

2018-2019 CONTINUITY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The San Luis Obispo County Grand Jury (Grand Jury) has no enforcement powers, but its mission is to shed light on various issues. The Continuity Report reviews the required responses to previously published Grand Jury Reports for adequacy, completeness and timeliness. If an agency agreed to make a change by a certain date, the Grand Jury seeks confirmation. This monitoring ensures compliance.

This is an informational report providing a summary of findings and recommendations made by the 2017-2018 Grand Jury, including updates on the status of open recommendations noted in prior continuity reports.

ORIGIN

A continuity report is traditionally prepared by each year's Grand Jury.

AUTHORITY

California Penal Code section 933.05 prescribes responses to findings and recommendations. Responding agencies are directed to report whether they agree or disagree (either partially or wholly) with a finding and whether a recommendation has been implemented, will be implemented, will not be implemented, or requires further analysis. If an agency rejects a Grand Jury recommendation, they are required to provide an explanation, citing why it is either unwarranted or unreasonable. If they respond that the recommendation requires further analysis, a timeframe within six months in which such analysis will be carried out must be included with the

response.¹ The Grand Jury posts all its reports and each agency's responses online each year at <https://www.slo.courts.ca.gov/gi/jury-grandjury.htm>.

NARRATIVE

The 2017-2018 Grand Jury issued six investigative reports that required responses from relevant agencies. The 2018-2019 Grand Jury reviewed all responses from all agencies in preparing this continuity report.

REPORT 1: "Our County Can Do Better: The Crisis Inside the Walls of the Psychiatric Health Facility"

REPORT 2: "A Look at County Behavioral Health Services: A Time for Improvement is Now"

REPORT 3: "Inspection Report for San Luis Obispo County Detention Facilities"

REPORT 4: "Safeguarding the Public's Health"

REPORT 5: "Moving the Dial at the County Jail: The Goal of Reducing Recidivism"

REPORT 6: "Is There a Health Risk from the Dunes? 'The Answer My Friend is Blowing in the Wind'"

¹ California Penal Code 933.05:

(a) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:

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

(b) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

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

2017-2018 GRAND JURY REPORTS

Link to all 2017-2018 Grand Jury reports and responses:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1FzAfNMnFmGOd6amF4dE1YBKEkSENVAtx>

(In some cases agency responses have been summarized, and not all responses are included in this report. Full responses are available at the Grand Jury's website.)

REPORT 1: "Our County Can Do Better: The Crisis Inside the Walls of the Psychiatric Health Facility"

Link to full report:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/15wkyFVs0yByyfXsxEvFJIaNGks7s2lvA/view>

This report was originated by the 2017-2018 Grand Jury members based upon citizen complaints and recent events concerning the treatment of behavioral health patients within the county. This was the first inspection of the Psychiatric Health Facility (PHF) in recent years. The 2017-2018 Grand Jury found the PHF to be a 16-bed antiquated facility that does not meet the crisis needs of the county's mentally ill population and committed staff members. Eight findings and six recommendations were made.

The County of San Luis Obispo Health Agency (Health Agency) was required to respond to six findings and six recommendations, all of which were received in a timely manner. They agreed with one of those findings, partially disagreed with four findings, and disagreed with one finding. Two recommendations were implemented, one was partially implemented, and three were not implemented.

Link to Health Agency responses:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Sbiyyu-uIR0kNd8r680dFqAfDH0ebnfG/view>

The San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors (BoS) was required to respond to two recommendations: one recommendation will be implemented, and one will not.

Link to BoS responses:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Yp6tX7LjXnJIy_fuQar6i0g_MqjvJFzF/view

Respondents	Findings Agreed with	Findings Partially Agreed with	Findings Not Agreed with	Total	Follow Up Recommended
Health Agency	F6		F2, F3, F4, F5, F7	6	
BoS					

Respondents	Recommendations Implemented	Recommendations to be Implemented	Recommendations Not Implemented	Require Further Analysis	Total	Follow Up Recommended
Health Agency	R1, R2	R4, R5	R3, R6		6	R2
BoS	R2		R3		2	

(In some cases agency responses have been summarized, and not all responses are included in this report. Full responses are available at the Grand Jury’s website.)

The Health Agency partially disagreed with:

Finding 2: The PHF facility is woefully inadequate for a psychiatric hospital.

Health Agency response: “The respondent disagrees partially with the finding. The Psychiatric Facility has consistently passed all licensing reviews for both condition and safety.”

Finding 3: There is not enough room for the programs and therapies required towards a goal of recovery; a separate and dedicated area is lacking for both treatment rooms and physical exercise.

Health Agency response: “The respondent partially disagrees with this finding. The Psychiatric Facility has consistently passed all licensing reviews for both condition and safety.”

Finding 7: The outdoor area is inadequate for the number of patients served and doesn’t provide space for exercise.

Health Agency response: “The respondent partially disagrees with this finding. The Psychiatric Facility has consistently passed all licensing reviews for both condition and safety.”

The Grand Jury recognizes the PHF meets licensing requirements but suggests that an expansion of space could provide a more therapeutic environment for patients and staff. The responses do not address the issues raised by the Grand Jury.

The Health Agency disagreed with:

Finding 5: In the event of an emergency requiring evacuation during the night or evening, the required staffing is insufficient for the safety of the patients, staff, and community. In an area-wide emergency, law enforcement may not be able to respond.

Health Agency response: “The respondent disagrees with this finding. The Psychiatric Facility has consistently passed all licensing reviews for both condition and safety.”

The Grand Jury considers that staff and patient safety are a concern during the night shift. Law enforcement response to an emergency may not be timely and minimal staff are available to manage patients during an emergency.

The Health Agency partially implemented:

Recommendation 1: Even though the PHF second and third shifts meet minimum State standards, staffing levels should be increased for staff, patient, and community safety reasons.

Health Agency response: “This recommendation has been partially implemented through the addition of permanent resources to the PHF in each of the past 5 years. The Department will continue to evaluate staffing needs at the PHF.”

Recommendation 2: The San Luis Obispo County Jail should have its own dedicated psychiatric hospital facility, serving only inmates. This would limit the number of inmates admitted as patients in the PHF. When inmates are admitted to the new PHF, a correctional deputy should be assigned.

Health Agency response: “The recommendation has been partially implemented. The Sheriff’s Office is in the process of establishing a behavioral health unit at the jail for inmates.”

