



SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
Civil Grand Jury

701 Ocean Street, Room 318-I
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
(831) 454-2099
grandjury@scgrandjury.org

Honoring Commitments to the Public

County Agency Actions in Response to 2019–2020 Grand Jury Recommendations

Summary

The 2022–2023 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury reviewed local government responses to five of the nine 2019–2020 Grand Jury reports to determine whether local government officials honored their commitments in compliance with California Penal Code 933.05. The reports reviewed were: *DeLaveaga Golf Course*; *Fail in the Jail*; *Homelessness: Big Problem, Little Progress*; *The Tangled Web*; and *Voter Data*. The Grand Jury evaluated whether the agencies followed through with the commitments made in these reports.

The Grand Jury also reviewed *Ready? Aim? Fire!*; however, follow-up responses to this 2019-2020 investigation were not pursued, since over the past three years there has been a major wildfire and three more fire-related Grand Jury investigations.

The value of the Grand Jury's reports is realized when government agencies apply the recommendations to improve transparency and efficiency for county residents.

Table of Contents

Summary	1
Background	3
Scope and Methodology	3
Investigations	4
1. DeLaveaga Golf Course	4
2. Fail in the Jail	6
3. Homelessness: Big Problem, Little Progress	7
4. Tangled Web	9
5. Voter Data	12
Notable Missing Responses	14
Conclusion	14
Findings and Recommendations	15
General	15
DeLaveaga Golf Course	15
Fail in the Jail	15
Homelessness	16
Tangled Web	16
Voter Data	17
Required Responses	17
Definitions	17
Sources	18
References	18
Appendix A	21

Background

Each year the Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) investigates local government operations and issues reports with the goals of improving government efficiency and effectiveness, and promoting accountability and transparency. The Grand Jury reports make recommendations for improvements. When called for in the report, elected local government officials are required to respond to the Grand Jury's findings and recommendations.

Each investigated organization receives a copy of the Grand Jury's report and a response packet that includes the instructions shown in Appendix A. They send their responses to the presiding judge of the Superior Court with a copy to the Grand Jury. Elected officials must respond within 60 days and governing bodies are required to respond within 90 days.

Only governing bodies and "elected county officers or agency heads" are required to respond to Grand Jury reports.^[1] There is no requirement that any individual other than an elected official respond. However, the Grand Jury may invite a response from other "responsible officers" such as the chief administrative officer of a government function.

Readers interested in a more comprehensive look at the Grand Jury reports and responses are encouraged to read the original reports and responses. All may be found on the County's Grand Jury web page in the Reports section.^[2]

Scope and Methodology

For this Honoring Commitments report, the 2022-2023 Grand Jury reviewed responses to the following five 2019-2020 reports:

- **DeLaveaga Golf Course**—How City Policies and Practices Have Affected the Bottom Line
- **Fail in the Jail**—No Lights, No Camera, No Action?
- **Homelessness: Big Problem, Little Progress**—It's Time To Think Outside The Box
- **The Tangled Web**—Oh, What a Mangled Web We Weave...
- **Voter Data—Registering Concerns**—Keeping a Closer Eye on the Distribution of County Voter Registration Data

The 2022-2023 Grand Jury has followed up with the responding agencies for some of the above reports. This report summarizes the government responses to each report's recommendations that fell under the categories "Has Not Been Implemented but Will Be Implemented in the Future" and "Requires Further Analysis." The Grand Jury wanted to know whether the agencies actually did implement recommendations that they said they would in the future, or that they did the further analysis and what its outcome was. Without follow-up, these are the most susceptible to falling by the wayside and dropping out of public view.

Each report section that follows covers the key findings and recommendations that we evaluated. Each section then describes the local agency commitments and actions taken to address those findings and recommendations.

Investigations

The Key Findings and Key Recommendations sections within the below investigations provide context for the Response section. The Response section describes agency responses to the investigation report, including recent agency actions. Findings and recommendations where the agencies said they had already implemented, or declined to take action, or which do not seem to the Grand Jury to be critical to improving government functions at this time, are not included.

1. DeLaveaga Golf Course^[3]

Summary: The 2019-2020 Santa Cruz Civil Grand Jury investigated the history, governance, use, costs and revenue related to the City of Santa Cruz's DeLaveaga Golf Course. The Grand Jury's intention was to provide insight and clarity on fiscal responsibility along with recommendations for improvements to City of Santa Cruz management of the DeLaveaga Golf Course.

