

## **Alternative 1**

**Proposed City Council Response to San Diego County Grand Jury Report, Entitled  
“Say What You’ll Do And Then Do What You Say:  
Past Grand Jurors Association Implementation Review Committee”**

Pursuant to California Penal Code section 933(c), the Mayor and City Council of the City of San Diego provide the following responses to the findings and recommendations included in the above referenced Grand Jury Report:

### **FINDINGS**

**Finding 02:** *The City of San Diego failed to make the Grand Jury Implementation Review Committee permanent in 2009 despite its success in insuring that Grand Jury recommendations were implemented.*

**Response: The City partially disagrees with the finding.**

At the end of 2007 the City Council established a mechanism for Grand Jury implementation review. City Ordinance 19671 (O-19671), was passed in October 2007, with the following purpose:

It is the purpose and intent of the City Council to establish the City of San Diego Past Grand Jurors Association Implementation Review Board. The Board is established to provide the Mayor and City Council with a pool of experienced citizens, who have served as members of the San Diego County Civil Grand Jury, to promote a policy regarding the implementation and follow-up of accepted recommendations of the County's Civil Grand Juries, and to assist and advise the Mayor and City Council in the process of reviewing the implementation of County Civil Grand Jury accepted recommendations.

The Implementation Review Board was automatically repealed (“sunsetted”) by O-19671 on December 1, 2009. The Grand Jury indicates in this finding that “the City of San Diego failed to make the Grand Jury Implementation Review Committee permanent in 2009 despite its success in insuring that Grand Jury recommendations were implemented.” No additional information is included in the Grand Jury report supporting this statement. The Implementation Review Board provided a mechanism for reviewing the status of previously accepted Grand Jury recommendations; however, the City believes it would be a better use of resources to utilize a standing Council Committee (or Committees) for this purpose. Additionally, the existing Council Committee structure is more familiar to citizens and would provide greater transparency and openness. See response to Recommendation 14-81.

## Alternative 1

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Recommendation 14-81:** *Establish an Implementation Review Committee similar to the one established in 2007-2009 and patterned after the current San Diego County Past Grand Jury Implementation Review Committee.*

**Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.**

Rather than establish a separate Implementation Review Committee of Past Grand Jurors Association members, this matter could be addressed in an efficient and effective manner by utilizing the City Council's existing Council Committee structure to review the status of carrying out recommendations from past Grand Jury reports. This would be consistent with the process for initially responding to the reports, where the appropriate Council Committee reviews the City's proposed responses to the Grand Jury reports, and forwards them to the City Council for final review.

Utilizing existing Council Committees would avoid additional support expenses and confusion associated with creation of a separate Committee process. Council Committees are held monthly, are open to the public, and the agendas are widely publicized in advance for the purposes of obtaining citizen input. Council Committees provide a widely known public platform and have authority to direct additional follow-up or actions. Attendance and participation by Past Grand Jurors Association members would be encouraged.

Status reports for Committee review would be developed by appropriate departmental staff. All Grand Jury status reports would be posted on appropriate Council Committee websites (on Committee agendas) along with the original Grand Jury reports.

This process would be implemented by the Council President, assigning this responsibility to one central Committee or, alternatively, to individual Committees based on the subject matter, as is the case with the City's original responses. This could be determined by the Council President during establishment of next year's Committee assignments in December.