Board of Supervisors response: “The Sheriff’s office is in the process of establishing a behavioral health unit at the jail for inmates that will provide intensive day treatment services. The facility is anticipated to open in FY 2018-19. Additionally, through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process for jail healthcare services, the County included an option for proposals to estimate the cost of staffing and operating a psychiatric health facility at the jail.”

2018-2019 Grand Jury notes that the new behavioral health unit will open May 1, 2019. Future Grand Juries should review how the opening of the new behavioral health unit at the jail impacts the PHF.

The Health Agency will not implement:

Recommendation 3: The County should find or build a new psychiatric hospital facility, with sufficient room for patient treatment and recovery. Funding could come from reserves sources (County and/or MHSA [Mental Health Services Act]) or pursuing a state grant.

Health Agency response: “Recommendation will not be implemented at this time as it is not feasible. If new grants, state, or federal funds become available this option will be evaluated.”

Board of Supervisors response: “This recommendation will not be implemented at this time as it is not feasible. If new funding becomes available or current funding can be redirected, this option will be evaluated. The County is committed to maintaining and improving the existing Psychiatric Health facility (PHF).”

Recommendation 6: The facility should annex additional area from the adjacent County facilities, adding the treatment and therapy environments to improve effectiveness and safety.

Health Agency response: “The recommendation will not be implemented, as it is not feasible. If new grants, State, or Federal funds become available this option will be evaluated.”

The Grand Jury recognizes the difficulty inherent in obtaining funding, but appreciates the county’s commitment to maintaining and improving the existing facility.

REPORT 2: “A Look at County Behavioral Health Services: A Time for Improvement is Now”

Link to full report:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1F9Reoi_eBj1ebT1dI34xKNH6lgAA2mOF/view

This report examined the San Luis Obispo County Behavioral Health Department. The 2017-2018 Grand Jury investigated the services provided through Behavioral Health by interviewing a wide spectrum of employees, private mental health professionals, and representatives from local non-profit agencies with behavioral health ties. Through these interviews, document review, and facility inspections, the Grand Jury discovered that the County provides programs and services to Medi-Cal beneficiaries among the population of over 5,000 residents with severe mental illness. Twelve findings and seven recommendations were made.

The County of San Luis Obispo Health Agency was required to respond to nine findings and seven recommendations. They agreed with six findings and partially agreed with three findings; two recommendations have been implemented and five recommendations will not be implemented.

Link to Health Agency response:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1kSM6q2AsX4ipt_gY7qlOEJoJvf-XVIN9/view

The San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors was required to respond to two findings and five recommendations. They agreed with one finding and partially disagreed with one finding; one recommendation will be implemented and four will not be implemented.

Link to BoS response:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_ousUr9hmB3ks3ZgDS63rKDrSBJx9rHr/view

Respondents	Finding Agreed with	Finding Partially Agreed with	Findings Not Agreed with	Total	Follow Up Recommended
BoS	F3,	F1		2	
Health Agency	F3, F5, F6, F9, F10, F12	F1, F4, F8		9	

Respondents	Recommendations Implemented	Recommendations to be implemented	Recommendations Not Implemented	Require Further Analysis	Total	Follow Up Recommended
BoS	R7		R1, R2, R5, R6		5	
Health Agency	R3, R7		R1, R2, R4, R5, R6		7	

(In some cases agency responses have been summarized, and not all responses are included in this report. Full responses are available at the Grand Jury’s website.)

The following recommendations will not be implemented:

Recommendation 1: Increase financial support to Behavioral Health from the County General Fund to accomplish the following within the next fiscal year. (Note: Some of this expense is reimbursable by Medi-Cal.):

- a. Reduce the wait time to enter the Full-Service Partnership program from months to weeks.
- b. Add clinicians and case managers to the mental health clinics thereby reducing wait time below the 10-day requirement and reducing the time between maintenance appointments.
- c. Add full time system navigators to all mental health clinics and encourage Cen-Cal (the local Medi-Cal affiliate) to add them at medical clinics.
- d. Add two additional Mental Health Evaluation Teams, one in North County and one in South County.

Health Agency and Board of Supervisors response: “This recommendation will not be implemented as it is not reasonable. The County will continue to seek additional funding sources to expand mental health services through grants, federal, and state funds. Three new case managers for the Adult Mental Health services division are included in the FY 2018-2019 recommended budget, with funding from MHSA. The County recently received a Children’s Triage Grant which will expand crisis response for youth in FY 2018-2019. A Clinician was approved to be added to the San Luis Obispo Police Community Action Team for outreach to homeless and crisis response

and will start during the summer of 2018. The Adult Full-Service Partnership will increase its open caseload to 40 slots at all times, and additional funding for “service slots” will be evaluated through the MHSA stakeholder process.”

The Grand Jury was notified by the Health Agency in March 2019 that current wait times for initial assessment of adult outpatients is 5.53 days and wait times for treatment are 7 days to a second appointment (this data is for January and February 2019).

Recommendation 2: Increase funding and support for the community and supportive housing programs.

Health Agency and Board of Supervisors response: “This recommendation will not be implemented at this time due to fiscal constraints ...”

Recommendation 4: Combine drug and alcohol treatment with mental health treatment, having all clinicians cross-trained to manage dual-diagnosis patients.

Health Agency response: “This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The County’s contracts with the State Department of Health Care Services are very prescriptive for the provision, documentation, and billing for mental health and substance use disorder services. Professional certification and licensure for addiction treatment and for mental health treatment are also specialized and require concentration in specific areas of practice. Clients served within behavioral health may present with needs for co-occurring treatment. Other clients may not be impacted by either substance use disorder or serious mental illness and would not require co-occurring treatment. However, the respondent has increased the number of staff who have training in both mental health and substance use disorder treatment and offers trainings in both specialties to all treatment staff, including contract agency staff.”

The Grand Jury notes that although the Health Agency rejected the recommendation, they stated they have increased the number of staff who have training in both mental health and substance use

disorder services and they offer training in both specialties to all treatment staff. We commend them for this proactive approach.

Recommendation 5: Reorganize the agency to concentrate on the complete behavioral health treatment process.

Health Agency: “This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable. The organization of the agency is not a factor on the ability to provide appropriate treatment services. As reflected in Recommendation 4, the County is obligated to provide specific treatment services based on diagnosis and functional needs to clients through highly regulated and monitored processes.”

Board of Supervisors response: “This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable. The County is obligated to provide specific treatment services based on diagnosis and functional needs to clients through highly regulated and monitored processes.”

Recommendation 6: Use innovation and incentives, such as county backed bonds or tax breaks to support the building of private psychiatric and substance abuse facilities within the county.