Key 2020 Findings:

- F4. The City of Santa Cruz's failure to conduct thorough, regular on-site inspections of the DeLaveaga Golf Course's restaurant/lodge resulted in excessive renovation costs to the City of Santa Cruz. This contributed to more than doubling the original estimates to bring the building up to code.*
- F5. The new draft Operations Plan lacks the necessary robustness to communicate how major golf course operations will be managed at DeLaveaga Golf Course, including but not limited to facility inspections, water use policies, variable pricing policies, charitable policies, operations review, and basic roles, responsibilities, and authority.*

Key 2020 Recommendations:

- R5. The City of Santa Cruz City Manager should perform a lessons learned activity and then update the City's relevant policies and operating procedures to avoid a future repeat of the DeLaveaga Golf Course's restaurant/lodge shutdown and renovation no later than second quarter 2021. (F4)*
- R6. The City of Santa Cruz Parks and Recreation Department and the City of Santa Cruz City Manager should add a formal process to the Operation Plan by addressing needed capital improvements, maintenance schedules, facility inspections, water use, variable pricing, charitable policies, operations review, and basic stakeholder roles and responsibilities. Stakeholders include the Santa Cruz City Council, the City's Parks and Recreation Department, the City's Parks & Recreation Commission, the Operator, the DeLaveaga Golf*

Requested 2020 Responses:^[4]

The City of Santa Cruz partially disagreed with Finding 4 as related to Recommendation 5, that there was a failure to conduct thorough, regular on-site inspections of the DeLaveaga Golf Course's restaurant/lodge, resulting in excessive renovation costs to the City of Santa Cruz. This contributed to more than doubling the original estimates to bring the building up to code. They stated that many of the issues discovered during the golf lodge renovation were interior to the building (e.g. electrical, plumbing, rotting wood, etc.). These issues were not evident in general facility inspections. The fundamental cause of the facility issues and exorbitant costs to renovate was a lack of ongoing capital improvement investment into the building over time. Due to limitations of City budgets, and to some degree, the local political will to invest in the golf course, funding was not sufficiently appropriated to maintain the golf lodge over time. Therefore, the result was a costly repair due to years of virtually no maintenance.

The City of Santa Cruz stated that this is an important lesson as other facilities at the golf course including the maintenance facility, golf cart barn, and driving range, among others, are in desperate need of investment. Otherwise they may face similarly expensive capital needs in the future. This is also true of many City-owned buildings such as the Civic Auditorium, Public Works Corp Yard and the Parks Yard, Market Street Senior Center, Harvey West Park facilities, and many more. Investment in an aging portfolio of City-owned assets is critical for the future.

Regarding Finding 5, as related to Recommendation 6, the City of Santa Cruz felt that they needed further analysis on whether or not the City Manager should perform a lessons learned activity and then update the City's relevant policies and operating procedures to avoid a future repeat of the DeLaveaga Golf Course's restaurant/lodge shutdown and renovation no later than second quarter 2021. The City of Santa Cruz stated that as of July 2020, there are no specific plans to do this, although it would be a helpful exercise and the Parks and Recreation Department would support it. The Parks and Recreation Department responded, indicating it would discuss with the City Manager's Office a plan to chart a course of action related to this recommendation before the end of calendar year 2020.

2022-2023 Update: Were Commitments Kept?

In response to this jury's request for an update, the Parks and Recreation Department indicated budgeting, and the Santa Cruz City Council approved funding to assess facilities and develop a long-term Capital Investment Plan as outlined in Budget, Fiscal Years 2023-2027.^[5] Additionally, the City Council appropriated funding for critical infrastructure and facility upgrades in FY 2023.^[6] The Parks and Recreation Department will initiate these projects in 2023. The completion of the study is estimated to be in June 2023, and the improvements to the driving range and golf course assets are estimated to be in October 2023.^[7]

2. Fail in the Jail^[8]

Summary: On September 28, 2019 an unplanned power failure at the Santa Cruz County Main Jail resulted in the loss of critical capability to provide safe and secure operation of the jail. While the risks were known well in advance of the failure event, steps to manage and mitigate the risks were not taken. Established, comprehensive policies for management in a power failure emergency were in place, but those policies were not followed. Evidence of process improvement and risk management practice after the event was lacking.

Key 2020 Findings:

F3. While an emergency generator has been procured, adequate testing of methods of connection and operation has not been done yet.

F5. The County was non-compliant with policy regarding emergency power backup at the jail and remained non-compliant for months, including fueling, maintenance, testing, and emergency backup power generation.

Key 2020 Recommendations:

See below under “2022-2023 Update: Were Commitments Kept?”

Requested 2020 Responses:^[9]

The Santa Cruz County Sheriff/Coroner agreed with Finding 5. They had previously requested that this work be done by the Santa Cruz County’s General Services Department. The Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors also agreed with Finding 5.

2022-2023 Update: Were Commitments Kept?

