Jury of 2006-2007 recognized its responsibility to monitor the implementation of the recommendations made by prior civil grand juries by tracking whether or not City officials and agencies have completed the objectives set forth in their responses to the reports, and by working with the Mayor's Office, the Controller and the Board of Supervisors to insure further follow-up.

This Jury chose to concentrate on follow-up to the seven reports issued by the immediate prior Civil Grand Jury of 2005-2006.

The 2006-2007 Jury began its review of the reports and responses after its term began in July 2006. Jury monitored the implementation of the recommendations in the reports of the 2005-2006 Jury, as follows:

- Disaster Planning: The Reality of Emergency/Disaster Medical Preparedness in San Francisco
- San Francisco's Information Technology Highway: Potholes or Possibilities
- Office of the Assessor-Recorder: Reducing the 4-Year Backlog
- Identity Theft: How Well Is the City and County Coping?
- Affordable Housing Bond Program: The Down Payment Assistance Loan Program
- San Francisco Jails: An Investigative Visit
- Continuity Report: Cooperation+Collaboration+Communication = Continuity

As the Jury began to follow up on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the 2005-2006 Disaster Preparedness Report, we soon decided that disaster

planning and preparedness in San Francisco were at a critical juncture and needed an ongoing investigation. At that point, the 2006-2007 Jury launched its own investigation, which will be released under the title "Preparing for a Disaster: Administrative Commitment and Appropriate Funding in the Department of Emergency Mangement and the Department of Public Health."

The San Francisco Civil Grand Jury for 2006-2007 presents the Continuity Report on the status of the implementation of the recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury in two sections:

I. How Can A Civil Grand Jury Encourage Compliance With Its Recommendations?

II. Have City Agencies Done What They Said They Would Do After the 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury Issued Its Report?

PROCEDURES

Members of the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury, sitting as a Continuity Committee, read the Civil Grand Jury reports from the last five years. We then met and determined, because of the time constraints of our own one-year term and the excellent follow-up done on prior reports by past juries, to follow up on the reports of the immediate past year.[1]

The 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury analyzed the reports issued by the 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury and the responses received thereto. In several cases, no responses were received as required by Penal Code Section 933.05. The current Jury informed the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of the failure to comply and the Court issued a further request.[2]

The current Jury attended hearings held by the Board of Supervisors on the reports.[3] The Jury examined the responses made by City officials, departments and agencies, and monitored the timelines for implementation set forth by the respondents to the reports. Over the course of the year, the Jury spoke with the Controller's Office, members of the Board of Supervisors, and members of last year's jury. We reviewed the updates made by the responding entities obtained by the Controller's Office and released

---

[1] The 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury has issued a separate report on police compensation and staffing, which follows up the 2004/05 CGJ report, "Compensation Issues in the San Francisco Police Department." The Responses to the 2004-2005 report specifically stated that the issues raised "… may be addressed in the new memorandum of understanding amongst the City & County of SF, the Police Commission, the Chief of Police and the SF Police Officers Association scheduled for July 1, 2007 - June 30, 2011."

[2] Despite this second request, responses have never been received from the San Francisco Police Department, the Department of Building Inspection, the Health Commission, and the Department of Technology and Information Services to the report on Emergency Medical Preparedness.

[3] The jury listened to tapes of hearings that had been held by the Board of Supervisors before July 1, 2006, when the Jury's term commenced, or early in its term.

in its report to the Board of Supervisors, "The Status of the Implementation of the Recommendations." We interviewed, telephoned or corresponded with representatives of affected departments to obtain further updates.

The Jury then entered the information it had received over the course of its review onto a spreadsheet, called a "Tracking Document." The Document summarizes the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury, and the responses to those made by the City officials, departments and agencies directed to respond.

Responders have two choices when responding to a Finding: agree or disagree. The Tracking Document notes whether the responders "agreed" or "disagreed" with each finding. If the respondent "disagreed" with the finding, no follow-up is appropriate.

If the respondent "agreed" with the finding, the Continuity Committee of the Civil Grand Jury then addresses the responses to the recommendations. According to California Penal Code, sections 933, 933.05, respondents may make the following responses to Recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury:

> … (1) that the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation of how it was implemented; (2) the recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for the implementation; (3) the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a time frame for the officer or agency head to be prepared to discuss it (less than six months from the release of the report); or (4) that recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation of why that is.

If the respondent stated that it would not implement the Recommendation because it was "not warranted or is not reasonable,"[4] no follow-up is appropriate.

If the Respondent indicated it would implement the Recommendation, the Civil Grand Jury then reviews what action the Respondent planned: immediate implementation, delayed implementation or further study.

The current Jury then summarizes these actions on the Tracking Document. The Continuity Committee of the Civil Grand Jury notes each instance where respondents implemented a Recommendation. If the Respondent indicated it would implement the Recommendation at a time certain in the future and a time that was within the term of the current jury, the Jury verifies that they had completed the action.

If the respondent indicated it would implement the recommendation in a timeframe beyond the term of the current Jury, the Jury suggests that future Civil Grand Juries follow up to assure the implementation is completed. Likewise, if the respondent indicated a recommendation needed further analysis and the current Jury deems it to be an important action to take, the Jury selectively urges future Civil Grand Juries to follow

[4] Penal Code Section 933.05 (b) (4).

up. The Tracking Documents can be found in Section II of this report.

I. HOW CAN A CIVIL GRAND JURY ENCOURAGE COMPLIANCE WITH ITS RECOMMENDATIONS?

The 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury acknowledges that each Civil Grand Jury is a unique and independent body; nevertheless, it also recognizes its obligation to preserve the work of prior juries and hold public officials accountable. Accountability of City officials -- the obligation of public officials to perform, not only their duties under the Charter, but to carry out decisions or promised actions -- is essential for good governance.

Following the end of any Grand Jury's term[5] and the release of its reports, all City departments and officials specified in the reports are required by Penal Code 933.05 to respond to the recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury as requested. They may agree or disagree in whole or in part with the findings, indicate which recommendations require further study and set forth a time to complete further examination, indicate they have implemented or will implement the recommendation and set forth a timetable to do so, or indicate that the recommendation is unreasonable or unwarranted and why.

After the release of the reports, the Board of Supervisors[6] holds hearings. The Controller's Office prepares an audit or Status Report. In addition, the Mayor's Office conducts an informal follow-up of each report, which may involve issuing Mayor's Directives covering concerns raised in the reports.

During this process, the jury that has issued the reports is no longer in existence and has no authority to act regarding the responses.[7] Thereafter, there is no automatic process by which the City tracks the timetable set forth by the respondents and follows up on the implementation of recommendations, unless subsequent juries, the Board, the Controller and/or the Mayor choose to monitor implementation.

A. Office of the Controller:

Prior juries have used a spreadsheet format to arrange the complex and extensive elements of the reports, the responses and the follow-up process, into a concise and readable form. The Continuity Committee of last year's jury refined the format into a "Tracking Document." The current Jury utilized that format.

---

5 The term of a Civil Grand Jury commences on July 1 and terminates on June 30 of the following year.
6 The City Services and Rules Committees of the Board of Supervisors held hearings on the 2003-2004 reports; the Government Audit and Oversight Committee held hearings on the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 reports.
7 A Civil Grand Jury may issue a report anytime during its year of service. In practice, however, most reports are issued at the end of the term.

The 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury established an understanding with the City Controller's Office to encourage follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations made by the Civil Grand Jury. The Continuity Committee of the 2006-07 Civil Grand Jury believes that future juries can extend and expand upon this cooperation.

The current Jury found that there was still no consistent, single tracking document used by all reviewers that would allow this Civil Grand Jury or future Civil Grand Juries to track responses, especially responses to recommendations that extended beyond the term of the issuing grand jury. This is why it is desirable that there be a single source or up-to-date document that can be reviewed by Civil Grand Juries for follow up until the requirement is completed. In addition, it would assist City departments and officials in tracking their progress, if they could become familiar with a single format.

The Controller's Office produced its Status Report late in the term of the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury. Status Reports issued by the Controller's Offices <u>record</u> responses; Tracking Documents issued by the Civil Grand Jury <u>assess</u> responses and make further recommendations. The format of the two tracking documents is similar, but not identical.

By the time, the Controller's Status Report was on line and available to the public and the Civil Grand Jury, the current Jury had completed much of its review of past reports. By that time, because the Civil Grand Jury has no clerical assistance, individual Jurors had input information onto the Jury's own Tracking Document. Civil Grand Jury time would be better spent on investigation of the implementation of recommendations rather than in clerical work. It would improve the efficiency of future Civil Grand Juries if the Controller's Office made available to future Juries the matrix of its Tracking Document input with information common to both reports; i.e., a summary of the findings and recommendations, and the required responses.

In addition, those required to respond to Civil Grand Jury Reports must do so within 60 days (or 90 days for the Board of Supervisors) of the release of the report. The Civil Grand Jury receives updates after the time of the initial response only if it requests them upon its own investigation. In the meantime, the Controller requests those required to respond to the reports to respond again, at a later date, directly to the Controller. It would assist future Civil Grand Juries in their follow-up activities, if the Controller's Office forwarded copies of the later responses to the Jury for its review.

Finding 1: It is desirable that Civil Grand Juries and the Controller's Office follow a consistent tracking format in reporting on the implementation of the recommendations of Civil Grand Juries. Both the Controller's Office and the Civil Grand Jury produce documents tracking responses to Civil Grand Jury Reports. The matrices on which the responses are reported are similar but not identical. Although the substance of the Civil Grand Jury's Continuity Report and the Controller's Status Report differ, the format should be identical.

➢ **Recommendation 1**: Starting with the reports of the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury, upon receipt of Civil Grand Jury reports, the Controller's Office should input the basic information contained in the reports on a matrix. This should include the Controller's summary of each finding, each recommendation, and the required respondent. The matrix should be transmitted to the newly sworn Civil Grand Jury for its use in reporting on its follow-up in the Tracking Document.

Finding 2: The Controller's Office issues its "Status Report on the Implementation of the Recommendations in Civil Grand Jury Reports" late in the term of a sitting Civil Grand Jury. When preparing its Status Report, the Controller's Office receives updates on the responses made to the Superior Court within the 60-day period required under the Penal Code. The sitting Civil Grand Jury is not privy to these updates.