Health Agency and Board of Supervisors response: “This recommendation will not be implemented as written. However, the County continuously seeks methods and funding to enhance behavioral health services.”

This is not the first time the Grand Jury has reported on the adequacy of mental health services in our county. The 2014-2015 Grand Jury report, “We Are Waiting: Access to County Provided Mental Health Services,” and the 2017-18 Grand Jury report, “A Look at County Behavioral Health Services: The Time for Improvements is Now,” both addressed the need for improved services, more staff, with a more efficient and effective delivery of mental health services in our county. While it is recognized that significant progress has been made toward improving services, it must be acknowledged that more remains to be done. Mental health and drug abuse are

nationwide problems. We have seen in our own communities the devastation that results from untreated behavioral health problems.

Future Grand Juries are encouraged to follow up on the following issues in the above reports:

- Has the new clinician added to the city of San Luis Obispo's Community Action Team been beneficial to the outreach and the services provided to the homeless population?*
- Has the Children's Triage Grant improved services to the youth population in our county?*
- Were the three clinicians suggested in the 2018 budget recommendations approved and hired?*
- Has the increased substance abuse training within the Health Agency, as cited in the agency responses to the recommendations, been beneficial to the delivery of services to a person seeking/needing treatment for both?*

REPORT 3: "Inspection Report for San Luis Obispo County Detention Facilities"

Link to full report:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ttns-1VyBNF_dHjx3FJnVMZDamIuQRJU/view

This report was based on the 2017-2018 Grand Jury's statutorily required annual inspections of all public prisons, including state prison, county jails, juvenile halls and holding cells utilized by law enforcement and courthouses. The Grand Jury took a detailed look at issues related to changes in population and programming in the County Jail. It specifically focused on housing, food, and transportation of prisoners. Studies were conducted of the medical and mental health treatment of the inmates. This report consisted of 20 findings and 10 recommendations.

The San Luis Obispo County Sheriff was required to respond to 15 findings and nine recommendations, all of which were received in a timely manner. He agreed with six findings and partially agreed with eight; he did not agree with one finding. The Sheriff stated that three recommendations will be implemented, three recommendations will not be implemented, and three recommendations required further analysis.

Link to Sheriff responses:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ssKQwjTaqBrjBceL0Rki_6Vx-9DCRQJM/view

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ckZOVWF5GlzZ9feDHO6mQw9UfCLrw5l0/view>

The San Luis Obispo County Probation Officer was required to respond to one finding and one recommendation. He partially agreed with one finding, and the one recommendation will not be implemented.

Link to County Probation Officer responses:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/17NDoZtm9zOvr6vlyW0fo9UsGeThhFzpn/view>

The San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors was required to respond to two findings and four recommendations. They partially agreed with the two findings; one recommendation will be implemented, two recommendations will not be implemented, and one recommendation required further analysis.

Link to BoS responses:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/12cR4fqKgUjNt4OqUgvpj3xQJ_7f6rW/view

Respondents	Findings Agreed with	Findings Partially Agree With	Findings Not Agreed with	Total	Follow Up Recommended
Sheriff	F1-4, F14, F16	F10, F11, F12, F13, F15, F17, F18, F19	F20	15	
BoS		F10, F17		2	
Chief Probation Officer		F9		1	

Respondents	Recommendations Implemented	Recommendations to be Implemented	Recommendations Not Implemented	Requires Further Analysis	Total	Follow Up Recommended
Sheriff		R3, R5, R6, R7, R8	R1, R2, R9, R10		9	R5, R8
BoS		R5, R7,	R4, R9		4	R5
Chief Probation Officer			R4		1	

(In some cases agency responses have been summarized, and not all responses are included in this report. Full responses are available at the Grand Jury’s website.)

County Courthouse Holding Cells

The Sheriff will not implement the following recommendation:

Recommendation 2: The facility needs an expansion to house the current inmate traffic. The expansion should add segregation cells for Atascadero State Hospital patients and mental health jail inmates. Employee restrooms and a regular holding cell should also be added. This would

improve the safety of both inmates and staff. In light of the increase in mental health jail inmates coming to the courthouse, this expansion is needed immediately.

Sheriff's response: "This recommendation will not be implemented. The Judicial Council of California recognizes the inadequacy of the existing courthouse in San Luis Obispo and lists the construction of a new courthouse as a critical priority. The projected cost of a new courthouse is \$148 million dollars." There are currently 22 other courthouses in California waiting for funding ahead of San Luis Obispo County.

The Grand Jury believes that an expansion for holding cells to segregate offenders is a safety concern and should not have to wait for full funding of all courthouse renovations.

The Sheriff responded that the following recommendations require further analysis:

Recommendation 1: The Sheriff should petition the court for the addition of a close-circuit AV system between the courthouse and the jail to reduce transportation cost and resolve overcrowding at the holding facility.

Sheriff's response: "This recommendation requires further analysis."

The Grand Jury requested follow-up on this matter and in March 2019 an additional response was received:

After further analysis the Sheriff's Office concluded that a closed-circuit AV system between the courthouse and the jail will not be implemented. The Superior Court tried the procedure, but discontinued the procedure in 2009 due to issues. These issues concerned the 6th Amendment right for criminal proceedings to be open to the public and defendants didn't have access to legal counsel. Due to the volume of family law cases, there was a lack of available courtrooms for video arraignments. Legal Counsel for the accused and a Deputy District Attorney were often unavailable because "their presence was required in other courtrooms where defendants were appearing in person." Because the arraignment was by video, the defense was unable to conduct "confidential communications with their client ... or negotiate a plea agreement with the district

attorney at the proceeding.” The court cannot compel the defense attorneys to meet with clients in person before or after a video arraignment.

Recommendation 3: In addition to either of the first two alternatives, the Grand Jury also recommends that cameras be added in the stairwells leading to the courtrooms and to the fenced area outside the sally port.

Sheriff’s response: “This recommendation requires further analysis. The Sheriff agrees with the benefits of having cameras in the stairwells. Because the building and camera system are State property the Sheriff’s Office will research the addition of cameras for the stairwells with the Presiding Judge.” The sally port is in a restricted and secured parking area and has no inmate movement. There would be no benefit in installing cameras in this area.

The Grand Jury requested follow-up on this matter and in March 2019 an additional response was received:

After further analysis “the Board of Supervisors approved the expenditure \$125,000 for this project and it is currently underway.” The project includes funds for the outside area and the sally port, which was not previously considered for implementation. The new camera system will be digital instead of the analog system that was in use at the time of the inspection. “The project will be completed by June 30, 2019.”

