

Alternative 2

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The Implementation Review Board was automatically repealed (“sunsetting”) by O-19671 on December 1, 2009.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 provide transparency to the public via a newly created webpage that would include status updates. See response to Recommendation 14-81.

Alternative 2

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 creating a new Grand Jury Reports page on the City's website. Status reports would be posted on this new webpage, and tracking and follow up responsibilities would be assigned to appropriate departmental staff.

Guiding policies from both the Mayor and City Council would outline roles and responsibilities and provide a timeline for required periodic updates to outstanding recommendations. This process as proposed would consist of the direct posting to the City's website of status reports by appropriate departmental staff.

Implementation Steps

- I. Grand Jury Report Page on the City's Website
 - a. A webpage would include Grand Jury reports directed to the City, as well as the responses to the Grand Jury.
 - b. Updates would be posted to the webpage on the progress of implementation – periodically as determined by policies.
- II. Follow Up and Tracking
 - a. Departmental staff as appropriate would be responsible for tracking and following up on the progress of implementing recommendations.
 - i. In most cases the Mayor's Office would direct departments to provide updates on the progress of implementation.
 - ii. In the cases where independent departments are responsible for implementation, the independent departments would assume responsibility for tracking and posting.
 - iii. In the cases where the City Council is responsible for implementation, the Office of the Independent Budget Analyst would assume responsibility for tracking and posting.
- III. Council Policy and Administrative Regulation
 - a. A Council Policy and an Administrative Regulation would be developed to outline roles and responsibilities. These documents would identify the following:
 - i. Who would have responsibility for follow up and tracking.

Alternative 2

- ii. The timeframe and frequency for providing updates on implementation progress.
- iii. What materials would be posted to the website.