There was no specific recommendation to upgrade the existing generator system to power all of the areas critical to ensure safe and secure operation of the jail during an unexpected power outage, but it was confirmed during our 2022 jail tour that a new generator was purchased in 2020 with an estimate of 1 to 1 ½ years to have it installed and operational. However, due to component shortages resulting from COVID/supply chain issues, the new generator system will not be operational until May or June of 2023.^[10] They stated that the old generator should have enough power to operate a good portion of the facility.^[11] While it will not fully power the facility, certain functions have been prioritized to receive generator power to minimize any risk to both inmates and staff. For security reasons, they did not want to identify any specific vulnerabilities. The new generator will have much more capacity. They are in constant communication with the County and subcontractors to prioritize this project. Therefore, they are working toward keeping their commitment on improving their functionality during an unexpected power outage to provide safe and secure operation of the jail.

3. Homelessness: Big Problem, Little Progress^[12]

Summary: The 2019-2020 Santa Cruz Civil Grand Jury investigated the County's response to homelessness. The report highlighted the considerable money, time and effort devoted to reducing the County's ever-growing number of homeless persons, and the lack of real progress towards solutions. Most of the recommendations in this report received the Response "Will Not Be Implemented". This year's Civil Grand Jury decided to examine two recommendations that received mostly "Requires Further Analysis" responses. It should be noted that since the 2019-2020 report was written, much has happened on the homelessness issue, including a \$14.5 million grant in 2021 to the City of Santa Cruz to improve and expand services to people experiencing homelessness. This changes the landscape and overtakes some of the report's recommendations. In several cases, the responses were not compliant. It is also clear the various agencies coordinated their responses, with several identical explanations provided.

Key 2020 Findings:

F12. There are parcels of land throughout the county that appear to be unused or underutilized, and could possibly be used to build housing for the homeless.

F21. If underutilized parcels of land throughout Santa Cruz County were identified, such as the area near Coral Street in Santa Cruz and the parcel adjacent to the County Mental Health Building in Watsonville, these parcels could potentially be used to increase the number of beds and services to support the homeless.

Key 2020 Recommendations:

R6. The Santa Cruz County Administrative Officer (CAO) and the County's City Managers should identify parcels of land within their jurisdictions that could be utilized to supply homeless services and/or temporary or permanent housing, and report such sites to their governing bodies by December 31, 2020. (F12)

R9. By December 31, 2020, the City of Santa Cruz should evaluate whether closing Coral Street permanently to thru traffic, to make more space available for additional housing and services for the homeless, would be a viable option. (F13 was cited in the 2019-2020 Grand Jury report, but this probably should have been F12 and/or F21)

Requested 2020 Responses:^[13]

F12. The Board of Supervisors, the cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley and Watsonville, and the City Manager of Watsonville all agreed with Finding 12, that there are parcels of land throughout the County that could potentially be used to provide services to homeless people. The City Managers for Capitola, Santa Cruz and Scotts Valley responded that their responses were included in their unified response from the City Council.

F21. The Board of Supervisors, the Cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville, the Santa Cruz County Administrative Officer and the Watsonville City Manager all agreed with Finding 21, that if underutilized parcels were identified, they could potentially be used to increase the number of beds and services to support homeless people. The Cities of Capitola and Scotts Valley partially disagreed, saying that zoning may not allow such use. Using identical text for their explanation for their responses, they both describe the partnership between the County, the City of Santa Cruz and Housing Matters to evaluate potential reconfiguration and expansion of the services for homeless people provided around Coral Street. The Human Services Agency and the planning Department responded that their input was included with the CAO response. The city managers of Santa Cruz, Capitola and Scotts Valley responded that their responses were included in their unified response from the City Council.

R6. The only required response to Recommendation 6 was from the Board of Supervisors. They responded that the recommendation required further analysis, questioning the feasibility of the approximate three month timeline to identify parcels of land suitable for temporary or permanent housing for homeless people.

Responses to Recommendation 6 were requested from the Santa Cruz County Administrative Officer, the Santa Cruz County Human Services Agency, and the city managers of the four Santa Cruz cities. Of these, the CAO provided the same response, using the same text as the BoS's required response described above. The HSA responded that their input was included with the CAO response. The city managers of Santa Cruz, Capitola and Scotts Valley responded that their responses were included in their unified response from the City Council. The Grand Jury noted that the City Councils were not assigned R6 and thus we do not have a response from these city managers. The Watsonville City Manager responded that R6 "Requires Further Analysis" and gave an explanation that they have 416 acres of land zoned for potential shelters or housing. They did not indicate any ongoing effort to provide shelters or housing for homeless people.