County Juvenile Hall

The following recommendation will not be implemented:

Recommendation 4: The Grand Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors commission a study to investigate repurposing the Juvenile Hall wing currently being used as a recreational/storage/training area as a juvenile and transitional aged youth Psychiatric Health Facility (PHF), with separate exterior access. This could be better use of the facility and fill an urgent County need. For better outside access, the study should consider using the current Coastal Valley Academy (CVA), space and moving the CVA to the unused area.

Chief Probation Officer response: This recommendation will not be implemented “because it is not warranted. The unused Juvenile Hall wing will be used as a recreation room for youth detained at the juvenile [hall]. There is no other legal County use of this wing of juvenile hall.”

Board of Supervisors adopted Chief Probation Officer’s response.

San Luis Obispo County Jail

These recommendations will be implemented in the future:

Recommendation 6: The jail administration should improve the visitor process including adding more parking, the ability to register for visits over the telephone or on-site, and screening of visitors as they enter the facility.

Sheriff’s response: “This recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.” The Kansas Jail and Medical Programming Unit construction has impacted parking for jail visiting. Once construction is completed, staff can park their vehicles behind the Kansas Jail. This increases parking in front of the Main Jail for visitors. Visitors can register on site for visits utilizing the kiosk in the lobby. They are unable to register for same day visits. Custody Sergeants are given authority to approve visits for people traveling a significant distance who were unaware of preregistering. The new Jail Management System (JMS) will make it easier to register for visits. “Visitors are not physically screened or searched because they do not enter secured areas of the jail.”

The Grand Jury finds the current visitor process to be adequate. However, visitors pass through the lobby to conduct their non-contact visits and contraband could be present in the building. A proactive approach could prevent an incident.

Recommendation 7: The Sheriff should construct a psychiatric hospital on the jail campus or elsewhere within the County.

Sheriff's response: "This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future." The Behavioral Health Unit will "encompass the previous medical/behavioral health facility (Stahl Hall) and the Modular buildings." The newly remodeled Behavioral Health Unit was funded by community members and partners, as well as the County General Fund. "The Behavioral Health Unit is designed to improve on-going services and has the ability to house a Jail Based Competency Treatment (JBCT) program contracted with the State. The JBCT program will provide on site treatment for 1370 felony inmates so they will not have to wait or be transported to a State Hospital bed. The facility can also be used to assist 1370 Misdemeanor inmates, which will help with crowding issues at the County Psychiatric Health Facility (PHF). The facility is not compatible with, designed for, or properly licensed under the Lanterman-Petris-Short Act (LPS) to house or treat subjects being detained for Welfare and Institutions Code 5150. Subjects detained for W&I 5150 are considered detained and not arrested."

Board of Supervisors adopted the response of the Sheriff.

The Grand Jury requested follow-up on this matter and in March 2019 an additional response was received:

The Behavioral Health Unit is due to open March 29, 2019. Staff will begin using the new unit to treat mentally ill inmates beginning May 1, 2019. They will utilize "part of the Kansas Facility to house JBCT eligible inmates. Minor improvements will be made to accommodate these inmates." No date has been set for the opening of the JBCT.

Recommendation 8: The Sheriff should increase the staffing for the jail mental health workers to reduce the wait time for appointments from five days to one day or less.

Sheriff's response: "This recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The County has a Request for Proposal (RFP) for jail medical and behavioral health services. ...The proposal will address proper staffing levels that meet National Accreditation Standards."

The Grand Jury notes that the jail has contracted with Wellpath for medical, behavioral, and dental services, which will be overseen by the jail's Chief Medical Officer. The 2019-2020 Grand Jury should follow-up to determine whether wait times have been reduced.

The following recommendation will not be implemented at this time:

Recommendation 9: The Sheriff should increase the staff in excess of the nine positions currently unfilled.

Sheriff's response: "This recommendation will not be implemented at this time. Currently all Custody Deputy positions have been filled with someone either hired and in training, or involved in the final stages of the hiring process. More Custody Deputy positions would be welcomed when the County Budget has the ability to fund more positions."

Board of Supervisors response: "This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted at this time." The Board approved the addition of a Backgrounds Investigation Officer, to decrease the time to recruit officers. If more resources are warranted after full staffing is achieved, the Sheriff would need to submit a request.

The following recommendation requires further analysis:

Recommendation 5: The Sheriff should formulate a long-term plan to deal with the problems associated with the condition and layout of the main jail. This plan should include the replacement of the current main jail facility.

Sheriff's response: "This recommendation requires further analysis." The new Kansas Jail and new medical building were well planned and laid out appropriately. The Main Jail is "47 years old and is in need of replacement ... [T]he old style layout no longer meets the needs of the current population, ... A long-term plan will be researched and developed to replace the Main Jail with a modern facility to meet the needs of the new inmate population."

The Grand Jury requested follow-up on this matter and in March 2019 an additional response was received:

In 2017, the Kansas Jail opened to replace an overcrowded Female Jail. The Medical Program Unit opened in 2018 to address the increasing number of high risk medical and mental health inmates. The main jail opened in 1971, and has been maintained by the Sheriff's Office. The last State Inspection did not address any issues other than overcrowding. The Sheriff's Office uses available funds to maintain the jail and monitors state grants. These funds are on a competitive basis and the Board of Supervisors needs to approve any taxpayer funds.

Board of Supervisors response: "This recommendation requires further analysis." There are major capital improvements planned in the near term, and five to 20 year time frame. The County is completing a "\$40 million dollar project to expand the women's jail and medical unit." They continue to "expend funds on deferred maintenance needs at the jail complex. Total jail replacement would need to be ranked and prioritized along with the many other County priorities. ... [P]rojects will be identified in the County's 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan. The Plan receives annual updates based on needs from County departments, analysis done by the Department of Public Works and Administrative Office, prioritization by an Executive Steering Committee, and approval by the Board typically in February of each year."

The Grand Jury notes that there is currently renovation underway at the County Jail. Improvements should be evaluated by future Grand Juries.

County Coroner's Facility

This recommendation will not be implemented:

Recommendation 10: The County should procure and install a back-up generator (fixed or portable) on site to provide back-up power in case of an outage.

Sheriff's response: "This recommendation will not be implemented at this time. The County has several portable generators on trailers that can be utilized should the Coroner's Office lose power. A generator on site not only requires the outlay of initial cost, but preventive maintenance and

testing to ensure the generator will work when needed. The current Sheriff and County generators already have maintenance in place and are available if needed. Adding another generator at this time is not currently budgeted but will be considered in the future when the County has the appropriate funds.”