➢ **Recommendation 2**: The Controller's Office should provide the sitting Civil Grand Jury with updates to the responses made to prior Civil Grand Jury reports as it receives them.

Responses required from:	Office of the Controller (60 days)

B. Board of Supervisors

The 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury believes that the hearings held by the Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee are extremely important in achieving accountability from respondents. The 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury encourages the Board to expand its method of responding to Grand Jury reports, by including substantive written responses to the recommendations.

The 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury has had discussions and correspondence with members of the Board regarding the Board's responses to the Grand Jury reports. Penal Code 933 requires the Board to respond to the Presiding Judge within 90 days of the release of a report to recommendations that address personnel or budgetary issues. Often budgetary issues presented to the Board by the Civil Grand Jury request that the Board take action in the future. For example, a recommendation may request the Board to approve budgetary proposals needed to implement Civil Grand Jury Recommendations. This, in effect, asks the Board to respond to a recommendation regarding a budgetary request that is not yet before them.

The Civil Grand Jury understands that requesting a response to a recommendation setting forth a "hypothetical" scenario makes response by the Board complicated. Perhaps due to this awkwardness, the Board did not provide the Civil Grand Jury with responses it was able to use effectively to prepare our Continuity Report. In addition, not all requests to the Board for response fall into this category. For example, both the 2004-2005 and the 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury recommended that the Board hold an annual hearing on Civil Grand Jury recommendations that are still pending. The Board provided no response to this specific recommendation: In response to every applicable recommendation, as reviewed in the Controller's Status Report, the Board stated that the recommendation "Will not be Implemented; Not Warranted or Not Reasonable." At the same time, the Board also stated, "the Board supports the recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury…." These statements appear to conflict.

The responses from the Board to the Controller went on to state "… [The Board] does not have the operational authority to implement the recommendations. Therefore, pursuant to California Penal Code Sections 933.005(a) and (b), the Board will not be implementing the recommendation." We are not sure of the meaning of that statement, nor does it appear to apply to every recommendation made by the Jury.

The information the Civil Grand Jury had on the responses made by the Board to the 2005-2006 Reports was found in the "Status of Implementation of the Recommendations of the San Francisco Civil Grand Juries for Fiscal years 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06," prepared by the Office of the Controller, dated April 6, 2007. As far as the Civil Grand Jury can ascertain, the Presiding Judge never received any responses from the Board of Supervisors.

Finding 3: Responses by the Board of Supervisors to the 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury reports were not sent to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on a timely basis and the responses were not specifically directed to the substance of the recommendation.

- **Recommendation 3**: The Board of Supervisors should respond to each individual recommendation directed to it by the Civil Grand Jury. The responses should be made to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within 90 days of the release of the report.

Finding 4: The hearing held by the Board of Supervisors on each report issued by the Civil Grand encourages implementation of agreed upon recommendations by officials, agencies and departments of the City and County of San Francisco.

- **Recommendation 4**: The Board of Supervisors should continue to hold hearings on the reports issued by the Civil Grand Jury.

Responses required from:	Board of Supervisors (90 days)

C. Future Civil Grand Juries:

More importantly, the 2006-2007 Jury encourages future juries to continue a systematic follow-up to prior reports by carrying on the Civil Grand Jury tradition of issuing a Continuity Report.

To facilitate this process and enable continuity, the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury proposes to select among its members a volunteer to assist the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury during the 60 day period (or 90 days in the case of the Board of Supervisors) in which responses to the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury are due. The volunteer would coordinate with the Office of the Presiding Judge to keep track of the responses received to the 2006-2007 reports by the Court, provide copies of the Responses to the Controller's Office, and submit a list of delinquent responses to the Jury to submit to the Judge at the end of the 60-day period. If the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury finds this proposed volunteer system assists it in providing needed continuity, the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury encourages the 2007-2008 Jury to continue the volunteer program into the following year.

II. HAVE CITY AGENCIES DONE WHAT THEY SAID THEY WOULD DO AFTER THE CIVIL GRAND JURY OF 2005-2006 ISSUED ITS REPORTS?

Attached are the Tracking Documents recording the status of the implementation of the Recommendations of the 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury.

Disaster Planning: The Reality of Emergency/Disaster Medical Preparedness in San Francisco

In the Tracking Document recording the implementation of responders to the 2005-2006 report on disaster planning, the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury recommends that future juries continue to monitor many recommendations that have not yet been implemented or have only partially been implemented. Many of these same issues are discussed in the separate investigation of the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury, "Preparing for a Disaster…."

Concurrent to the release of the 2005-2006 report on Disaster Planning, the Mayor issued Directive 06-03 on Emergency Medical Disaster Preparedness (see Appendix C to the 2006-2007 Report "Preparing for a Disaster…). Among other Directives, the Mayor directed the formation of the Multi-Casualty Working Group to address the issue of hospital evacuation and develop appropriate response plans and plans to coordinate with regional plans. These plans, and the implementation of other Mayor's directives, have not yet been completed.

Finding 5: Certain of the Directives in the Mayor's Directive 06-03, Emergency Medical Disaster Preparedness, have not yet been implemented.

- **Recommendation 5**: The Mayor should follow up on the implementation of the actions required in his Directive 06-03.

Responses required from:	The Mayor (60 days)

San Francisco's Information Technology Highway: Potholes or Possibilities

To date San Francisco has yet to coordinate the various computer and technological systems used across departments, partially because of dissatisfaction by departments with the performance of the Department of Telecommunications Services, partially due to the lack of technology expertise, or leadership and authority, and partially due to funding limitations.

Before they could be implemented, some of recommendations of the 2005-2006 Jury required changes to the Administrative Code to strengthen the role of the Executive Director of the Department of Telecommunications Services (DTIS), coordinate budget items related to technology across departments, and centralize as much of the City's information technology as feasible, including outside contracts. At the time 2005-2006 Jury prepared its report, the City Administrator had agreed that changes to the Administrative Code were necessary. At present, changes to the Code have been drafted. They are currently under review by the Board of Supervisors, the City Administrator and the City Attorney's Office.

In addition, before a number of the recommendations of the 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury could be implemented, the City had to complete an assessment of the state of information technology in the City, including an inventory. One of the proposals that the Committee on Information and Technology (COIT) is considering is a Citywide Technology Assessment. COIT, however, did not propose such an assessment in the 2006-2007 budget. Instead, several smaller projects, i.e., the Inventory of Core systems and the Technology Equipment budget study, "did come through the budget process." COIT intends these projects to be part of the ultimate foundational framework for a complete and comprehensive Citywide Technological Assessment.

In the meantime, the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury is pleased that the Budget Analyst of the Board of Supervisors is about to embark upon a review of Information Technology throughout all departments and agencies in the City.

Implementation of the recommendations of the 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury will require funding to attract personnel with adequate expertise and to upgrade current systems. After approval of changes to the Administrative Code and the completion of a comprehensive Citywide Technological Assessment, the Mayor and the Board would have to approve adequate funding to bring about the needed changes. At such time, the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury believes a future jury should undertakes a new investigation of the status of information technology in the City.

Office of the Assessor-Recorder: Reducing the 4-Year Backlog

The Office of the Assessor-Recorder responded to the 2005-2006 report on August 22, 2006. The Office provided the Jury with further updates on the implementation of the recommendations in June 2007. The 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury has observed progress on the implementation of the Recommendations over the last year.

In addition, the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury is pleased to hear that the Controller's Office will soon conduct an audit of the Office of Assessor-Recorder in relation to the timeliness of assessing new and transferred properties. For that reason, the Civil Grand Jury recommends that future juries wait to follow up on the ability of the Assessor-Recorder to expedite placing assessments of new or transferred properties on-line and reducing its backlog until enough time has elapsed to judge whether the improvements have been adequate.

<u>Identity Theft: How Well is the City and County Coping</u> ?

Review of the 2005-2006 report on Identity theft indicated that the City does have security measures in place to safeguard against identify theft. According to findings listed by the 2005-06 Civil Grand Jury, City departments do not routinely maintain social security records or credit card numbers in any database that is vulnerable or can be compromised.

Nevertheless, in Finding #1, the 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury found in its investigation that the contract between the City and the Bank of America concerning cash and credit card operations at the Department of Health did not contain a clause protecting the confidentiality of data. The Mayor responded to this Finding on July 21, 2006, "The San Francisco Treasurer's Office is aware of the Bank of America contractual data protection issue with the Department of Public health and is in the process of correcting [it]." As of June 5, 2007, no corrective action, i.e., a new Request for Proposal or banking contract has been processed.

Finding 6: The confidentiality clause in the City's Contract with the Bank of America has not been added. New Requests for Proposals or banking contracts including confidentiality clauses have not been drafted.

- **Recommendation 6**: The Mayor's Office and the Treasurer should explain to the Civil Grand Jury why the confidentiality clause has not been corrected.

Finding 7: The fact that the confidentiality clause has not been corrected indicates a lack of commitment on the part of the City to protect identity, despite the responses made to the 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury report on Identity Theft.

- **Recommendation 7**: The Mayor's Office in cooperation with the Controller, should review security procedures to ensure the security of all personal information regardless of how it is maintained, manually or electronically. This would include employee information as well as that of the public.

Responses required from:	Treasurer, Office of the Controller, and the Mayor (60 days)

Affordable Housing Bond Program: The Down Payment Assistance Loan Program

The 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury reported on the state of the Affordable Housing Bond Program to provide low-income first time homebuyers down-payment assistance. When the Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing appeared before the Board of Supervisors at the August 14, 2006 hearing on the Civil Grand Jury report, he testified that the balance of the fund was reduced to $1.6 million at that time.

In the meantime, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor have competing proposals to assist low-income homebuyers. Future Civil Grand Juries should follow the progress of the Mayor's Housing Proposal and the Supervisors' Housing Proposals and consider making further recommendations regarding low-income housing programs.

San Francisco Jails: An Investigative Visit

On August 17, 2006, members of the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury spent a full day inspecting jail facilities of the City and County of San Francisco, including, Jails #1 and #2 located at the Hall of Justice, and Jails #5 and #7 in San Bruno. During the one-day on site interviews with inmates, members of the Jury heard many inmates request more in-jail programs to prepare them for post-release and more follow-up community programs to assist them after they are released.