R9. Responses to Recommendation 9 were required from the Board of Supervisors, and the four City Councils. The BoS provided no response to Recommendation 9. The City of Santa Cruz responded that the recommendation requires further analysis, with the explanation that the City, County and Housing Matters are working collaboratively to evaluate increasing access to services and shelter on Coral Street and adjacent private property. The Cities of Capitola and Scotts Valley also responded that the recommendation requires further analysis, using the same text as the City of Santa Cruz to describe collaboration with Housing Matters. They further add they have no authority over Coral Street, which is within Santa Cruz City limits. Watsonville responded "Will not be Implemented" with the explanation that the recommendation is not within their jurisdiction.

2022-2023 Update: Were Commitments Kept?

R6. In March 2021, the Board of Supervisors adopted a “Three Year Strategic Plan to Address Homelessness” which includes consideration of using county-owned and unincorporated county areas for temporary housing for the homeless.^[14] The plan calls for 600 emergency shelter and transitional housing beds, 120 of which would be in unincorporated county areas. Santa Cruz Local’s article on the plan refers to the Civil Grand Jury’s recommendation to identify suitable unincorporated parcels, but it is not clear if the Jury’s recommendation influenced creation or adoption of the plan.^[15]

In March 2022, The Santa Cruz City Council unanimously approved the “Homelessness Action Plan” which aims to eliminate unsanctioned homeless camps and move people to managed shelters in the city and throughout the County.^[16] The plan calls for collaboration with leaders from the County of Santa Cruz, and the Cities of Watsonville, Scotts Valley and Capitola to identify 20 new locations for shelters across the county.^[17] Again, whether the Grand Jury’s recommendation influenced this is unknown.

R9. The City of Santa Cruz is currently working on a Master Plan for Coral Street including newly acquired property, the existing shelters and housing, and the planned “Harvey West Project” of 120 units of supportive housing.^[18] In December 2022, the City held a “Community Design Charrette” to solicit input on the Coral Street Master Plan. This included a group discussion of limiting vehicle access to Coral Street, and a suggestion to build a pedestrian and bicycle overpass bridge over it.^[19] The Grand Jury assumes that the Master Plan preempts any recommendation to close Coral Street, but hopes that suggestions such as limiting vehicle access or building a bridge be considered as part of the Master Plan.

4. Tangled Web^[20]

Summary: The public relies on current, accurate information to conduct its business with government agencies and offices. When the 2019-2020 Grand Jury accessed county and city websites to gather data and contact government officials, they found that website information was sometimes inaccurate and out-of-date. In fulfilling our charter as an advocate for the public to improve government operations, they pointed out where these errors exist and directed those responsible to provide an up-to-date and accurate information platform to the public.

Key 2020 Findings:

- F1. County and City website information is sometimes missing, out-of-date, and inaccurate; links may be broken. Thus, many city and county departments aren't updating their websites often enough to keep citizens informed.*
- F2. County and City administrations lack a process to review content accuracy and currency and thereby assure timely correction and revision of content.*

- F3.** County and City goals for website redesign or quality improvement are not sufficiently “SMART”: Specific + Measurable + Attainable + Relevant + Time-Bound.
- F4.** The County does not have a notification system by which users can be alerted to updated web content. The County's website would be enhanced by the addition of a site-wide notification system.
- F5.** County and City website content providers do not provide an explanation in content for incorrect or out-of-date information, even though they appear to know the reasons.

Key 2020 Recommendations:

- R1.** The County Administrative Officer and the City Managers should establish a formal process by December 31, 2020 for their departments to validate and verify the accuracy and currency of website information. (F1, F2, F5)
- R3.** The County Administrative Officer and the City Managers should establish ‘SMART’ goals for website quality assurance and manage these goals beginning in 2021. (F3, F4, F5)

Requested 2020 Responses:^[21]

City of Capitola

The City of Capitola partially disagreed with Findings 1, 2, and 3. They update information on a regular basis. There have been occasions when old data did not get removed after updated data was added. Stale and inaccurate data is corrected and replaced whenever found. The City is in the process of updating its website platform to make this task easier for departments. They also stated that SMART (Specific + Measurable + Attainable + Relevant + Time-Bound) is not a methodology that the City of Capitola has adopted.

The City of Capitola disagreed with Finding 5. They stated that If data is determined to be incorrect or out-of-date, they remove or correct the data. The City does not knowingly keep incorrect or out-of-date information on the City website.

The City of Capitola, addressing Recommendation 1, agreed to implement in the future a formal process by December 31, 2020, for their departments to validate and verify the accuracy and currency of website information.

Regarding Recommendation 3 the City of Capitola felt that establishing SMART goals for website quality assurance and managing these goals beginning in 2021 needed further analysis.