The Grand Jury acknowledges that much has been done in the past years to address problems in San Luis Obispo County Detention Facilities, including a major project to expand the women’s jail, medical unit and deferred maintenance at the jail complex. As this project draws to a close, and our incarcerated population changes, we need to remain vigilant as to future needs.

REPORT 4: “Safeguarding the Public’s Health”

Link to full report:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1AIEbj40RynSn69fQdZQtKf-ZnF8c29-4/view>

This report examined the policies and procedures of the Environmental Health Division of the San Luis Obispo County Health Agency in regards to their handling of complaints. The authority of the Environmental Health Division to regulate extends to several activities such as restaurant and food service inspections, petroleum product storage, beach water quality testing, and inspections of public swimming pools, spas, and hot tubs. In addition to their inspections and testing, the Environmental Health Division also conducts public education programs and collaborative mitigations. In its recommendations, the 2017-2018 Grand Jury addressed the risk of Legionnaire’s disease, the risk of a possible Hepatitis A outbreak, and mosquito abatement programs within the County. Six findings (one of which did not require a response) and six recommendations were made.

The San Luis Obispo County Public Health Department was required to respond to five findings and six recommendations, all of which were received in a timely manner. They agreed with four of those findings and partially disagreed with one finding; two recommendations have been partially implemented and four will not be implemented.

Link to Health Department response:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1MdMY3OpbKejGawojOx9dNxH4JLk4VhKu/view>

The San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors was required to respond to two recommendations. They were in agreement with the responses provided by the Department of Public Health.

Link to BoS response:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FyHWJMbtSLU3A9BH0hi-Odf1MgpIRG6J/view>

Respondents	Findings Agreed with	Findings Partially Agreed With	Findings Not Agreed with	Total	Follow Up Recommended
BoS				0	
Public Health	F2, F3, F5, F6	F4		5	

Respondents	Recommendations Implemented	Recommendations to be Implemented	Recommendations Not Implemented	Requires Further Analysis	Total	Follow Up Recommended
BoS	R4		R3		2	R4
Public Health	R4, R5		R1, R2, R3, R6		6	R4, R5

(In some cases agency responses have been summarized, and not all responses are included in this report. Full responses are available at the Grand Jury’s website.)

The Public Health Department partially implemented the following recommendations:

Recommendation 4: The cost of starting and operating a comprehensive mosquito abatement program (Vector Control) is known. Funding commensurate with that cost should be set aside each year by the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors and County Administration, so that when it becomes necessary, the money will be immediately available.

Public Health response: “This recommendation has been partially implemented. Funding has been made available for mosquito surveillance but not mosquito abatement. On two occasions, in November 2017 and March 2018, the Board [BoS] received an analysis of options for re-instating a local surveillance and control program. At the latter of these meetings, the Board voted to delay consideration of reinstating a mosquito control program until the next budget cycle. However, the County maintains a 5% contingency within its annual budget so it has the ability to address emergencies or unbudgeted issues that occur mid-year.”

Recommendation 5: The San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Health has a program to educate the public about mosquitoes, how to avoid acting as their host, and how to minimize the risk of becoming infected with the diseases they carry. Before mosquitoes carrying the Zika Virus arrive in this County, additional funding should be allocated by the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors to support expansion of EHD's public education efforts.

Public Health response: "This recommendation has been implemented, to some extent. The Public Health Department was allocated an additional \$50,000 from the County General Fund, beginning in Fiscal Year 2016-17 to conduct targeted mosquito surveillance of *Aedes* species and other types of mosquitoes. The actual expense for the surveillance work has been lower than anticipated such that Public Health has been able to leverage a portion of these resources for staff time to develop public education information. This information has been posted online, including the development of a map based GIS viewer on the Environmental Health Services Division website, some press releases have been developed, information has been shared on social media, and more recently, outreach has been conducted at a local elementary school." ... "[T]he Board voted to delay consideration of any mosquito control program efforts until the next budget cycle. However, the County maintains a 5% contingency within its annual budget so that it has the ability to address emergencies or unbudgeted issues that occur mid-year."

The 2020-2021 Grand Jury should follow-up on Recommendations 4 and 5 once the 2020-21 budget has been adopted.

The Public Health Department will not implement the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: The San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Health should require that customers at commercial hot tub and spa establishments be informed there is a risk of *Legionnaires' disease* inherent in that environment.

Public Health response: "This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. Legionnaire's disease can cause a serious type of pneumonia, and the spread of *Legionella* bacterium is concerning. State law prescribes signage that public swimming pool

operators are required to post, which includes hot tubs and spas. The department will add links to resource information on public swimming pool safety starting in FY 2018-19, including information on the risks associated with *Legionella* in swimming pools and spas, on the Environmental Health Services Division website.”

Recommendation 2: The San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Health should use only ELITE Program Laboratories to test for the presence of *Legionella* when there is a known case of disease potentially associated with the samples.

Public Health response: “The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The Public Health Department uses only certified laboratories for the testing of clinical and environmental specimens for *Legionella*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Environmental Legionella Isolation Techniques Evaluation (ELITE) designation is a voluntary status. Many reputable laboratories choose not to pursue such a designation and yet deliver reliable testing results.”

Recommendation 3: The San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Health should conduct a vaccination and sanitation outreach program among the homeless population to prevent an outbreak of Hepatitis A in the County. Funding to support the program should be allocated by the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors.

Public Health response: “This recommendation will not be implemented at this time because it is not warranted.” ... “Though the California Hepatitis A outbreak has been declared over by the California Department of Public Health, a response plan was developed and Public Health staff are poised to respond through vaccination and outreach and education messages should a similar problem develop in our county.” ... “Routine reporting to our Public Health Department of new cases of Hepatitis A viral infection is ongoing. Should such reports indicate a new outbreak, action would be taken accordingly.”

The Grand Jury requested information about the above mentioned response plan and it was promptly received.

Recommendation 6: The San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Health website's statistics should be updated at least quarterly.

Public Health response: "The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. Posting statistics more frequently than annually could provide incomplete and misleading information to the public. In an effort to present the most accurate and statistically valid data, the Public Health Department often pools multiple years of data to support its findings and to be able to conduct trend analysis."

The Grand Jury is satisfied with responses and explanations provided by the Department of Public Health.