The Jury observed some training facilities, including facilities for training in culinary and laundry skills. Only a culinary certificate is offered. The Jury also observed some Charter school educational classrooms. The Jury deemed neither the vocational training nor the Charter school programs adequate to the needs of the inmates. The Charter Schools, for example, were only available to inmates without a high school diploma.

The Jury understands that most inmates in the County Jail system are not incarcerated at the facilities run by the City and County of San Francisco for a long time, which makes developing consistent ongoing programming difficult. Despite this, the Jury believes that even a start in educational and training program could provide continuity to further training and education once an individual is released, increasing the opportunities for an inmate to function outside the system and decreasing the chance the individual will be incarcerated again.

Many of those released from the jails need post-release assistance to prevent recidivism, often including drug recovery, violence prevention or both. According to the Mayor's Office, as of September 2006, it has provided funds to the Sheriff and community agencies to support re-entry programs. The Sheriff's Department has set aside $600,000 to create a comprehensive re-entry program for recently released individuals, called the No Violence Alliance. The Sheriff's Office reports that, as of

March 2006, 100 ex-offenders had been served. Statistics measuring effectiveness of the program to prevent recidivism are being collected.

Future Civil Grand Juries should monitor the No Violence Alliance program to assess the percent of recidivism of those in the program as compared to the general population of released individuals to judge whether the program is working and is adequately funded.

Finding 8: Educational and trade programs, both inside the jails and in the community should reduce recidivism. Measurement statistics are being gathered and analyzed on the No Violence Alliance program begun in September 2006.

- **Recommendation 8**: If the No Violence Alliance program successfully reduces recidivism, the Sheriff, coordinating with governmental and community agencies, should expand the program, and develop and propose additional programs. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors should approve funds for those projects.

Responses required from:	Sheriff, Board of Education, Adult Probation (60 days)

Finding 9: A Charter school in the San Bruno Jail offers classes to some eligible inmates without high school diplomas.

- **Recommendation 9**: The School Board should extend the Charter school program in the jails to reach more of the eligible inmates.

Finding 10: The Charter School cannot offer educational opportunities to inmates who have a high school diploma.

- **Recommendation 10**: San Francisco Community College should offer programs within the jails, combined with a post-incarceration program, to inmates with a high school diploma to encourage individuals to take advantage of community college programs when they are released.

Responses required from:	Sheriff, Board of the Community College, Adult Probation (60 days)

<u>Continuity Report: Cooperation + Collaboration + Communication = Continuity</u>

The issues raised in the above-entitled 2005-2006 Continuity Report regarding accountability in City government as to the implementation of Civil Grand Jury recommendations was discussed herein in Section I: How Can Juries Encourage

Compliance with Its Recommendations. The Continuity Report also reported on its follow-up of prior Jury reports.

The 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury's Continuity report also followed up on the implementation of recommendations in three reports issued by earlier Civil Grand Juries. Of these three reports, the Jury made Findings and Recommendations regarding the 2002-2003 Report entitled, "Preferential Treatment Persists in a Department Marked by Political Pressures and a Leadership Void: Civil Grand Jury Report on the Mangement of the Department of Building Inspection."

When the 2005-2006 Continuity Report was issued in June 2006, there was an Acting Director at the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). A new permanent Director was named in February 2007. While there was an Acting Director, new rules regarding the conduct of employees of DBI were promulgated by the Ethics Commission, in negotiation with DBI. These revised rules speak directly to the concerns raised in the 2002-2003 Civil Grand Jury report and the 2005-2006 follow-up. On September 9, 2006, the San Francisco Chronicle reported:

> …[Acting Director DBI]submitted to the city Ethics Commission a new proposed code of conduct saying that no building department employee may directly or indirectly engage in construction, remodeling or plan preparation of any structure in San Francisco unless the employee or a family member lives at the property.
>
> … [The] Ethics Commission Executive Director …, who hammered out the rules with … [the Acting Director] in anticipation of a commission meeting Monday night, said he believed the regulations now are as strict as they can be within the bounds of fairness to employees.

It is the opinion of the 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury that DBI has begun to implement many of the Civil Grand Jury recommendations and that, because a new Director has held the position for fewer than six months, it would be premature for the current Civil Grand Jury to make further Findings and Recommendations. As soon as enough time has elapsed to enable accurate oversight and measurements of performance, a future Civil Grand Jury should ascertain if the new ethical rules and procedures in DBI are effective.

III. TRACKING DOCUMENTS

REPORT I. DISASTER PLANNING: THE REALTIES OF EMERGENCY/DISASTER MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations **2005-2006 CGJ**	**Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury**	**Pertinent Responses**	**Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries**

Section A: STRATEGIC PLANNING

Finding A.1. A.1 a- A.1 b (1-4)	City lacks effective strategic planning process on emergency preparedness. Recommendations: OES/HS should develop planning process with input from private/public; Disaster Council; Redefine as planning body; Implement Work Groups with key stakeholders, including Medical; Initiate Master Strategic Planning Committee; Hire outside expert consultant as facilitator	Mayor	DISAGREE Has updated citywide Plan and says OES/HS is performing strategic planning process Implemented: Strategic planning in process Requires further study	Requires Further Study: Disaster Council not appropriate Planning Body. Next Civil Grand Jury should follow-up if Administrative Code Section 7 has not redefined Disaster Council.
Finding A.1. A.1 a, A.1 b (1-4)	City lacks effective strategic planning process on emergency preparedness. Recommendations: OES/HS should develop planning process with input from private/public; Redefine Disaster Council; Implement Work Groups	Office of Emergency Services/Homeland Security (OES/HS) (now DEM)	Finding: __________?[8] Implemented: Will hire a consultant to develop strategic plan and involve stakeholders	Implemented: Outside consultant to develop strategic plan hired. Disaster Council: Requires further study: Not appropriate Planning Body. Next Civil Grand Jury should follow-up to

[8] OES/HS did not state in response to any Finding whether it "Agreed" or "Disagreed" as required by Penal Code 933.05. In the future OES/HS (now DEM) should state for each finding whether it AGREES or DISAGREES.

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
	with key stakeholders, including Medical; Initiate Master Strategic Planning Committee; Hire outside expert consultant as facilitator			find out if Administrative Code Section 7 has not redefined Disaster Council Reformatted Committees: Partially Implemented. DEM is reformatting Steering Committees. Private Sector Participation in Policy Formation: Requires further study. Future Juries should monitor progress on including critical private sector entities in disaster planning.

Section B: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Finding B-1	City's Emergency Response bureaucratic not innovative.	Mayor	AGREE	
B-1	Recommendation: Establish Clearinghouse to share ideas across departments & private sector;		Concurs with DPH response	
Finding B-2	Proposed new position of Hospital Coordinator does not address issue of participation of private sector in planning		PARTIALLY AGREE AGREES in principle that private sector should be involved	
B-2	Recommendation: Mayor Directive to OES re inclusion of private sector in emergency planning		Mayor added Hospital Council to Disaster Council.	Partially Implemented: Mayor should be more active in persuading City departments and private hospitals to work together. Future Juries should monitor progress on including critical

REPORT I. DISASTER PLANNING: THE REALTIES OF EMERGENCY/DISASTER MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
			Mayor issued Directive May 23, 2006 on Emergency Medical Disaster Preparedness	private sector entities in disaster planning. Partially Implemented: Not all actions in Mayor's Directive have been implemented. Office of the Mayor should follow-up on compliance with Mayor's May 23, 2006 Directive and progress of Multi-Incident Casualty Work Group.
Finding B-1 B-1 Finding B-2 B-2	City's Emergency Response bureaucratic not innovative. Recommendation: Establish Clearinghouse to share ideas across departments & throughout private sector; Proposed new position of Hospital Coordinator does not address issue of participation of private sector in planning Recommendation: Mayor Directive to OES re inclusion of private sector in emergency planning	Department of Public Health, including Office of Policy Planning (DPH/OPP)	AGREE Disaster Council meets quarterly; OES hosts UASI steering committee 2x a month; Dept. participates in Hospital Disaster Task force monthly Finding: _________? DPH working toward goal through Hospital Disaster Task force	Implemented: Hospital Coordinator hired. Partially Implemented: DPH needs to commit staff, provide more funding and administrative commitment to the Multi-Incident Work Group and to work with Hospitals,. Future Juries should follow-up on status.
Finding B-1	City's Emergency Response bureaucratic not innovative.	Emergency Medical Services (DPH/EMSA)	AGREE	

REPORT I. DISASTER PLANNING: THE REALTIES OF EMERGENCY/DISASTER MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations **2005-2006 CGJ**	**Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury**	**Pertinent Responses**	**Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries**
B-1	Recommendation: Establish Clearinghouse to share ideas across departments & throughout private sector;		AGREE that ideas should be shared, but workgroups and committees must be integrated.	Partially Implemented: EMSA needs to work with other sections of DPH, other departments and hospitals to improve medical disaster preparedness in both sectors. Future Juries should follow up on status.
Finding B-2	Proposed new position of Hospital Coordinator does not address issue of participation of private sector in planning		Finding: _________?	
B-2	Recommendation: Mayor Directive to OES re inclusion of private sector in emergency planning		EMSA AGREES that in long term Emergency task force must include representation from all emergency medical stakeholders	Partially Implemented: EMSA should work with DPH and DEM to expand medical disaster preparedness work groups to include hospital medical providers and ambulance providers. Future Juries should follow up on status.
Finding B-1	City's Emergency Response bureaucratic not innovative.	Office of Emergency Services/Homeland Security (OES/HS) (now DEM)	Finding __________?	.
B-1	Recommendation: Establish Clearinghouse to share ideas across departments & throughout private sector;		Disaster Council is body that includes private sector; plus DPH and OES meet monthly with the Hospital Emergency Task force	Partially Implemented: DEM working on redefining Disaster Council and reorganizing planning bodies. Should involve the private sector more, especially hospitals by coordinating with those in DPH who have working relationship with hospitals.
Finding B-2	Proposed new position of Hospital Coordinator does not address issue of participation of private		Finding _________?	

