



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET ANALYST REPORT

Date Issued: September 12, 2011

IBA Report Number: 11-54

Rules Committee Meeting Date: September 14, 2011

Item Number: 2

Response to Grand Jury Report Titled “No ‘Cost’ for Alarm?”

OVERVIEW

On June 1, 2011, the San Diego County Grand Jury filed a report with the San Diego Police Department, Mayor, and City Council entitled “No „Cost’ for Alarm?”. The goal of the report was to address a number of issues related to complaints of financial accounting improprieties in the Permits and Licensing Unit of the Police Department, particularly relating to the alarm permits program.

The Grand Jury Report included seven findings and seven recommendations. Of the seven recommendations, four were directed to the Police Department and three were directed to the Mayor and the City Council. The San Diego Police Department, Mayor, and City Council are required to provide comments to the Presiding Judge of the San Diego Superior Court on each of the findings and recommendations relating to their respective agencies in the Grand Jury Report within ninety days. Due to the demands of the legislative calendar and the future release of an audit of the Permits and Licensing Unit of the Police Department, the Presiding Judge granted an extension to the date for the Mayoral and City Council response to November 1, 2011. This report presents the City Council’s response as recommended by the IBA.

The IBA has obtained a copy of the Mayor’s draft responses to each of the findings and recommendations. For each finding and recommendation directed to the City Council, the Council may 1) join the Mayor’s response; 2) respond with a modification to the Mayor’s response; or 3) respond independently of the Mayor.

In responding to each Grand Jury finding, the City is required to either 1) agree with the finding or 2) disagree wholly or partially with the finding. Responses to Grand Jury recommendations must indicate that the recommendation 1) has been implemented; 2) has not yet been implemented, but will be in the future; 3) requires further analysis; or 4) will not be implemented

because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. Explanations for responses are requested when applicable.

Of the ten items directed to the City Council included in the Mayor’s response, the IBA recommends that the City Council joins the Mayor’s response for two items and respond with a modification to the Mayor’s response for eight items.

The table below provides a summary of the IBA’s recommendations.

Recommendations: Findings:	11-49, 11-50	<i>Join the Mayor’s Response</i>
Recommendations: Findings:	11-48, 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07	<i>Respond with a Modification to the Mayor’s Response</i>

The full text of the Mayor’s responses, and the IBA’s recommended responses on behalf of the City Council, can be found in Attachment 1 to this report.

It should be noted that at the time this report was released, the Mayor’s responses were still in draft form. Should any further changes be made to the Mayor’s responses, the proposed Council responses will be reevaluated and amended accordingly.


Melinda Nickelberry
Fiscal & Policy Analyst


APPROVED: Andrea Tevlin
Independent Budget Analyst

Attachments:

1. Recommended City Council Responses to Findings and Recommendations in San Diego County Grand Jury Report entitled “No „Cost’ for Alarm?”
2. San Diego County Grand Jury Report entitled “No „Cost’ for Alarm?”