REPORT 5: "Moving the Dial at the County Jail: The Goal of Reducing Recidivism"

Link to full Grand Jury report:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-dkbMkZFUmfyntRSHMUQxhXjuSwNqIYD/view>

This report addressed the programs at the San Luis Obispo County Jail including services, classes, and activities offered to inmates, and their role in reducing an inmate's risk of reoffending. The 2017-2018 Grand Jury focused its investigation on programs handled by the Jail Programs Unit (JPU); it did not examine treatment services overseen by the Jail's Chief Medical Officer. The 2017-2018 Grand Jury recommended that jail administration should invest more in evidence-based programs and in programs that address the young adult population. They also advised that efforts to find solutions to classification and housing issues be intensified with the goal of moving the Jail from a warehousing to a rehabilitation environment. Eight findings and eight recommendations were made.

The San Luis Obispo County Sheriff was required to respond to eight findings and seven recommendations. The Sheriff agreed with two findings, partially agreed with four findings and disagreed with two findings. Two recommendations will be implemented, two will not be implemented, and three required further analysis.

Link to Sheriff’s responses:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1fRBOW5RSPV_P4XyKBe4Z4YXs36RmjA4F/view

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ckZOVWF5GlzZ9feDHO6mQw9UfCLrw5l0/view>

As Chair of the San Luis Obispo County Community Corrections Partnership executive committee, the San Luis Obispo County Chief Probation Officer was required to respond to two recommendations. They will not be implemented because it is not within the Community Corrections Partnership’s authority to do so.

Link to Chief Probation Officer response:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gXcHHuiA3B4a6rU0j1lw9xNb9aYenAO_/view

The San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors was required to respond to the suggested use of AB 109 reserves noted in Recommendation 1. Recommendation 1 will be implemented (in accordance with response received from the Sheriff, but not the Community Corrections Partnership).

Link to BoS response:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/14GBxWOO0zdYia7pgU4xSm_zmZt54f87G/view

Respondent	Findings Agreed with	Findings Partially Agreed with	Findings Not Agreed with	Total	Follow Up Recommended
Sheriff	F1, F3	F2, F4, F5, F6	F7, F8	8	

Respondents	Recommendations Implemented	Recommendations to be Implemented	Recommendations Not Implemented	Requires Further Analysis	Total	Follow Up Recommended
Chief Probation Officer			R1, R3		2	
BoS	R1				1	
Sheriff		R1, R6	R5, R7	R2, R4, R8	7	R1, R2, R4, R6, R8

(In some cases agency responses have been summarized, and not all responses are included in this report. Full responses are available at the Grand Jury’s website.)

Of the seven recommendations the Sheriff was required to respond to, none had been implemented at the time his response was received.

The recommendations that will be implemented and require follow-up by future Grand Juries include:

Recommendation 1: Jail administration should intensify efforts to make the investment and access the funding to provide behavior change programming across classification and housing boundaries, e.g., one-on-one services (or “virtual participation” using distance learning technology) where needed. The three million dollars in AB 109 reserves currently available is an obvious source. The Sheriff should develop a plan during fiscal year 2018-2019 to address this recommendation and request funds for this purpose from the Community Corrections Partnership as part of his budget for fiscal year 2019-2020.

Sheriff’s response: We are currently in the Request for Proposal process for improving inmate technology systems, which would have the ability to reach “difficult to serve” inmate populations.

The Grand Jury requested follow-up on this matter in March 2019 and the additional response was received:

Two key developments have occurred since the first response was received, which will lead to improvement in behavior change programming across classification and housing boundaries. First, the Jail Programs Unit and the leadership of Wellpath have a plan in place to begin programming with inmates who are placed in restricted housing. Second, a Correctional Sergeant has been selected to lead the new Behavioral Health Unit, which will open soon. It will provide more programming for the most high need inmate population.

Follow-up by 2019-2020 Grand Jury is advised to determine whether continued areas of improvement have been identified after the Medical Programming Unit is fully operational.

Recommendation 6: The construction program manager position at the Honor Farm, funded by AB 109, should be leveraged to provide vocational education opportunities to a broader group of male and female inmates than is currently the case (if or when a replacement is hired to fill the position).

Sheriff's response: "This recommendation will be implemented in the future ... The Construction Program is vocational in nature and focuses on job skills and employment opportunities in the construction industry ... Providing a wide array of opportunities allows inmates to try different skills, leverage skills they already possess, or be introduced to different opportunities they may not have had exposure to out of custody. Construction as a whole provides this avenue by connecting with employers in the community that are looking for a variety of skills (i.e. electricians, general labor, carpenters, basic safety training, plumbing, welding, etc.)."

Follow-up should be conducted by the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 Grand Juries to determine whether more inmates, both male and female, are being served by vocational education opportunities.

The Sheriff replied that two recommendations will not be implemented, stating that they are not warranted:

Recommendation 5: Programs funded by the Sheriff's Office should be awarded based on competitive bids. This should begin immediately.

Sheriff's response: Requiring competitive bidding on programming contracts that are below the County's specified dollar amount (currently \$25K) "would be overly burdensome if required in all cases regardless of cost."

Recommendation 7: Correctional deputies should have a measure regarding encouraging inmate program participation as a component of their regular performance reviews.

Sheriff's response: "This recommendation is not warranted. Some of the rating areas are as follows: Interpersonal Skills- 1. Cooperates with co-workers to solve problems 2. Utilizes appropriate communication behaviors when dealing with internal conflict, feedback, or problem solving solutions 3. Interacts with the public in a professional manner 4. Makes appropriate changes in work behavior based on constructive feedback from co-workers and the public 5. Maintains a professional demeanor that supports credibility of the Sheriff's Office. Job knowledge- Utilizes accumulated knowledge and experience to complete duties 3. Follows all

policy or procedure changes 5. Exercises constituted authority appropriately 6. Demonstrates knowledge of the goals and objectives of the position. All of these criteria are related to staff ability to deal with a variety of situations, including programming and adapting to the philosophical changes of the jail environment in relation to rehabilitation.”

The Grand Jury suggests that adding a specific measurement about encouraging inmates to participate in rehabilitative programs rather than relying on individual supervisors to mention it would send a clear message that this is now the desired behavior.

The Sheriff cited three recommendations as requiring further analysis:

Recommendation 2: Jail administration should re-examine how to offer programs inside housing units which can be more effective, e.g., sentenced-only housing units, as some who spoke with the Grand Jury have suggested. Sheriff’s Office Custody Manual Policy 516 should be updated to reflect that legal status (pre-trial vs. sentenced) is not used as a criterion for housing assignments if these two inmate statuses continue to be mixed.