City of Santa Cruz

The City of Santa Cruz agreed with Findings 1, 2, and 5.^[22]

The City of Santa Cruz addressing Recommendation 1 agreed to implement a formal process by December 31, 2020 for their departments to validate and verify the accuracy and currency of website information.^[22]

City of Scotts Valley

The City of Scotts Valley partially disagreed with Findings 1 and 2. The City of Scotts Valley responded in 2020 that they post all City Council, Committee and Commission agendas on the City website's Agenda Center. Some commissions/committees meet only as needed and a committee's last meeting may have been a year or more in the past. Thus, even though these agendas and minutes may appear out of date, the content is current. Similarly, the City maintains various plans and documents on its website and although they may be dated years in the past, the posted documents are still the most current. The City updates its website content regularly. They do not have the resources for a dedicated webmaster and staff manages the website on a departmental level. City staff reviews and updates City webpages on a regular, although not regimented, schedule.

The City of Scotts Valley partially disagreed with Finding 3. They implemented a major upgrade to their website in May 2018, moving from an antiquated website to the current, highly functional and easy-to-navigate site. The City of Scotts Valley has not adopted the formal goal paradigm of Specific + Measurable + Attainable + Relevant + Time-Bound. However, the City maintains the goal, as an operational prerequisite, to provide current, timely and useful information to the public.

The City of Scotts Valley disagreed with Finding 5. When the City identifies outdated or inaccurate information on its website, it is rectified as soon as is practically feasible. They view their website as an important communication and engagement tool with the community and do not allow erroneous information to persist on their website.

The City of Scotts Valley felt that they needed further analysis regarding Recommendation 1, the establishment of a formal process for their departments to validate and verify the accuracy and currency of website information. They routinely update information and maintain current agendas and notices.

The City of Scotts Valley also felt that they needed further analysis regarding Recommendation 3, the establishment of SMART goals for website quality assurance and manage these goals beginning in 2021.

2022-2023 Update: Were Commitments Kept?

In response to this Grand Jury's request for information, the City of Capitola said they kept their commitment to complete a content clean-up and overall update of their website in 2021. The website is now more logically organized, provides users with easier access to information, and is easier to update than the prior website.^[23] The City of Capitola also kept their commitment to analyze the creation of SMART goals for website quality assurance, but determined that they were not necessary at this time.^[23]

In response to this Grand Jury's request for information, the City of Santa Cruz said they kept their commitment to clean up their website. In December 2020 the City of

Santa Cruz coordinated with departments to do a thorough departmental website review and to edit the contents. This included checking the accuracy of the content, repairing broken links, and archiving unused contents. They also updated the City's meeting agenda, minutes, video and audio recordings. This was completed by October 2021.^[24] To maintain an updated Website, the City of Santa Cruz plans to implement a more automated way to audit the content to allow departments to edit more frequently and efficiently. It is estimated that this more automated system will be implemented in the calendar year 2023, depending on funding and staffing of their Information Technology Department. At the time of their response to our follow-up inquiry they had a 35% shortage of employees.^[24]

In response to this Grand Jury's request for information, the City of Scotts Valley said they kept their commitment to analyze Recommendations 1 and 3. Regarding recommendation 1 the City decided to redesign their website to afford transparency, accessibility, and ease of use to all stakeholders. With the goal of having as many of the processes automated as practicable, the City will have much better tools available to track website usage and functionality. Due to the COVID pandemic and staffing issues the initiation of the new website project was delayed. An improved staffing level was achieved by June 2022 and the redesign of their website was started.^[25] The City is fully committed to having this completed by the spring of 2023.^[26] Regarding recommendation 3, when the City of Scotts Valley developed its 2021-22 Strategic Plan in the Spring of 2021, they had a discussion of the SMART goals paradigm. Due to the upcoming redesigned website it was felt that adopting SMART goals was not necessary at this time.^[26]

5. Voter Data^[27]

Summary: Data Security has become a major concern to our community. There are many articles which chronicle, in painful detail, the destruction of lives caused by the theft of millions of confidential records. The 2019-2020 Grand Jury discovered that California elections code requires county elections departments to share voter data, including a key piece of data that would assist hackers: an individual's complete date of birth. While date of birth has not been clearly defined as personally identifiable information in the California Elections Code, date of birth is often used in identity theft, as well as social engineering and phishing attacks. State law requires each county to provide access to data collected during the voter registration and election processes. This data contains Personally Identifiable Information (PII) as defined by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). There are reports of voter registration data being offered for sale on hacker websites. County election departments were recommended to examine their processes to make sure that best practices are being employed, and all precautions are being taken to ensure that voter registration data is secure.