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
	sector in planning			
B-2	Recommendation: Mayor Directive to OES re inclusion of private sector in emergency planning		Mayor issued Directive May 23, 2006 on Emergency Medical Disaster Preparedness	Partially Implemented: Office of the Mayor should follow-up on its May 23, 2006 Directive on the progress of the Department of Public Health and the Emergency Medical Services Agency.
Finding B-1	City's Emergency Response bureaucratic not innovative.	Disaster Council	AGREE IN PART	
B-1	Recommendation: Establish Clearinghouse to share ideas across departments & throughout private sector;		Response from Mayor's Office states that DPH continues to work with Disaster Council, Hospital Council, OES and significant advances has been made. Hospital Council has been added to Disaster Council.	Partially Implemented: Mayor added Hospital Council to Disaster Council, but DEM and Office of the Mayor should participate with DPH involving hospitals whether through Disaster Council or another policy group. Future Juries should monitor progress.

Section C: LEADERSHIP

Finding C.1	City needs strong leader to direct medical/emergency preparedness	Mayor	DISAGREE	
C-1	Recommendation: Create Senior level medical/emergency expert to oversee medical preparedness working outside DPH;		Concurs with DPH	
Finding C2	New Hospital Coordinator to be hired		AGREE	

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
C-2	Recommendation: Hire coordinator experienced in emergency preparedness		Concurs with DPH	
Finding C3	A poor working relationship exists between OPP and EMSA within DPH		DISAGREE	
C-3	Recommendation: Improve coordination between OPP and EMSA within DPH		Concurs with DPH	
Finding C.1	City needs strong leader to direct medical/emergency preparedness	Department of Public Health,	DISAGREE Dr. Katz would be the responsible officer in charge of a Medical Emergency and is eminently qualified.	
C-1	Recommendation: Create Senior level medical/emergency expert to oversee medical preparedness working outside DPH.		Leader of emergency medical preparedness must be in DPH by statute; Dr. Katz relies upon Deputy Director to coordinate emergency activities, who in turn relies upon staff at each DPH facility and meets weekly with them; plus 2 past DPH employees managers at OES	Will not implement, not reasonable.
Finding C2	New Hospital Coordinator to be hired		AGREE	
C-2	Recommendation: Hire coordinator experienced in emergency preparedness		Deputy Director of DPH will coordinate hiring.	Partially Implemented: Department Hired Coordinator, but not experienced in medical emergency preparedness. DPH still needs an experienced senior

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
				position dedicated to medical emergency preparedness.
Finding C-3	A poor working relationship exists between OPP and EMSA within DPH		DISAGREE OPP and EMSA work collaboratively.	
C-3	Recommendation: Improve coordination between OPP and EMSA within DPH		OPP staff attends all EMSA meetings and EMSA staff attends weekly DPH Emergency Preparedness HS Steering Committee weekly meetings.	Will not implement, not warranted.
Finding C.1	City needs strong leader to direct medical/emergency preparedness	Emergency Medical Services Agency	DISAGREE	
C-1	Recommendation: Create Senior level medical/emergency expert to oversee medical preparedness working outside DPH;		Leader of emergency medical preparedness must be in DPH by statute, not organizationally feasible; conflict of interest.	Will not implement, not reasonable
Finding C2	New Hospital Coordinator to be hired		AGREE Will be hired by Department.	Partially Implemented by Department.
C-2	Recommendation: Hire coordinator experienced in emergency preparedness			
Finding C-3	A poor working relationship exists between OPP and EMSA within DPH		DISAGREE OPP and EMSA work well together under DPH	

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
C-3	Recommendation: Improve coordination between OPP and EMSA within DPH			Will not implement, not reasonable.
Finding C.1	City needs strong leader to direct medical/emergency preparedness	Office of Emergency Services/Homeland Security (now DEM)	__________?	
C-2	Recommendation: Create Senior level medical/emergency expert to oversee medical preparedness working outside DPH;		Believes leadership should remain with DPH and states exemplary coordination exists between OES/HS and DPH	Will not Implement; now warranted.
Finding C2	New Hospital Coordinator to be hired		__________?	
C-2	Recommendation: Hire coordinator experienced in emergency preparedness			
Finding C-3	A poor working relationship exists between OPP and EMSA within DPH		__________?	
C-3	Recommendation: Improve coordination between OPP and EMSA within DPH			

Section D: SURGE CAPACITY

REPORT I. DISASTER PLANNING: THE REALTIES OF EMERGENCY/DISASTER MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations **2005-2006 CGJ**	**Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury**	**Pertinent Responses**	**Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries**
Finding D.1.	Finding: DEM and DPH should identify surge capacity in all medical facilities private & public and exercise	Mayor	AGREE	
D-1	Recommendation: All hospitals should participate in annual drills and be part of planning for drills		Concurs with DPH	Not Implemented. To date there has been no citywide disaster drill including all hospitals that tested HRSA goal of 600-bed capacity. Mayor should use his position to assist DEM and DPH in obtaining agreement of hospitals to participate in surge capacity exercises.
Finding D-2	Community clinics should be prepared to accept overflow.		DISAGREE	
D-2	Recommendation: D.2.a.-- DPH mandate its own clinics address surge capacity; D.2.b.-- DPH should distribute necessary emergency supplies + identify alternate sites for non-emergency care + publicize sites;		Concurs with DPH	
Finding D-3	DPH has purchased patient tracking;		AGREE	
D-3	Recommendation: DPH should maintain, test and distribute software patient tracking software		Concurs with DPH	
Finding D.1.	Finding:	Department of Public Health, including	AGREE	

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations **2005-2006 CGJ**	**Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury**	**Pertinent Responses**	**Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries**
	DPH should identify and test surge capacity in all medical facilities private & public	Office of Policy and Planning (DPH/OPP)		
D-1	Recommendation: All hospitals should participate in annual surge capacity drill and be part of planning for drills		Hospitals may be incapacitated in emergency and plans are needed for treatment of mass casualties outside hospital settings.	Not Implemented. To date there has been no citywide disaster drill including all hospitals that tested HRSA goal of 600-bed capacity.
Finding D-2	Community clinics should be prepared to accept overflow.		DISAGREE	
D-2	Recommendation: D.2.a.--DPH mandates its own clinics address surge capacity; D. 2. b. -- DPH should distribute necessary emergency supplies + identify alternate sites for non-emergency care + publicize sites;		Clinics participate in citywide drills and provided with communication equipment; OES working on alternate treatment sites in City and region.	Partially Implemented: Clinics are not yet fully equipped or ready to perform Urgent Care in case of a disaster. Future Juries should follow up.
Finding D-3	DPH has purchased patient tracking; Recommendation: DPH should maintain, test and distribute software patient tracking software		AGREE	Partially Implemented: Patient Tracking Program not yet implemented. Budget for FY08 not adequate to support implementation of Patient Tracking Program. The next CGJ should follow up.
Finding D.1.	Finding: DPH should identify and	Emergency Medical Services (DPH/EMSA)	AGREE	

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
	test surge capacity in all medical facilities private & public			
D-1	Recommendation: All hospitals should participate in annual drills and be part of planning for drills		DPH says has no authority over private hospitals.	Not Implemented. To date there has been no citywide disaster drill including all hospitals that tested HRSA goal of 600-bed capacity.
Finding D-2	Community clinics should be prepared to accept overflow.		AGREE	
D-2	Recommendation: D.2.a.--DPH mandates its own clinics address surge capacity; D. 2. b.--DPH should distribute necessary emergency supplies + identify alternate sites for non-emergency care + publicize sites;		EMSA says it has no authority over clinics, plus supplies are limited	Partially Implemented: EMSA provides communication equipment, but no authority over clinics, and cannot guarantee equipment in emergency. Did not respond whether or not there is an overall plan for alternate medical sites.
Finding D-3	DPH has purchased patient tracking;		AGREE	
	Recommendation: DPH should maintain, test and distribute software patient tracking software		Will test patient software equipment in November 2006	Partially Implemented: Patient Tracking Program not yet implemented. Budget for FY08 not adequate to support implementation of Patient Tracking Program. The next CGJ should follow up.
Finding D-2	Community clinics should	San Francisco Community Clinic	AGREE	

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
	be prepared to accept overflow.	Consortium		
D-2	Recommendation: D.2.a. DPH mandate its own clinics address surge capacity;		The Consortium makes it clear that they are only able to service the "walking wounded or worried well." They have no staff of facilities for patients that require bedridden or urgent care patients	Partially Implemented: Clinics are not yet fully equipped or ready to perform Urgent Care in case of a disaster. Future Juries should follow up.
	D. 2.b. DPH should distribute necessary emergency supplies + identify alternate sites for non-emergency care + publicize sites;		The Consortium AGREES and has implemented a communications plan that follows the proper chain of command to request supplies.	Partially Implemented: Clinics are requesting supplies from DPH. Future Juries should follow up.
Finding D.1.	Finding: DPH should identify and test surge capacity in all medical facilities private & public	OES/HS (now DEM)	AGREE	
D-1	Recommendation: All hospitals should participate in annual drills and be part of planning for drills			Not Implemented. To date there has been no citywide disaster drill including all hospitals that tested HRSA goal of 600-bed capacity.