Sheriff’s response: “Legal status” has been removed from the Manual and agency staff has reached out to other agencies to identify alternative housing practices that could be adopted at the jail. As of November 2018, jail staff visited and attended training at the Los Angeles County Jail and identified that efficiency of all jail programs should be evaluated. JPU, with assistance from California State Association of Counties (CSAC), completed a full assessment of programs in October 2018 and determined that the 37 current programs should be streamlined with the intent of offering programs that produce the best results and are the best use of staff resources. Assessment of the feasibility of sentenced-only housing was to be completed by December 31, 2018.

The Grand Jury requested follow-up on this matter and in March 2019 an additional response was received:

“The JPU submitted a recommendation in regard to sentenced-only housing in December of 2018 up the chain of command. There has been no official response from administration about the recommendation.”

Follow-up should be conducted by the 2019-2020 Grand Jury on the status of sentenced-only housing.

Recommendation 4: Jail administration should provide more programs with a proven track record, using available AB 109, inmate welfare, and grant funding where programs cost money. During fiscal year 2018-2019, the Sheriff should provide additional evidenced-based programming and re-evaluate programs with no clear link to reducing recidivism.

Sheriff’s response: “This recommendation requires further analysis ... A Grant Proposal was submitted May 2018 for funds from Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to complete the data set matching project and finalize that project to identify recidivism statistics ... Re-evaluation of program success is largely based on the ability to review those statistics but is otherwise difficult to measure or draw conclusions from. If the grant is received, this would be a two-year project completing in December 2020.”

The Grand Jury received notice that the grant has been received. It is recommended that the 2020-2021 Grand Jury follow up on the project results.

Recommendation 8: Rehabilitative programming should be developed and delivered which specifically targets young adult inmates, by replicating or adapting, for example, the evidence-based programs and interventions employed by the San Luis Obispo County Probation Department at the nearby San Luis Obispo County Juvenile Hall. Planning should occur during fiscal year 2018-2019, and programming specifically targeting this population should be put in place by July 1, 2019.

Sheriff’s response: “This recommendation requires further analysis. Currently several JPU staff has been evaluating a variety of programs that are functional in other counties/institutions ... The

Jail Program Unit uses a risk assessment tool (LSI) which reveals if an inmate has a low to high risk for reoffending. Research suggests evidence based programming should be targeted at individuals with a medium to high risk of reoffending. The goal previously set by JPU and Probation providers in our county is to target medium to high LSI scores not necessarily a specific age range.”

The Grand Jury requested follow-up on this matter in March 2019 and the additional response was received:

“With the exception of the Chess Club, all programs offered in Juvenile Hall are being offered in the jail ... 18-25 year olds are housed throughout the facility and can avail themselves of any of the classes offered in their housing unit ...”

The Grand Jury notes that the Sheriff’s initial response focused on programs that provide “one-on-one reentry in-reach” to 18-25 year olds who are about to be released. In his response to the related finding (Finding 8), the Sheriff noted that on January 1, 2018 the Alternative Sentencing Unit waived fees related to Home Detention participation for those 18-25 years old and that there are Jail Programming Unit efforts to target the 18-25 age group. The Grand Jury remains interested in knowing which, if any, current programs specifically target the roughly 16% of the jail population that falls within the 18-25 year old range who are not awaiting release nor have the option of participating in the Home Detention Program.

REPORT 6: “Is There a Health Risk from the Dunes? ‘The Answer My Friend is Blowing in the Wind’

Link to Grand Jury report:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1L6Go3WZKbABWSCu8XWPDE3GZm52_YeG/view

This report examined the controversial issue of particulate air quality on the Nipomo Mesa from the perspective and interests of the residents of the Mesa and nearby communities. The 2017-2018 Grand Jury reviewed the regulatory actions taken by the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), and the position of the California Department of Parks and Recreation and their responses to District regulatory actions.

A jointly-approved (APCD and State Parks) remediation plan proposed by State Parks was accepted by the APCD Hearing Board. This plan has the potential to reduce particulate air pollution, and its associated health risk to residents of the Nipomo Mesa and nearby communities within a five-year time-frame. Nine findings and four recommendations were made.

The APCD was required to respond to one recommendation and three findings. They agreed with one finding and partially disagreed with two findings; the recommendation will be implemented.

Link to APCD responses:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/110x3F6phyaB9hDy-btRpUOqwIpfqgcZK/view>

https://drive.google.com/file/d/19zvg_0flwhvr5LzCYg3pN2jLWDvVdf4Y/view

The Lucia Mar Unified School District (LMUSD) was required to respond to one finding and one recommendation; they agreed with the finding and will implement the recommendation.

Link to LMUSD response:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PG76DWyHw021-Tkct-TDnBv2zZBiZvOG/view>

The San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors was required to respond to three findings and one recommendation. They did not agree with one finding, but did agree with the two fact-based findings; the recommendation will not be implemented.

Link to BoS response:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1b7haTZyYBuANwRqmXtio3cWmuF-z-7oa/view>

Respondents	Findings Agreed with	Findings Partially Agreed with	Findings Not Agreed with		Follow Up Recommended
BoS	F6, F9		F7	3	F7
APCD	F4		F1, F5	3	
APCD Hearing Board				1	F8
LMUSD	F2			1	

Respondents	Recommendations Implemented	Recommendations to be implemented	Recommendations Not Implemented	Require Further Analysis	Total	Follow Up Recommended
Bos			R3		1	
APCD	R1				1	
APCD Hearing Board					1	R4
LMUSD	R2				1	

(In some cases agency responses have been summarized, and not all responses are included in this report. Full responses are available at the Grand Jury’s website.)

The agencies did not agree (either partially or wholly) with the following findings:

Finding 1: The District does not have an effective system to follow-up with the public, schools, medical clinics, hospitals, or those who sign up to receive AirAware Alerts and Better Breather Alerts.

APCD response: The following active communication programs related to alerting the public during air quality events include:

- AirAware Text Notification Program
- Better Breather Alert
- Advertising the AirAware Alert System
- Follow-up system for AirAware Alert System

The Grand Jury acknowledges the improvements made by the APCD after the 2017-2018 Grand Jury pointed out that schools were not proactively notified.

Finding 5: When PM10 concentrations were recorded in the hazardous range, the Nipomo Mesa experienced some of the worst air quality conditions in the United States.

APCD response: “This qualitative statement is more of an opinion and cannot be definitively affirmed. The statement would need to be pollutant based, the definition of ‘some of the worst’ defined, and an averaging period specified. There have been hours where Nipomo Mesa monitors showed PM10 in the hazardous range that were some of highest hourly readings reported in the

United States at that moment. However, there are no hourly air quality standards for PM10 or PM2.5 and the daily standards have not been in the hazardous range.”