Key 2020 Findings:

- F1. Risk of misuse of voter registration data acquired by ELEC_2194 (1994) could be mitigated by stronger security measures at the County of Santa Cruz level.*
- F2. County applicants are not informed of recent amendments to ELEC_2188 (1994), and thus may not be taking all reasonable precautions to protect voter registration data, avoid data breaches, and report breaches if they occur.*

Key 2020 Recommendations:

- R1. In Distributed Data that is provided to county recipients, the County Elections Department should replace voter full date of birth with year of birth only. This action should be implemented before the end of FY2021.*
- R4. The County Elections Department should incorporate amendments to ELEC 2188 (1994), as specified in AB 1678 and AB 1044, in the county application and website information, namely that county recipients must inform the Secretary of State of a data breach, and that County Applicants may be subject to data security training.*
- R5. The County Elections Department should provide county applicants with data security training, consistent with any guidance from the Secretary of State, with the goal of implementing best practices aimed at protecting voter registration data. This action should be implemented before the end of FY2021.*

Requested 2020 Response:

County Elections Department

The Santa Cruz County Elections Department agreed with Findings 1 and 2 in 2020.^[28]

The Santa Cruz County Elections Department agreed to implement in the future Recommendation 1 about replacing the voter's full date of birth with year of birth only, Recommendation 4 regarding incorporating amendments to ELEC 2188 (1994), as specified in AB 1678 and AB 1044, in the County Application and website information, and Recommendation 5 regarding providing County Applicants with data security training, consistent with any guidance from the Secretary of State, with the goal of implementing best practices aimed at protecting voter registration data.^[29]

2022 Update: Were Commitments Kept?

We sent multiple inquiries to the County Elections Department to verify that these recommendations were implemented. Unfortunately, no response was received.

Since we did not receive a response from the County Elections Department, we could not determine if the County honored the commitments made in their response to the 2019-2020 Grand Jury Report.

Notable Missing Responses

Nearly all required responses to the 2019-20 investigative reports were submitted to the Grand Jury; the Board of Supervisors' required response on the Homelessness Investigation Recommendation 9 on evaluating closure of Coral Street was the lone exception. Far fewer invited responses were received. In many cases, the agency the response was invited from said their response was included with a required response. Thus some invited responses were missed because the agency providing the response was not invited to respond to each finding and recommendation. Additionally, there was evident coordination of responses from some agencies. This Grand Jury believes the public would be better served by the agencies providing their own responses to our recommendations rather than saying their response was given by others, or colluding to provide duplicates.

This Grand Jury made several attempts to ascertain whether the Elections Department had implemented the recommendations they said they would implement, but received no response.

Conclusion

The 2022-2023 Grand Jury reviewed responses to five of the 2019-2020 reports and found that, in general, commitments were kept. In some cases, the agencies are implementing recommendations but it's not clear if the actions are in response to the Grand Jury or whether they were instigated by the agencies.

The Grand Jury also reviewed Ready? Aim? Fire!, however we did not evaluate whether commitments were kept. Over the past three years there have been a major wildfire and three other fire-related investigations;^[30] ^[31] therefore, it would be difficult to gauge whether or not the studied entities fulfilled any of the recommendations specifically from the 2019-2020 Grand Jury report.

The Grand Jury continues to recommend that all organizations create and regularly update formal records of the actions they take to address Grand Jury recommendations, and to share those records with the public, in accordance with CA Penal Code Section 933(c).^[32]

Findings and Recommendations

General

Findings

- F1.** The 2022-2023 Grand Jury reviewed responses to five of the 2019-2020 reports and found that, in general, commitments were kept.
- F2.** The evident coordination of responses from agencies leaves the public without independent contributions across agencies.

Recommendations

- R1.** All agencies should provide their own independent responses to findings and recommendations instead of referring to the response of another agency. (F2)
- R2.** We continue to recommend that all organizations create and regularly update formal records of the actions they take to address Grand Jury recommendations, and to share those records with the public, in accordance with CA Penal Code Section 933(c). (F1, F2)

DeLaveaga Golf Course

Finding

- F3.** The City of Santa Cruz delayed the timeline rather than proceeding as outlined in their 2020 response to the Grand Jury. Instead, the City budgeted for a more comprehensive assessment of system-wide facilities and a capital investment plan to be completed in 2023.

Recommendation

- R3.** The City of Santa Cruz should report to the Grand Jury on the completion status of the Facilities Assessment and capital investment plan no later than December 31, 2023. (F3)

Fail in the Jail

Finding

- F4.** The safe and secure operation of the County Jail remains vulnerable during an unexpected power outage.