Section E: TRAINING AND DRILLS

Finding E.1	After Action Reports: Delay in undermines ability of city leaders to understand operational issues at departmental levels.	Mayor	AGREE	

REPORT I. DISASTER PLANNING: THE REALTIES OF EMERGENCY/DISASTER MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations **2005-2006 CGJ**	**Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury**	**Pertinent Responses**	**Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries**
E1.a.	Recommendations: –follow-up speeded up written comments in 10 days, report available in 45;		Concurs with DPH below	Implemented
E 1.b.	– Mayor's Office should receive immediate reports after drills automatically and all other follow-up reports;		Concurs with DPH below	Implemented
E 1.c	- After Action Reports should be provided to Disaster Council		Concurs with DPH below	Implemented

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
Finding E.1	After Action Reports: Delay in undermines ability of city leaders to understand operational issues at departmental levels.	Department of Public Health, including Office of Policy and Planning (DPH/OPP)	AGREE	
E1.a.	Recommendations: –follow-up speeded up written comments in 10 days, report available in 45;		AGREE	Implemented by DEM
E 1.b.	– Mayor's Office should receive immediate reports after drills automatically and all other follow-up reports;		AGREE	Implemented by DEM
E 1.c	- After Action Reports should be provided to Disaster Council		AGREE	Implemented by DEM
Finding E.1	After Action Reports: Delay in undermines ability of city leaders to understand operational issues at departmental levels.	Emergency Medical Services (DPH/EMSA)	AGREE and should go farther by adding SMART procedures to correct deficiencies.	
E1.a.	Recommendations: –follow-up speeded up written comments in 10 days, report available in 45;		AGREES	Implemented by DEM
E 1.b.	– Mayor's Office should receive immediate reports after drills automatically		AGREE	Implemented by DEM

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
E 1.c	and all other follow-up reports; - After Action Reports should be provided to Disaster Council		AGREE	Implemented by DEM
Finding E.1	After Action Reports: Delay in undermines ability of city leaders to understand operational issues at departmental levels.	Office of Emergency Services/Homeland Security (OES/HS)	_________?	.
E1.a.	Recommendations: –follow-up speeded up written comments in 10 days, report available in 45;		OES/HS appears to agree in principal, but not to the 10 day/45 day timeframe.	Implemented by new DEM administration
E 1.b.	– Mayor's Office should receive immediate reports after drills automatically and all other follow-up reports;		_________? ________?	Implemented by new DEM administration
E 1.c	- After Action Reports should be provided to Disaster Council		Would not provide After Action Report to Disaster Council for security reasons.	Implemented by new DEM administration
Finding E.1	After Action Reports: Delay in undermines ability of city leaders to understand operational issues at departmental levels.	Disaster Council	AGREE	
E1.a.	Recommendations: –follow-up speeded up written comments in 10 days, report available in		AGREE	Implemented by DEM

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations **2005-2006 CGJ**	**Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury**	**Pertinent Responses**	**Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries**
	45;			Implemented by DEM
E 1.b.	– Mayor's Office should receive immediate reports after drills automatically and all other follow-up reports;		AGREE	
E 1.c	- After Action Reports should be provided to Disaster Council		AGREE	Implemented by DEM
Finding E.1	After Action Reports: Delay in undermines ability of city leaders to understand operational issues at departmental levels.	San Francisco Fire Department	AGREE	
E1.a.	Recommendations: –follow-up speeded up written comments in 10 days, report available in 45;		AGREE	Implemented by DEM
E 1.b.	– Mayor's Office should receive immediate reports after drills automatically and all other follow-up reports;		AGREE	Implemented by DEM
E 1.c.	- After Action Reports should be provided to Disaster Council		AGREE	Implemented by DEM

Section F: COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

REPORT I. DISASTER PLANNING: THE REALTIES OF EMERGENCY/DISASTER MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations **2005-2006 CGJ**	**Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury**	**Pertinent Responses**	**Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries**
Finding F.1. F-1	Communication: Problems with the hospital phone equipment, siren system and 911. Recommendations: Establish communications work plan for phones, sirens and 311 development	Mayor	AGREE	311 System: Implemented Siren Dead Spots: Partially implemented, still problems. Voice over on sirens eligible in many locations. Future Juries should continue to monitor both.
Finding F.2. F-2	No accurate listing of key personnel Recommendation: All depts. maintain and distribute contact list and work schedule/alternates		DISAGREE Mayor has issued directive requiring OES/HS to request and obtain updated key personnel list by July 2006 and quarterly thereafter	Implemented per May 10 Directive. Future Juries should monitor to verify lists updated regularly
Finding F.1. F-1	Communication: Problems with the hospital phone equipment, siren system and 911. Recommendations: Establish communications work plan for phones, sirens and 311 development	Emergency Medical Services (DPH/EMSA)	AGREE EMSA is concerned that there is no way to integrate mutual aid ambulances out of county into EMSA communications.	Future Juries should follow up integration of mutual aid ambulances with SF communication system.
Finding F.2. F-2	No accurate listing of key personnel Recommendation: All depts. maintain and distribute contact list and work schedule/alternates		Not Qualified to Respond EMSA maintains a list and provides to DPH.	

REPORT I. DISASTER PLANNING: THE REALTIES OF EMERGENCY/DISASTER MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations **2005-2006 CGJ**	**Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury**	**Pertinent Responses**	**Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries**
Finding F.1.	Communication: Problems with the hospital phone equipment, siren system and 911.	Office of Emergency Services/Homeland Security (OES/HS) (Now DEM)	__________?	.
F-1	Recommendations: Establish communications work plan for phones, sirens and 311 development		Phone numbers within DPH being addressed by Dept.	311 System: Implemented Siren Dead Spots: Partially implemented, still problems. Voice over on sirens eligible in many locations. Future Juries should continue to monitor both.
Finding F.2.	No accurate listing of key personnel		__________?	
F-2	Recommendation: All depts. maintain and distribute contact list and work schedule/alternates		Mayor maintains lists per Mayor's Directive of May 2006	Implemented per May 10 Directive. Future Juries should monitor to verify lists updated regularly.

Section G: PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Finding: G.1.	Non-emergency cases need to be redirected to alternate sites	Mayor	AGREE	
G.1.a.	Recommendations: Develop Guidelines for treating non-emergency injuries by October 2006, implement by June 2007		Concurs with DPH	Not Implemented: Mayor issued May 23, 2006 Directive requiring formation of Multi Casualty Incident Working Group, but plans are not complete.
G.1.b.	Mass Media Campaign in advance of disaster to inform public of procedures to be followed		Concurs with DPH	

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
G.1.c.	Upgrade www.72.org upgraded to include on non-emergency help		Concurs with DPH	
G.1.d.	Inform public of emergency stations/channels		Working with OES/HS to inform departments on protocols for broadcasting during disaster	
G.1.e.	Expand NERT and other neighborhood programs		Concurs with DPH	
G.1.f.	Alternative medical delivery sites for neighborhoods without hospitals		Concurs with DPH	
Finding G.2.	Schools are a key site to distribute multilingual emergency preparedness information		AGREE	
G.2.	Recommendation: School Program for Emergency Training		Will consider this recommendation in concert with OES/HS and SFUSD	
Finding: G.1.	Non-emergency cases need to be redirected to alternate sites	Department of Public Health, includes Office of Policy and Planning (DPH/OPP)	AGREE	
G.1.a.	Recommendations: Develop Guidelines for treating non-emergency		Developing Multi Casualty Incident Plan by December 31, 2006	Not Implemented: Multi Casualty Incident Plan not complete. Next CGJ

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
	injuries by October 2006, implement by June 2007			should follow up.
G.1.b.	Mass Media Campaign in advance of disaster to inform public of procedures to be followed		Will coordinate with DEM on inclusion of medical provisions in mass media campaign.	Partially Implemented: increase in medical information dispersed re: pandemic flu.
G.1.c.	Upgrade www.72.org to include on non-emergency help prior to disaster		Not appropriate until emergency occurs.	Will not implement; not reasonable.
G.1.d.	Inform public of emergency stations/channels		N/A	
G.1.e.	Expand NERT and other neighborhood programs		AGREE	Still to be Implemented: DPH participating in Neighborhood/Community Planning Work Group. Future Juries should monitor progress.
G.1.f.	Alternative medical delivery sites for neighborhoods without hospitals		OES has hired contractor to determine alternate medical emergency sites.	Still to be Implemented: DPH participating in Resource Planning Work Group on identifying Alternate Sites. Next CGJ should monitor progress.
Finding: G.1.	Non-emergency cases need to be redirected to alternate sites	Emergency Medical Services (DPH/EMSA)	AGREE	
G.1.a.	Recommendations: Develop Guidelines for treating non-emergency injuries by October 2006, implement by June 2007		AGREE, but says to put plan of directing non- emergency cases from hospitals in place will time take time-consuming research and planning.	Not Implemented: Multi Casualty Incident Plan not complete. Next CGJ should follow up.

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
G.1.b.	Mass Media Campaign in advance of disaster to inform public of procedures to be followed		Need to coordinate with the regional media market	
G.1.c.	Upgrade www.72.org to include on non-emergency help prior to disaster		Should be reviewed by Medico-legal authority before implementing	Not Implemented: EMSA believes can be implemented with medical/legal review. Future Juries should follow up.
G.1.d.	Inform public of emergency stations/channels		All stations should receive same information.	Not Implemented: EMSA believes all stations should receive same information. Future Juries should follow up.
G.1.e.	Expand NERT and other neighborhood programs		EMSA requesting additional resources to maintain registry of seniors and disabled	EMSA participation: Disaster Registry. Beginning to implement. Future Juries should follow up.
G.1.f.	Alternative medical delivery sites for neighborhoods without hospitals		AGREE	Not implemented to date. Future Juries should follow-up.
Finding: G.1.	Non-emergency cases need to be redirected to alternate sites	Office of Emergency Services/Homeland Security (OES/HS)	_____________?	
G.1.a.	Recommendations: Develop Guidelines for treating non-emergency injuries by October 2006, implement by June 2007		OES/HS supports DPH on convening Mass Casualty Working Group on these issues	Not Implemented: Multi Casualty Incident Plan not complete. Next CGJ should follow up.
G.1.b.	Mass Media Campaign in advance of disaster to inform public of procedures to be followed		OES/HS has launched community outreach program; will work with DPH in an event to disseminate information	Partially Implemented: increase in medical information dispersed re: pandemic flu.

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
G.1.c.	Upgrade www.72.org to include on non-emergency sites prior to disaster		Should be done at the time of an event, not in advance	Will Not Implement; OES shares concerns of DPH about informing public in advance.
G.1.d.	Inform public of emergency stations/channels		OES/HS will use Emergency Alert System	Partially Implemented: Not clear that Emergency Alert System is adequate. Future juries should monitor.
G.1.e.	Expand NERT and other neighborhood programs		OES/HS AGREE and process is underway	Not Implemented: Neighborhood/Community Planning just started; NERT needs to be staffed, funded, and integrated into emergency resource planning and preparedness. Future Juries should monitor.
G.1.f.	Alternative medical delivery sites for neighborhoods without hospitals		OES/HS AGREE and is working with DPH on pre-placement of supplies in neighborhoods.	Partially Implemented: DPH, GSA and DEM working on Resource Planning and logistics.
Finding G.2.	Schools are a key site to distribute multilingual emergency preparedness information		AGREE	
G.2.	Recommendation: School Program for Emergency Training		Should include SFFD NERT program, Red Cross as well as SFUSD	Partially Implemented, but Disaster Registry Information not disseminated; NERT information not disseminated through handouts.