The Board of Supervisors will not implement the following recommendation:

Recommendation 3: The 2017-2018 Grand Jury recommends to the Board of Supervisors that if the Particulate Matter Reduction Plan (PMRP) fails to achieve its required goal of eliminating exceedances of state and federal PM10 air quality standards within the four-year time-frame specified in the PMRP, the Board of Supervisors should within 30 days perform the following:

- a. Rescind State Parks current month-to-month, informal agreement under which State Parks has operated and managed off-highway vehicular activities on the La Grande Tract, and under the Board of Supervisors authority, do the following:
 - o Give written notice to State Parks that all off-highway vehicular activity on the La Grande Tract shall cease after a period of no longer than six months.
 - o Support State Parks’ planned transition of off-highway vehicular activity on the La Grande Tract to State owned areas in the southern portion of the ODSVRA located near Oso Flaco Lake within six months.
- b. Choose one of the following two options:
 - o Negotiate a lease with State Parks and include in the lease agreement the stipulation that Le Grande Tract shall only be used for non-vehicular camping or conventional recreational activity and that it not be used for any type of vehicular-recreational activity.
 - o Sell the La Grande Tract to State Parks and include in the sales agreement the stipulation that the La Grande Tract shall only be used for non-vehicular camping or conventional recreational activity, and it not be used for any type of vehicular-recreational activity.

Board of Supervisors response: “The recommendation will not be implemented as it is not reasonable for the current Board to commit to a decision on behalf a future Board of Supervisors that may be in place in four years, when the goals for air quality standards of the PMRP are

expected to be achieved. The Board of Supervisors may reevaluate recommendation options at that time.”

The 2017-2018 Grand Jury wrote a very detailed report outlining the plan to reduce the dust pollution associated with the Oceano Dunes OHV park. The Grand Jury is aware of how important this agreement is to the residents of the Nipomo Mesa.

There already has been progress. Last year, State Parks installed 100 acres of sand fencing, and according to the APCD, pollution measured at the Cal Fire station on the Arroyo Grande Mesa (which is at the center of the affected area) was 22% lower than predicted by scientific modeling. The number of violations of state standards for particulate matter also dropped from 97 in 2017 to 47 in 2018.

We are aware that stakeholders from both sides of this issue were not happy with the agreement, but it seems to be working. State Parks intends to continue “cooperative efforts” to reduce pollution.

The Grand Jury requests that future Grand Juries follow up yearly on the results of the jointly-approved (APCD and State Parks) remediation plan proposed by State Parks and accepted by the APCD Hearing Board.

OPEN RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PREVIOUS GRAND JURIES

2016-2017 Grand Jury Report “How Long Will the Need Go Unfulfilled?: Residential Detoxification in San Luis Obispo County”

Recommendation 2: The Board of Supervisors should direct the Sheriff and the Health Agency to evaluate the feasibility of and approach to repurposing vacant buildings within the County Jail’s honor farm as a residential detox service. A final report on the feasibility and if indicated the specific steps required to convert this housing to substance-abuse residential and/or treatment facility should be completed by June 2018.

The Board of Supervisors (BoS) response stated this recommendation would be implemented and that the Health Agency and Sheriff would present a report to the BoS for further consideration in June of 2018. After examining the minutes from that BoS meeting, generalized discussion of the “Stepping Up” initiative appears to have taken the place of any presentation on this specific issue.

Recommendation 10: The County Health Agency should direct its Drug and Alcohol Services (DAS) to work with the board of the homeless shelter to develop a plan for operationalizing two detox beds in the yet-to-be-built Homeless Services Center, which could entail the DAS providing onsite outpatient detox services if other treatment options are not viable. This plan is to be developed prior to the opening of the center or by June 2018.

In March 2019 the Grand Jury received the following update from the County Health Agency:

“The County, along with CAPSLO and private donors, have collaborated to fund the construction of a residential treatment facility with medication assisted treatment capacity on the campus of 40 Prado in San Luis Obispo. Once approved by the Board of Supervisors in March, the construction is estimated to be completed in 2020.”

Future Grand Juries should consider evaluating services offered and the number of individuals being served to determine whether they are adequate for our population upon completion of the project.

2016-2017 Grand Jury Report: “Is it Five Minutes to Midnight in Cambria?: An Update on the Risk of Catastrophic Fire”

Recommendation 1: Cambria Community Services District (CCSD) should resume a regular plan for the fire hydrant testing as soon as possible and no later than the end of the calendar year 2017.

CCSD agreed with the recommendation and the CCSD Fire Department stated that they had adopted two new policies regarding fire hydrant maintenance and flow testing. They are testing an

average of twelve hydrants a month and, once all hydrants have been tested, they will flush and maintain all hydrants on a two-year basis.

In their continuity report, the 2017-2018 Grand Jury commended Cambria on establishing a testing and maintenance schedule, but noted that private hydrants in California are required to be inspected every year for maintenance and to ensure that they are working. Based on the numbers provided by the CCSD, it would take 2.5 years to complete the fire hydrant maintenance for initial testing.

The Grand Jury contacted the CCSD in February 2019 for an update on the status of the testing and maintenance progress and received the following response:

“... To date, we have been able to complete 64% of the 368 hydrants within the water system infrastructure. The initial intent of the CCSD was to have all hydrants serviced on a 2-year basis. This would equate to approximately 15 hydrants completed every month. Over the past couple of years, even in the most aggressive months, staff has been limited to completing 12 hydrants per month. Further review suggests that a more reasonable expectation would be in the 10-12 hydrants per month, which would put us on a three-year rotation. In short, we have policies in place, and we are making good progress. We understand and are in complete agreement with the recommendations of the Grand Jury, and continue to evaluate how to best implement the hydrant maintenance program. We currently are evaluating how to best proceed.”

CONCLUSIONS

The 2018-2019 Grand Jury reviewed six reports from the 2017-2018 Grand Jury. In our review, we examined 38 findings and 30 recommendations. The Board of Supervisors and the various agencies that responded to these reports adopted 16 of the recommendations. We recognize and appreciate our leaders, as they show their dedication to improving our county services.

REQUIRED RESPONSES

This is an informational report. No responses are required.

Presiding Judge	Grand Jury
Presiding Judge Ginger Garrett Superior Court of California 1035 Palm Street, Room 355 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-1000	San Luis Obispo County Grand Jury P.O. Box 4910 San Luis Obispo, CA 93403-4910