Recommendation

- R4.** The Santa Cruz County Sheriff should verify that the new generator system is operational by August 31, 2023. If not, the reasons for the further delay should be explained. (F4)

Homelessness

Findings

- F5.** The adoption of multi-year plans by both the City and County of Santa Cruz offer the public some assurance that locations can be found within the County where homeless services will be provided.
- F6.** Although the Cities of Capitola, Scotts Valley, and Watsonville agreed that there appear to be unused or underutilized parcels of land that could possibly be used for homeless services, it is not clear how this could be done.
- F7.** The master plan for Coral Street being worked by the City of Santa Cruz includes consideration of limiting vehicle access to Coral Street, but the grants received by the City and the plan to build 120 units of supportive housing preempt the original Grand Jury recommendation to consider closing it.

Recommendations

- R5.** As recommended in the 2022 “Homelessness Action Plan,” the Cities of Capitola, Scotts Valley, and Watsonville should collaborate with leaders from the County of Santa Cruz and the City of Santa Cruz to identify 20 new locations for shelters across the county. These cities should report on the status of this recommendation no later than December 31, 2023. (F6)
- R6.** The County of Santa Cruz and the four cities should plan to provide services for homeless persons at the sites identified in their plans, including but not limited to supportive housing, case management, and medical services. The County of Santa Cruz and the four cities should report to the Grand Jury on the status of providing homeless services at the sites identified no later than December 31, 2023. (F5, F6)
- R7.** The City of Santa Cruz should complete and then implement their Master Plan for Coral Street, including consideration of limiting vehicle access. The City of Santa Cruz should report to the Grand Jury on the status of Coral Street no later than December 31, 2023. (F7)

Tangled Web

Findings

- F8.** Staffing shortages made automating the process for updating the website of the City of Santa Cruz and redesigning the website of the City of Scotts Valley more difficult.

Recommendations

- R8.** The City of Santa Cruz should verify that their commitment to automate the

process for updating their website has been completed by October 31, 2023. (F8)

R9. The City of Scotts Valley should verify that their commitment to redesign their website to afford transparency, accessibility, and ease of use to all stakeholders has been completed by October 31, 2023. (F8)

Voter Data

Finding

F9. Data security is an important issue, including the security of voter registration data and it is unknown if measures have been taken in this area.

Recommendation

R10. The Santa Cruz County Clerk should outline steps that have been taken to make voter registration data more secure by September 30, 2023. (F9)

Required Responses

<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Respond Within/ Respond By</i>
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	F1, F2, F4, F5, F9	R1, R2, R4, R6, R9	90 Days September 5, 2023
Santa Cruz County Sheriff	F4	R4	60 Days August 7, 2023
Santa Cruz County Clerk	F9	R10	60 Days August 7, 2023
Capitola City Council	F1, F2, F6	R1, R2, R5, R6	90 Days September 5, 2023
Santa Cruz City Council	F1, F2, F3, F5, F7, F8	R1, R2, R3, R6, R7, R8	90 Days September 5, 2023
Scotts Valley City Council,	F1, F2, F6, F8	R1, R2, R5, R6, R9	90 Days September 5, 2023
Watsonville City Council	F1, F2, F6	R1, R2, R5, R6	90 Days September 5, 2023

Definitions

County Applicant: A person or persons applying to the Santa Cruz Elections Department to receive voter registration data.

County Recipient: A person or persons who have been approved by the Santa Cruz County Elections Department to receive voter registration data.

Sources

References

1. *Website*. Penal Code 933c. "Investigation of County, City, and District Affairs [925 - 933.6]." Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=933.&lawCode=PEN
2. 2019-20 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. April 1, 2021. *2019-2020 Grand Jury Reports and Responses*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
<https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Departments/GrandJury/2019-2020GrandJuryReportsandResponses.aspx>
3. 2019-20 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. June 16, 2020. *DeLaveaga Golf Course How City Policies and Practices Have Affected the Bottom Line*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/DeLaveagaGolf_Report.pdf
4. 2019-20 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. Sept 14, 2020. *City of Santa Cruz City Council Respond to the Findings and Recommendations Specified in the Report Titled DeLaveaga Golf Course How City Policies and Practices Have Affected the Bottom Line*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/2aR_DeLaveagaGolf_SCCityCouncil_Response.pdf#page=33
5. Confidential Grand Jury document.
6. Confidential Grand Jury document.
7. Confidential Grand Jury document.
8. 2019-20 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. June 19, 2020. *Fail in the Jail No Lights, No Camera, No Action?*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/JailInfrastructure_Report.pdf
9. Mitchell Medina, Undersheriff. Sept 17, 2020. *County of Santa Cruz Response to: Fail in the Jail: No Lights, No Camera, No Action?*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/2019-2020ConsolidatedResponses.pdf#page=308
10. Confidential Grand Jury document.
11. Confidential Grand Jury interview.
12. 2019-20 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. June 30, 2020. *Homelessness: Big Problem, Little Progress It's Time To Think Outside The Box*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/MicroHomes_Report.pdf