DISASTER PLANNING	Recommendations **2005-2006 CGJ**	**Responding Department 2005-2006 Civil Grand Jury**	**Pertinent Responses**	**Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries**
Finding G.2. G.2.	Schools are a key site to distribute multilingual emergency preparedness information Recommendation: School Program for Emergency Training	San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD)	AGREE	Partially Implemented, but Disaster Registry Information not disseminated; NERT information not disseminated through handouts.
Finding G.2. G.2.	Schools are a key site to distribute multilingual emergency preparedness information Recommendation: School Program for Emergency Training	San Francisco Fire Department	AGREE NERT disaster survival material should be made available to children to take home to parents; SFFD looking for funding to set up kiosks with disaster materials at fire stations	NERT needs to be staffed and funded so that it can conduct activities such as disseminating information in the schools. Future Juries should follow-up.

REPORT II: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY HIGHWAY: POTHOLES OR POSSIBILITIES

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Findings/ Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries

Section 1: DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIS)

Findings 1.a-1.e	Dissatisfaction with DTIS performance . Workload reduced by State, personnel reduced DTIS staff reduced by 100 due to budget cuts Layoffs favor seniority, eliminating new hires with current technology expertise 2005, DTIS under General Services Agency	DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIS) and COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (COIT)	AGREE	
Recommendations 1.1	Train DTIS personnel on project management, not just IT. Professional service contracts should include such.		New vision and strategy approved May 2006. Chief Technology Officer to focus on a project-management methodology after which training can occur. City purchaser will review recommendation on training by professional service. Director drafting Enterprise IT plan, to be completed in 6 months, for review by COIT. Requires approval by Mayor and Bd. of Supervisors and changes in administrative code by Board.	To be Implemented: Long-term project; future Juries should review and assess progress.
1.2	Monitor and evaluate training by contractors.			
1.3	Use hybrid model, centralizing only common functions.			
1.4	IT activities head should be elevated to Chief Information Officer.			Implemented: Executive Director of DTIS is now Chief Information Officer

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Findings/ Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
1.5	Change Administrative Code to strengthen DTIS.		Director DTIS is now Chief Information Officer with authority over general and enterprise depts.	
1.6	Requires adequate funding.			

Section 2: COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (COIT)

Findings 2.a-2.d	Failure to communicate between COIT leadership and staff; inadequate scheduling of meetings; no long range planning; City departments not submitting required folios to COIT	DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIS) and COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (COIT)	AGREE	
Recommendations 2.1	Restructure COIT to policymaking body.		New vision and strategy approved May 2006. COIT, IT and Telecommunications combined; committees will meet monthly; enforcement guidelines will be instituted.	To be Implemented: Follow-up: Long-term project, but future Juries should review and assess initial progress. Implemented: Meetings now held monthly.
2.2	Schedule regular meetings.			
2.3	Amend Code to streamline expenditures.			
2.4	Force Department compliance through budget constraints.			

Section 3: BUDGET AND FINANCE

Findings 3.a-3.d	Citywide IT planning or governance not operating in City; contract review is not centralized; les	DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIS) and	AGREE	

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Findings/ Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
	than 20% of IT money is generated by DTIS; City Departments opt for less expense outside contractors.	COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (COIT)		
Recommendations 3.1	CIO, as part of budget process should review departmental IT plans.		As of June 2007, director of DTIS will be involved in IT budget process. As of July 2008, COIT will chair committee with Mayor's Budget Office and Departments will submit IT plans for review and approval	Recommendation To Be Implemented: Next CGJ should follow up progress of assessing smaller departments needs.
3.2	Review all City IT contracts		COIT will review all contracts.	Partially Implemented and To Be Implemented: Next CGJ should follow up progress of inventory control.
3.3	COIT should be recognized as IT policy making for all City Departments		Consistent with new vision and strategy approved May 2006, code will be changed	To be Implemented in the Future: Future Juries should follow up progress
3.4	Functions to be centralized in DTIS		Consistent with new vision and strategy approved May, 2006, but leaves department specific functions in departments	
3.5	DTIS to assist smaller departments		Assessing needs.	Requires Further Analysis: Future Juries should follow up progress of assessing if IT centralized.
3.6	Inventory all City's IT holdings		In progress.	

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Findings/ Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries

Section 4: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GOVERNANCE

Findings 4.a-b	DTIS is viewed as a department and CIO is not recognized as having authority over other departments IT functions; City departments have sought IT solutions from outside contractors because of expertise and high costs of utilizing DTIS	DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIS) and COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (COIT)	AGREE	
Recommendations 4.1	CIO should be Mayoral Cabinet position with technical expertise, long-term contract position, organizational ability		Consistent with new vision and strategy approved May, 2006. Chris Vein appointed to CIO to oversee all IT in City.	Requires Further Analysis: Future Juries should follow up progress
4.2	Adopt specific short-range IT plan, back up with resources		Consistent with new vision and strategy approved May 2006, but must be evolving and requires support of Mayor, Board & Depts.	Requires Further Analysis: future Juries should follow up to assess including name and function change of DTIS, institution of committees and support groups, progress of budget oversight.
4.3	Rename DTIS and redefine powers		Name will be changed; Code will be changed to support enterprise responsibilities.	
4.4	New DTIS should combine centralized and decentralized functions		Model approved that centralizes enterprise functions in new enterprise department with specific-department functions left to departments Model approved and implementation being planned	

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Findings/ Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
4.5	Recommend support groups – citywide policy group, interdepartmental group, technical advisory group		CIO will review all department IT plans under new position	Implemented: new structure and support group
4.6	Tie departmental IT plans to budget process overseen by CIO			
4.7	Tie department IT plans to budget process		New subcommittee on Planning and Budget formed	To Be Implemented: Future Juries should follow-up if departmental IT plans tied to budget process overseen by CIO.

Section 5: LEADERSHIP

Findings 5.a-d	CIO had not been established at date of report; Department Head of DTIS does not have authority to oversee other department's IT; DTIS directorship changes hands frequently; salary inadequate	DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIS) and COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (COIT)	AGREE	
Recommendations 5.1	Elevate DTIS Executive Direction to CIO		Implemented	Partially Implemented: DTIS Executive Director, now, Chief Information Officer, and a Department IV Department Head.
5.2	Reclassify position to Department Head V		Implemented	
5.3	Provide CIO with authority to oversee all aspects of IT.		Changes to Administrative Code underway to strengthen CIO's position.	

REPORT II: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY HIGHWAY: POTHOLES OR POSSIBILITIES

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Findings/ Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
Findings 1 through Findings 5	See above	MAYOR	AGREE	
Recommendations 1-3; 4.2-4-7	See above		Mayor agrees with the responses of Chris Vein, Executive Director of DTIS.	
Recommendation 4.1	CIO should be Mayoral Cabinet position with technical expertise, long-term contract position, organizational ability		Needs further review after implementation of enterprise technology plan; Controller and City Administrator terms exceed that of Mayor to elevate CIO would require voter approval.	Follow-up: Has Mayor revisited proposal to elevate position and seek voter approval of longer term.
Recommendation 5.1 and 5.2	Elevate DTIS Executive Direction to CIO; Reclassify position to Department Head V		Needs further review. Upgraded to Department Head IV; V will be revisited after implementation of plan	

Office of General Services and Office of Contract Administration responded in agreement with the responses of DTIS and COIT.

REPORT III. OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR-RECORDER: REDUCING THE 4-YEAR BACKLOG

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries

Section 1: MOST CRITICAL CONCERNS: ASSESSMENT BACKLOGS

Finding 1-1a	Backlog of properties needing appraisal, including new properties, exceeds comparable counties.	ASSESSOR	AGREE	
Recommendation 1-1a	Commit to clear backlog in 24 months, with highest value property first.		Recommendation implemented March 2006.	
Finding 1-1b	Backlog cleared by hiring needed staff.		AGREE	Future Juries should verify that additional permanent staff has been hired and data systems integrated
Recommendation	Need to hire 5 new appraisers and 2 clerks		Recommendation implemented Hired temporary to process at least non-complex transactions timely.	
Finding 1-1c	Backlog team of key appraisers oversee project		AGREE Recommendation will be implemented. Assessor has improved data integration between the two data systems.	
Recommendation	Measure productivity of team			
Finding 1-2a.	Change of ownership/sale price recorded at close of escrow		AGREE	
Finding 1-2b	Delay in Assessor input		AGREE	

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
	can be up to three years			
Recommendation	Complete process in timely manner – in weeks for non-complex properties		Recommendation implemented Hired temporary to process at least non-complex transactions timely	
Finding 1-2	Board of Equalization reviews Assessor every five years; 2004 review limited; 2005 review to be published in 2006 Assessor has yet to implement recommendations from 2002 review		DISAGREE Many BOE recommendations have been implemented; others are ongoing and will be implemented in the future.	Future Juries should monitor Board of Equalization reviews and inquire about compliance
Recommendation	Promptly comply with Board of Equalization's recommendations		Will be implemented in the future; ongoing	
Recommendation	Ask BOE to re-survey Assessor to assure compliance before next scheduled review (2010)			

Section 2: OFFICE PROCEDURES

Findings 2-1a-b	Office (OAR) has no desk manual	ASSESSOR	AGREE	
Recommendations	Establish and distribute desk manuals and conduct training.		Implemented. July 06 electronic desk manual Distributed, updates will be continued.	

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
Findings 2-2 a-b	No standardized procedures and record keeping and no quality control		AGREE	
Recommendation	Include standards for appraisal in desk manual, develop quality control program and implement standards for record keeping		New performance measures being followed. Appraisers follow Revenue and Taxation Code. Standards Unit developing manual of appraisal guidelines and provides guidance.	Next CGJ should ascertain whether Standards and Quality Control continues to develop new quality control measurements and whether they are being followed.
Findings 2-3	No performance standards for appraisal positions.		AGREE	
Recommendations	Standards and Quality Control Group should develop performance standards to measure quality and productivity of individual appraisers; implement an employee performance evaluation based on this.		Implemented: Reviews of appraisers each July. Recommendation being implemented. Planning workshops provided to all supervisors; department finalizing defined performance measures for each employee.	
Finding 2-4	Cross train staff to meet seasonal needs		AGREE	
Recommendations	Job descriptions and labor agreements should provide for cross training		Not Yet Implemented: OAR working with HR on new classification study to be complete by	Next CGJ should ascertain whether Assessor and Human Resources have completed classification study and

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
			November 2006	revised job descriptions.
Findings 2-5 a-b	Job descriptions out of date and do not follow Civil Service requirements		AGREE	
Recommendations	Bring job descriptions up to date and work with HR		Not Yet Implemented: OAR working with HR on new procedure for updating job descriptions for appraisers and auditors to be complete by November 2006.	
Findings 2-6a-b	DBI provides OAR with new construction data weekly, floor plans must be requested		AGREE	
Recommendation	DBI should provide floor plans weekly. DBI is evaluating new computer systems		Not Yet Implemented: Still working with DBI to receive timely dates.	Future Juries should ascertain if DBI has improved computer system so that data can be transmitted to the Assessor in a timely manner
Finding 2-7	DBI should select system to interface with OAR's		AGREE	
Recommendation	Cost estimates of construction are sometimes used to base new assessment		Not Yet Implemented: see above	
Findings 2-8 a-b	OAR should send questionnaire to property owners to ascertain actual cost of		AGREE	

REPORT III. OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR-RECORDER: REDUCING THE 4-YEAR BACKLOG

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
Recommendation	construction.		Implemented: All property owners currently receiving questionnaires or self-reporting forms.	
Findings 2-6a-b	DBI provides OAR with new construction data weekly, floor plans must be requested	DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION	DBI providing OAR with microfilm rolls of plans monthly, and equipment to retrieve DBI records. DBI does not have digitized copies of plans.	
Recommendations	DBI should provide floor plans weekly.			
Finding 2-7	DBI is evaluating new computer systems		DBI assessing new computer system and by fall 2006 should be able to provide OAR with digitized drawings and provide access of images.	
Recommendation	DBI should select system to interface with OAR's			

Section 3: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Findings 3-1 a-c	Record System: There is no user manual for EZ Access program in office, no programming staff for EZ Access. Staff appears not to have mastered program	ASSESSOR	AGREE OAR has obtained user manual	
Recommendations	Obtain manual; educate staff, then study program to ascertain if it should be enhanced.		Implemented: Have obtained User Manual.	
Finding 3-2	OAR is considering		AGREE	

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
	purchase of new system to replace EZ Access (cost of EZ Access $5.7 million)			
Recommendation	Do not purchase new system until EZ Access assessed		Implemented: Is not buying new system at this time.	
Finding 3-3	Separate recording systems are not compatible with EZ Access		AGREE	
Recommendation	Obtain programming assistance to update all programs so they are compatible		Requires Further Analysis: Need funding to obtain program assistance.	

Section 4: STAFFING

Findings 4-1 a-b	OAR is not fully staffed, short 28 unfilled positions	ASSESSOR	AGREE	
Recommendations	OAR should determine staffing needs, seek to employ only needed personnel; fill seven positions to reduce backlog.		Implemented: OAR has budgeted for needed staff and is working with HR. (Has retained City Attorney to handle complex appeals.)	
Findings 4-2 a-b	OAR lacks qualified mid-level appraisers; new Administration HR		AGREE	

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
	policy should streamline hiring practices			
	OAR should hire experienced mid-level appraisers and try to implement 60-day hiring process		Implemented: OAR working with HR to identify new hires and reduce hiring time	

Section 5: BACKLOG OF APPEALS

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
Findings 5-l a-b	Negotiations with taxpayers are inconsistent, leading to unnecessary appeals; of 1700 assessment appeals in 2004-2005, 70% were resolved without a hearing.	ASSESSOR	DISAGREE	
Recommendation	Office policy should encourage resolution without hearing.		In the Process of Implementation: Assessor's Standards is developing database. Have real estate market data, documentation and databases. Assessor's representative will present all cases to the Assessment Appeals Board.	Future Juries should review record of success of Assessor's Appeals to ascertain if those representing Assessor's Office have been prepared, have proper documentation, have conducted discover, have appropriate expert witness and outside consultant if necessary.
Findings 5-2 a-c	OAR often lacks appropriate cap rate documentation; appeals would be more successful if historical documentation improved; OAR lacks adequate quality control and consistency on appeals		DISAGREE	

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
Recommendation	OAR should have adequate documentation and develop data base to establish office standard for all appeals		Implemented: Assessor has backed up data documentation and databases	
Finding 5-3	Most information before Board is public, but OAR does not keep track so it is available for use in al appeals.		DISAGREE	
Recommendation	Maintain records of appeals and use EZ Access to store and coordinate data.		Implemented: Has record of information used in Assessment Appeals, stores records in files or on EZ Access. Is pursuing purchase of document retrieval	
Findings 5-4 a-c	OAR has difficulty with high-end appeals, uses inadequate expert witnesses, and brings in outside counsel too late.		AGREE	
Recommendation	Assure quality of expert witnesses and private counsel and hire timely.		Not implemented: Recent case have not required outside consultants or witnesses.	
Finding 5-5	Number of OAR appeal staff inadequate		AGREE	
Recommendation	Outsource appeals when necessary		Will Implemented when needed: Assessor hiring new consultants that are more qualified.	
Findings: 5-6a-b	OAR at a disadvantage		AGREE	

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
	at hearings -- does not conduct pre-hearing discovery and may not have paper work at hearing.			
Recommendations	Appeal staff must be trained on effective advocacy and conduct pre-hearing discovery.		Implemented: Every auditor required to take public speaking course and receive advanced training.	

Section 6: ADDITIONAL CONCERNS

Finding 6-1	OAR now using the resources of the California Assessors' Association	ASSESSOR	AGREE	
Recommendation	OAR should actively participate in the Association		Current Assessor has attends conferences and is active participant	
Finding 6-2	OAR had not published annual report until 2005. Now filing and will continue to do so.		AGREE	
Recommendation	OAR should continue to publish thorough annual report and make it available on Web site.		Implemented: Will continue to publish report annually.	
Findings 6-3 a-c	OAR must keep training up to date or loose certification; 40% deficient in 2005;		AGREE	

ASSESSOR BACKLOG	Findings/ Recommendations to 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
	appraisers with Advanced Certificates need fewer hours of continuing education.			
Recommendation	Require appraisers to bring continuing education requirements up to date with twelve months; do not allow appraisers to fall behind in future; include this as requirement in job description.		Implemented: Most appraisers and auditors are now current	

REPORT IV. IDENTITY THEFT: HOW WELL IS THE CITY AND COUNTY COPING?

IDENTIFY THEFT	Findings/ Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
Finding 1	Department of Health maintains information technology operation and keeps personal records on patients. There is no clause protecting confidentiality with Bank of America, which handles cash and credit card transaction for department.	MAYOR CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	AGREE, but contract is with Tax Collector, not department of Health	Mayor stated on July 21, 2006, that the Treasurer's Office was in the process of correcting RFP with Bank of America. As of June 5, 2007 this still was not done. Jury asks Mayor to follow up. Requests the next CGJ to follow up.
Finding 2 Finding 3 Finding 4 Finding 5 Finding 6 Finding 7	The following departments have wisely chosen to contract out credit card processing to nationally-recognized firms specializing in Web-based remittance processing: Treasurer & Tax Collector Parking & Traffic Parking Citations Payroll Police. Accordingly, no known instances of identity theft have been caused by City/County of S.F.		Not Applicable to Mayor, applicable to Treasurer AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE Not Applicable to Mayor, applicable to departments	

IDENTIFY THEFT	Findings/ Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future Civil Grand Juries
Recommendation 2	Civil Grand Jury recommended City continue to handle sensitive data with the same care that is currently the practice	MAYOR	Implemented	Implemented, but if confidentiality clause has not been corrected in Bank Contract, this should be reviewed.
Recommendation 3	A clause protecting confidentiality of City's data should be included in the Department of Public Health's contract with Bank of America		Not Implemented Yet	Not Implemented Yet[9]: Working on new banking contract (Request for Proposals-- RFP) has not been started. Next CGJ should inquire from Treasury Department if new RFP with confidentiality clause is in place.
Finding 1 Recommendation 3	RPF with Bank of America should contain confidentiality clause	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH	AGREE	Cannot Implement, responsibility of Treasurer. See comments above.

[9] Not Implemented as of June 5, 2007.

REPORT V. AFFORDABLE HOUSING BOND PROGRAM: THE DOWN PAYMENT ASSISTANCE LOAN PROGRAM

AFFORDABLE HOUSING BOND	Finding/ Recommendation 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2005 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future CCJs

Section 1: SALES PRICE FOR PROPERTIES

Finding 1	Maximum price set in 2004 overtaken by rising market.	Mayor's Office of Housing with agreement by Mayor	AGREE.	None
Recommendation 1	Should be increased by at least 15% and place available funds ($3.4 million) into community		Have implemented policies and procedures to increase price limits accordingly.	

Section 2: APPLICANT BASIS

Finding 2	Program currently on "first come, first served" basis.	Mayor's Office of Housing with agreement by Mayor	DISAGREE.	None
Recommendation 2	A waiting list should be developed by Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH).		Will Not Be Implemented: Each buyer in program already has time-limited loan commitment from bank. Waiting list would require them to re-qualify and many on list would find other housing.	

REPORT V AFFORDABLE HOUSING BOND PROGRAM: THE DOWN PAYMENT ASSISTANCE LOAN PROGRAM

AFFORDABLE HOUSING BOND	Findings/Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for future CGJs

Section 3: FUND SIZE

Finding 3	Fund is too small to address need.	Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) with agreement by Mayor	AGREE	
Recommendation 3	Mayor and Board should sponsor ballot proposition for bond to fund DALP but also audit past housing bonds and have plan for future needs.		Needs Further Analysis: MOH exploring other options such as redevelopment plans to help low-income persons, especially first time homebuyers. .	Next Civil Grand Jury: should follow the progress of the Mayor's Housing Proposal and the Supervisors Housing Proposal and whether down-payment assistance for low –income first time homebuyers has increased.

Section 4: MAYOR'S REPORT

Finding 4	Mayor's Office has not filed annual DALP reports since 2002.	Mayor's Office	AGREE	None
Recommendation 4	These past reports should be filed with the Board.		Will not be Implemented: Bond legislation does not require these reports.	

JAIL INSPECTION	Findings/ Recommendations 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Juries

Section 1: FACILITIES

Finding and Recommendation 1.1	Women's sections unacceptably crowded, but planning move to new facility.	SHERIFF	AGREE. Implemented. Women have now been moved from Jails #1 and #2 to Jail #8 at 425 7th Street.	None City should continue to seek funding for cooling system on top floors and for help with an acoustical expert to reduce noise level.
Finding and Recommendation 1.2	1.2 Ventilation problems in Jails #1 and #2 causing great discomfort to staff and inmates. Cooling system should be replaced.	SHERIFF	AGREE Would like to Implement: Will continue to advocate for repair.	Future Civil Grand Juries should investigate if there is a short time affordable "band aid" for the cooling/ventilation system in Jails #1 and #2 because the estimates of $1,000,000 to fix heating and ventilation systems in building that is to be replaced in ten to fifteen years is not cost effective.

JAIL INSPECTION	Recommendations of 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
Finding and Recommendation 1.2	1.2 Ventilation problems in Jails #1 and #2 causing great discomfort to staff and inmates. Cooling system should be replaced.	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	AGREE Being Implemented: Work on replacing cooling tower at the Hall of Justice to be completed by November 2007 will not affect floors 6 and 7 and, therefore, Jails #1 and #2 will have no relief. Hall of Justice cooling tower is being replaced, complete by Nov 2007, affecting basement through 5th floor, not 6th and 7th, which have heating and ventilating but no cooling system. $30,000 has been approved for cleaning these systems but it would require up to $1,000,000 to fully upgrading these top floors.	Future Civil Grand Juries should investigate if there is a short time affordable “band aid” for the cooling/ventilation system in Jails #1 and #2 because the estimates of $1,000,000 to fix heating and ventilation systems in building that is to be replaced in ten to fifteen years is not cost effective.
Finding and Recommendation 1.3	1.3 Environment drab and noisy. City should budget for better acoustics, colors, and possibly displaying prisoners’ art.	SHERIFF	PARTIALLY AGREE Agree that acoustical improvement is needed; recommendation will require further study because DPW has not done analysis Disagree and Will Not Implement: Too difficult to paint in overcrowded jail facility. Disagree and Will Not Implement: Not within standard security precautions to hang art on prison walls.	
Finding and Recommendation 1.3	1.3 Environment drab and noisy. City should budget for better acoustics, colors, and possibly displaying prisoners’ art.	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	DPW has no funding for acoustical improvement; colors and artwork not the responsibility of DPW	

JAIL INSPECTION	Recommendations of 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries

Section 2: STAFFING

Findings and Recommendations 2.1	Unfilled positions adversely affect jails. Need coordinated recruitment outreach plan.	SHERIFF	AGREE Implemented	None
Findings and Recommendations 2.2	Should consult with DTIS for maximum exposure	SHERIFF	DISAGREE: Sheriff's Dept has had comprehensive recruitment plan for 26 years and is recognized as leader in recruiting women and minorities despite lack of funding. Will be Implemented In the Future: Funds requested in 07-08 Budget for computer website and outreach.	

Section 3: POST-RELEASE PROGRAMS

Finding and Recommendation 3.1	Post-release funds and organization non-existing . Mayor and Board of Supervisors should fund project to reduce recidivism, coordinating with governmental and community agencies. Could save enough money in law enforcement to cover costs of the program.	SHERIFF	AGREE. Implemented: Different program funded. No Violence Alliance. By March 2006, 100 ex-offenders have been served. Statistics measuring effectiveness are being collected.	Future Civil Grand Juries should investigate and monitor programs to reduce recidivism and assess each year the percent of recidivism to determine if programs are working. Successful programs should be sufficiently funded.

JAIL INSPECTION	Recommendations of 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
Finding and Recommendation 3.1	Post-release funds and organization non-existing . Mayor and Board of Supervisors should fund project to reduce recidivism, coordinating with governmental and community agencies. Could save enough money in law enforcement to cover costs of the program.	MAYOR	AGREE. Sheriff's Dept working with District Attorney and Public Defender to design a coordinated reentry effort.	Future Civil Grand Juries should investigate and monitor programs to reduce recidivism and assess each year the percent of recidivism to determine if programs are working. Successful programs should be sufficiently funded.

CONTINUITY REPORT	Recommendations of 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries

Section 1: Civil Grand Jury Tracking Document

Finding 1.1	The responses to the development of a Tracking Document form the Mayor and the Controller was positive.	CONTROLLER	AGREE	See Section I. of 2006-2007 Continuity Report
Recommendation 1.a.	Mayor's and Controller's Tracking Documents should be put on-line and updated as a working document.		Implemented: Controller's Office Tracking Document went on line November 2006	
Finding 1.2	In the past, no coordinate process existed for CGJ, Controller and Mayor to work together to monitor recommendations and responses		AGREE	
Recommendation 1.b.	System to update progress on recommendations coordinated with Mayor and Controller should be developed to track progress on whether recommendation implemented, still in process, requires further study, abandoned.		Implemented: The Controller now maintains a system to update progress on CGJ recommendations. Will issue annual updated Status Reports that will be posted on website	
Finding 1-3	Responses to CGJ reports may lack specificity regarding implementation		AGREE	

REPORT VII. CONTINUITY REPORT

CONTINUITY REPORT	Recommendations of 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
Recommendation 1.c.	Board should hold annual hearing on CGJ recommendations that are still pending or more than two years old.		Will Not Implement – does not apply to Controller	
Recommendation 1.d.	Controller and/or mayor should provide information to CGJ regarding scheduled City departmental meetings when topics related to past CGJ recommendations are part of agenda.		Will Not Implement: Does not receive materials on meetings, so cannot forward to CGJ	
Finding 1-4	Board of Supervisors is required to respond when recommendations address personnel or budgetary issues. In the past, responses have not provided specific direction to those responsible for implementation nor requested accountability from respondents.		Not Applicable to Controller	

CONTINUITY REPORT	Recommendations of 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
Recommendation 1.c.	Board should hold annual hearing on CGJ	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	No responses received	See Section I. B. of 2006-2007 Continuity Report
Finding 1.4	Board of Supervisors is required to respond when recommendations address personnel or budgetary issues. In the past, responses have not provided specific direction to those responsible for implementation nor requested accountability from respondents.			

Section 3: DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

Finding 3.1	DBI plans to complete new permit tracking system by August 2006	DBI	PARTIALLY DISAGREE Disagree with timeline. Proposals due September 2006. After that will take two years to implement.	Future Civil Grand Juries should assess whether revised ethical codes have been implemented and area effective.
Finding 3.2	DBI staff lack technical skills necessary to implement new permit tracking system and quality control and quality assurance programs including random secondary field inspection.	DBI	DISAGREE DBI staff is capable of participating implementation.	
Finding 3.3	DBI hired a manager for developing IT training for all	DBI	AGREE	

CONTINUITY REPORT	Recommendations of 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
	staff			
Finding 3.4	Code of Professional Conduct is being modified and has not been implemented.		DISAGREE DBI issued and implemented Code of Professional Conduct on June 23, 2006.	
Finding 3.5	DBI submitted SIA to Ethics Commission, but not yet approved		AGREE	
Finding 3.6	DBI has hired two analysts to develop and implement quality control and quality assurance programs.		AGREE	
Finding 3.7	An update of strategic plan is due November 2006.		AGREE	
Recommendation 3.a.	Acting Director should set a timeline for meeting with officials of the affected unions and finalizing a draft of the policies and guidelines of the Code of Professional Conduct.		Implemented: DBI finalized Code June 23, 2006 and revised in September 2006.	
Recommendation 3.b.	SIA should be approved by Ethics Commission within 90 days. Training program should be implemented.		Implemented: Ethics Commission after modifications approved in September 2006.	
Recommendation 3.c.	Mayor and Boars should support Acting Director to		Will be Implemented: Will continue to work with Board and Mayor	

CONTINUITY REPORT	Recommendations of 2005-2006 CGJ	Responding Department to 2005-2006 CGJ	Pertinent Responses	Recommended Follow-up for Future Civil Grand Juries
	assure that progress continues and recommendations are implemented.			
Recommendation 3.b.	SIA should be approved by Ethics Commission within 90 days. Training program should be implemented	ETHICS COMMISSION	Ethics Commission after modifications approved in September 2006.	

IV. CHART OF REQUIRED RESPONSES

Recommendations:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Requires Response within 90 days:										
Board of Supervisors			●	●						
Requires Response within 60 days:										
The Mayor					●	●	●			
Adult Probation								●	●	●
Board of Education; Unified School District								●		
Board of the Community College; Chancellor, City College									●	●
Office of the Controller	●	●				●	●			
Office of the Treasurer						●	●			
Sheriff's Department								●	●	●

APPENDIX A: SOURCES CONSULTED/BIBLIOGRAPHY

Interviews and resources incorporated by reference, Appendix pages II-VII to **"**Preparing for a Disaster: Administrative Commitment and Appropriate Funding in the Department of Emergency Management and the Department of Public Health," 2006-2007 Civil Grand Jury, released in July 2007.

INTERVIEWS, TELECONS OR CORRESPONDENCE WITH REPRESENTATIVES FROM:

City and County of San Francisco, Office of the Controller

City and County of San Francisco, Office of the Treasurer's and Tax Collector

City and County of San Francisco, Sheriff's Department

City and County of San Francisco, Office of the Assessor-Recorder

City and County of San Francisco,
Department of Telecommunications and Information Services

Mayor's Office of Housing

HEARINGS, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON 2005-2006 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORTS

June 12, 2006; July 24, 2006; August 14, 2006; September 11, 2006

CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT AND RESPONSES:

"Board of Supervisors: Status of the Implementation of the Recommendations of the San Francisco Civil Grand Juries for Fiscal years 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-0," prepared by the Office of the Controller's, City and County of San Francisco, April 6, 2007.

Civil Grand Jury Reports, 2005-2006, City and County of San Francisco.

Responses to Civil Grand Jury Reports, 2005-2006, City and County of San Francisco.

RESOURCES – STATE OF CALIFORNIA

California Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05

OTHER RESOURCES:

San Francisco Chronicle, "Building Agency Head Plans New Ethics Rules," September 9, 2006.