13. 2019-20 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. Sept 28, 2020. *2019-2020 Consolidated Report Responses*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/2019-2020ConsolidatedResponses.pdf#page=515
14. County of Santa Cruz
Human Services Department. "Agenda Item Submittal for June 9, 2021 Board of Supervisors Meeting." *Website*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
<https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20500357-focus-strategies-homeless-report-march-2021>
15. Stephen Baxter. March 6, 2021. "County land for temporary housing included in homeless proposal." *Website*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
<https://santacruzlocal.org/2021/03/06/county-land-for-temporary-housing-included-in-homeless-proposal/>
16. City of Santa Cruz. March 3, 2021. "City Council Agenda Report for Meeting March 8, 2022." *Website*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
<https://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/21352451/santa-cruz-homelessness-action-plan.pdf>
17. Kara Meyberg Guzman. March 9, 2022. "Santa Cruz plan for unhoused includes shelters and county coordination." *Website*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
<https://santacruzlocal.org/2022/03/09/santa-cruz-plan-for-unhoused-includes-shelters-and-county-coordination/>
18. Sarah Neuse, Senior Planner. No Date. "Coral Street Visioning Report." *Website*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
<https://www.cityofsantacruz.com/Home/Components/Topic/Topic/11943/>
19. Jessica A. York. December 13, 2022. "Santa Cruz gathers input on Coral Street future." *Website*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
<https://www.santacruzsentinel.com/2022/12/13/santa-cruz-gathers-input-on-coral-street-future/>
20. 2019-20 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. June 16, 2020. *The Tangled Web Oh, What a Mangled Web We Weave....* Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/TangledWeb_Report.pdf
21. Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors. Sept 14, 2020. *Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors Respond to the Findings and Recommendations Specified in the Report Titled*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/2019-2020ConsolidatedResponses.pdf#page=10
22. Ralph Dimarucut. Sept 14, 2020. "Santa Cruz City Council Response Packet - The Tangled Web." *Website*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/1cR_TangledWeb_SantaCruzCityCouncil_Response.pdf#page=9
23. Confidential Grand Jury document.

24. Confidential Grand Jury document.
25. Confidential Grand Jury document.
26. Confidential Grand Jury document.
27. 2019-20 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. June 19, 2020. *Voter Data – Registering Concerns Keeping a Closer Eye on the Distribution of County Voter Registration Data*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/VoterData_Report.pdf
28. David Brown, Senior Administrative Analyst. October 20, 2020. “19-20 Grand Jury Report Responses.” *Website*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/6aR_VoterData_CountyClerk_Response.pdf#page=5
29. David Brown, Senior Administrative Analyst. October 20, 2020. “19-20 Grand Jury Report Responses.” *Website*. Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2020_final/6aR_VoterData_CountyClerk_Response.pdf#page=7
30. 2021-22 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. 2021. *Reducing Our Community’s Risk from Wildfire It Will Take Money, Time, and Serious Cooperation*. Accessed March 9, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2022_final/2022-5_CZUFire_Report.pdf
31. 2020-21 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury. 2020. *Wildfire Threat to the City of Santa Cruz Promote Policies to Prevent and Protect*. Accessed March 9, 2023.
https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2021_final/2_CityWildfire_Report.pdf
32. *Website*. 933(c). “Investigation of County, City, and District Affairs [925 - 933.6].” Accessed February 23, 2023.
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=933.&lawCode=PEN
33. *Website*. “Investigation of County, City, and District Affairs [925 - 933.6].” Accessed May 7, 2023.
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=933.05

Appendix A

Instructions for Respondents

California law PC §933.05^[33] requires the respondent to a Grand Jury report to comment on each finding and recommendation within a report. Explanations for disagreements and timeframes for further implementation or analysis must be provided. Please follow the format below when preparing the responses.

Response Format

1. For the Findings included in this Response Packet, select one of the following responses and provide the required additional information:
 - a. **AGREE** with the Finding, or
 - b. **PARTIALLY DISAGREE** with the Finding and specify the portion of the Finding that is disputed and include an explanation of the reasons therefor, or
 - c. **DISAGREE** with the Finding and provide an explanation of the reasons therefore.
2. For the Recommendations included in this Response Packet, select one of the following actions and provide the required additional information:
 - a. **HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED**, with a summary regarding the implemented action, or
 - b. **HAS NOT YET BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE**, with a timeframe or expected date for implementation, or
 - c. **REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS**, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for that analysis or study; this timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report, or
 - d. **WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefore.