

Compliance and Continuity Report



2022 – 2023
Contra Costa County
Civil Grand Jury
Report #2301
April 21, 2023

A REPORT BY
THE 2022-2023 CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY
725 Court Street
Martinez, California 94553

Report 2301

Compliance and Continuity Report

Contact:
Cynthia Roberts
Grand Jury Foreperson
(925) 608-2621

Compliance and Continuity Report

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| BACKGROUND | 1 |
| <i>REQUIREMENTS FOR FINDINGS (WITH KEY TO THE COLORS)</i> | 1 |
| <i>REQUIREMENTS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS (WITH KEY TO THE COLORS)</i> | 2 |
| SUMMARIES OF INDIVIDUAL REPORTS | 4 |
| <i>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2102</i> | |
| ■ <i>TELE-MENTAL HEALTH: EXPANSION OF REMOTE ACCESS TO CARE</i> | 4 |
| <i>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2103</i> | |
| ■ <i>WEST COUNTY WASTEWATER DISTRICT REPORT</i> | 10 |
| <i>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2104</i> | |
| ■ <i>CYBER ATTACK PREPAREDNESS IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</i> | 13 |
| <i>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2105</i> | |
| ■ <i>IMPROVING ANIMAL SERVICES IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</i> | 17 |
| <i>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2106</i> | |
| ■ <i>911 MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS RESPONSE</i> | 23 |
| ENDNOTES | 30 |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Background

Under the Penal Code, the Contra Costa County civil grand jury is impaneled annually to investigate city and county government, special districts, and certain nonprofit corporations.

Findings and recommendations developed from these investigations are contained in the reports signed by the civil grand jury foreperson and the grand jury supervising superior court judge.

Recipient entities are required to respond to the reports within certain time constraints and in accordance with specific formats as stated in the California Penal Code¹.

The 2022-2023 civil grand jury reviewed five reports from the 2020-2021 civil grand jury. There were seven letters, with copies of applicable reports, mailed to the different entities from which responses were required. These included two public agencies, which were required to respond within 90 days.

Requirements for Findings (with key to the colors)

These five reports contained a cumulative total of 71 findings presented to the various recipients.

The Penal Code establishes these rules for the responses to findings:

Does each individual response from each respondent include a legally permitted option?

The responses to the findings must include one of the following legally permitted options²:

| Response | # | % |
|--|----|----|
| The respondent agrees with the finding (Penal Code (P. C. § 933.05 (a) (1))) | 49 | 69 |
| The respondent disagrees 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 (P. C. § 933.05 (a) (2)). | 12 | 17 |
| The respondent disagrees wholly 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 (P. C. § 933.05 (a) (3)). | 8 | 11 |
| Noncompliant response given | 1 | 1 |
| No response given. | 1 | 1 |

Is each individual response from each respondent in compliance?

| Compliance | # | % |
|---|----|----|
| Response in compliance | 69 | 97 |
| Response not in compliance ³ | 2 | 3 |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Requirements for Recommendations (with key to the colors)

These five reports made a cumulative total of 53 recommendations to the various recipients.

The Penal Code establishes these rules for responses to recommendations:

Does each individual response from each respondent include a legally permitted option?

The responses to the recommendations must include one of the following legally permitted options⁴:

| Response | # | % |
|--|----|----|
| The recommendation has been implemented with a summary regarding the implemented action (P. C. § 933.05 (b) (1)). | 23 | 43 |
| The recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future with a time frame for implementation (P. C. § 933.05 (b) (2)). | 12 | 23 |
| The recommendation <u>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</u> , 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 (P. C. § 933.05 (b) (3)). | 3 | 6 |
| The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or not reasonable with an explanation therefor (P. C. § 933.05 (b) (4)). | 12 | 23 |
| Noncompliant response given | 0 | 0 |
| No response given. | 3 | 6 |

An area of concern that does not impact determination of compliance

Is each individual response from each respondent in compliance?

| Compliance | # | % |
|---|----|----|
| Response in compliance | 50 | 94 |
| Response not in compliance ⁵ | 3 | 6 |

Compliance and Continuity Report

For further explanation of the responses to the recommendations, refer to the complete responses posted online.

The responses to the 2020-2021 grand jury reports are posted on the Contra Costa County grand jury website in their entirety and can be viewed at:

[Contra Costa Superior Court: Civil Grand Jury Reports](#)

The grand jury believes it is important for future grand juries to continue to review these responses and to be vigilant in seeing that recommendations that have been accepted are implemented. Special attention should be paid to those responses requiring implementation within specified time frames. In this manner, the commitment and hard work of past and future grand juries will result in positive changes for the citizens of Contra Costa County.

Compliance and Continuity Report

Summaries of Individual Reports

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2102 ■ *Tele-Mental Health: Expansion of Remote Access to Care*

The Report can be found at: [Tele-Mental Health: Expansion of Remote Access to Care](#)
Complete responses are found at: [Board of Supervisors' Response to Grand Jury Report](#)

Findings

- F1. Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, tele-mental health and audio-only services available through BHS were a small portion of the outpatient services provided (7% in 2018; 8% in 2019).

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

- F2. During the Covid-19 pandemic, BHS did not offer training to prepare clinicians or clients for effective and confidential use of tele-mental health services.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees wholly with this finding. An explanation was given. |

- F3. During the Covid-19 pandemic, BHS tele-mental health services continue to be underutilized. While audio-only increased to 52% of all outpatient services, tele-mental health was 18% of outpatient services delivered

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

- F4. At the outset of the Covid-19 pandemic, tele-mental health and audio-only services decreased the number of missed appointments.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

- F5. Tele-mental health services are appropriate for clients who are more stable, verbal and insightful.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

F6. Tele-mental health services are appropriate to use with clients displaying symptoms of anxiety and depression.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F7. The greater use of audio-only services has the limitation of not offering visual cues, which provide clinicians with important clinical information.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F8. Tele-mental health services are not appropriate for a. Homeless populations b. Patients presenting with chronic schizophrenia with a limited capacity to manage the tasks of daily life c. Patients prescribed controlled substances or injectable medication.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

F9. BHS has not incorporated tele-mental health into a comprehensive service delivery model to offer a broad range of opportunities for underserved populations to receive mental health services.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees wholly with this finding. An explanation was given. |

F10. Access to outpatient mental health services in Contra Costa County suffers from difficulties with transportation to clinics, long wait times for appointments, and insufficient availability of after-hours appointments.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

F11. BHS has a limited number of clinicians who can provide culturally and linguistically sensitive services to diverse minority groups.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees wholly with this finding. An explanation was given. |

F12. Increasing access to mental health services is a priority for Contra Costa County BHS.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

F13. The FCC reported 99.2% of Contra Costa County residents have access to internet broadband for greater use of tele-mental health services.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees wholly with this finding. An explanation was given. |

F14. BHS has not followed the directives of the California Telehealth Advancement Act of 2011 to develop telehealth services to better meet the needs of underserved populations in the community.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees wholly with this finding. An explanation was given. |

F15. The Congressional Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021 expands Medicare services to allow tele-mental health services to be integrated with in-person sessions, and to be received by beneficiaries in their home without geographic limitations.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F16. BHS lacks an adequate electronic data system to evaluate the efficacy of outpatient mental health services provided.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

F17. BHS does not collect clinical data from network providers, which limits accountability for the outpatient mental health services provided to county residents.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

Recommendations

R1. Develop a hybrid plan to integrate tele-mental health services with in-person services in their clinics.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

- R2. Coordinate with network provider groups to integrate tele-mental health services with in-person services.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

- R3. Develop a training program for BHS clinicians, network providers, and support staff to facilitate the use of tele-mental health.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation requires further analysis. An explanation was given. Due: June 30, 2022 Analysis Complete? Unknown |

- R4. Develop a training program for clients to facilitate and provide support for the use of tele-mental health.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

- R5. Collect outcome data from BHS providers and programs to provide feedback to improve mental health services delivered to the community.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

- R6. Collect outcome data from network providers to provide feedback to improve mental health services delivered to the community.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: July 1, 2022. Implemented? Unknown |

- R7. Increase the use of MyChart health care information system to make clinical information accessible to clients and providers.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

R8. Modernize the electronic data collection capabilities of the quality management program to provide meaningful information about mental health services.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation requires further analysis. An explanation was given. Due: June 30, 2022 Analysis Complete? Unknown |

R9. Develop appropriate clinical metrics to evaluate outcomes that improve the effectiveness of mental health services provided.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

R10. Seek grants and MHSA funding to upgrade the technological resources of the quality management program.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

R11. Allocate funds for BHS to upgrade its quality management program.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Summary of Responses

Findings

| IN COMPLIANCE? | | | RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 17 | 100 | Respondent agrees | 6 | 35 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees partially | 6 | 35 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees wholly | 5 | 29 |
| No | 0 | 0 | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 17 | | Total | 17 | |

Recommendations

| IN COMPLIANCE? | | | RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---|-----------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 11 | 100 | Agrees | 7 | 64 |
| | | | Has not yet been implemented | 1* | 9 |
| | | | Requires further analysis | 2* | 18 |
| | | | Will not be implemented | 1 | 9 |
| No | 0 | 0 | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 11 | | Total | 11 | |
| | | | *A follow-up for recommendations to be implemented in the future or would receive future consideration is missing. It is unknown if any follow-up was done. | | |

Compliance and Continuity Report

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2103 ■ WEST COUNTY WASTEWATER DISTRICT REPORT

The Report can be found at: [West County Wastewater District Report](#)
Complete responses are found at: [Response from the West County Wastewater District](#)

Findings

- F1 Board members are prohibited by WCWD Policies and Procedures from communicating directly with district staff other than the General Manager.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|---|--|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | Respondent disagrees wholly with this finding. An explanation was given. |

- F2. Therefore, a director cannot obtain non-publicly available information from district staff about district operations without the General Manager's consent.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

- F3. The General Manager determines the agenda for district board meetings in consultation with the Board president.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|---|--|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

- F4. Alternatively, a Board member may place an item on the meeting agenda, but only with a Board majority vote.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|---|--|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

- F5. The Board has given the General Manager the discretion to spend up to \$50,000 (per vendor per fiscal year) of WCWD funds for district maintenance and operations without Board approval.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|---|--|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

F6. Board members can review the check register for the WCWD’s general fund, but the General Manager’s discretionary expenditures are not segregated or identified on the check register.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|---|--|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F7. In the Board’s 2020 investigation of two directors, the Board allocated a \$1000 stipend to each to obtain legal advice. In the Board’s most recent investigation of the same directors, no stipends were paid.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|---|--|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F8. The WCWD has no written policy on when or under what circumstances it will pay for a director’s legal expenses.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|---|--|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

Recommendations

R1. The Board adopt procedures by which any Board member can obtain information about WCWD operations without the agreement of the General Manager.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|---|---|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | Respondent will partially implement. <i>Response not among those allowed by PEN § 933.05 (b).</i> A summary was provided. |

R2. The Board adopt procedures by which any Board member can place an item on the meeting agenda without the General Manager’s approval or a Board majority vote.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|---|--|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

R3. The Board adopt a written policy on reimbursement of a director’s legal fees for both internal investigations and claims brought against a director by an outside third party.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|---|---|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: June 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

R4. The Board adopt a procedure that requires the General Manager to identify expenditures made under the authority to make per-vendor payments of less than \$50,000 per fiscal year.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|---|--|
| Board of Directors of the West County Wastewater District (Board) | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |

Summary of Responses

Findings

| IN COMPLIANCE? | | | RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|----------------|-------|---------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 8 | 100 | Respondent agrees | 6 | 75 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees partially | 1 | 12.5 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees wholly | 1 | 12.5 |
| No | 0 | 0 | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 8 | | Total | 8 | |

Recommendations

| IN COMPLIANCE? | | | RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|----------------|-------|---------|-------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 3 | 75 | Agrees | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Has not yet been implemented | 1* | 25 |
| | | | Requires further analysis | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Will not be implemented | 2 | 50 |
| No | 1 | 25 | Noncompliant Response | 1 | 25 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4 | | Total | 4 | |

*A follow-up for recommendations to be implemented in the future or would receive future consideration is missing. It is unknown if any follow-up was done.

Compliance and Continuity Report

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2104 ■ CYBER ATTACK PREPAREDNESS IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

The Report can be found at: [Cyber Attack Preparedness in Contra Costa County](#)

Complete responses are found at: [Response from the Board of Supervisors](#)

Findings

F1. County IT Departments are chronically understaffed.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F2. Obsolete equipment poses a vulnerability threat to County IT security.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F3. Some County IT departments do not have time to conduct software and hardware updates, and vulnerability scans which are critical for cyber security because of understaffing.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F4. Some County departments with small IT staffs do not have specialized cyber security personnel.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F5. Cyber security training is performed on an inconsistent basis in some County departments.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F6. County employees and contractors use personal storage devices (e.g., flash drives) on County computers.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

F7. The use of personal devices makes County computers vulnerable to denial of service, data breaches or other cyber-attacks.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F8. IT expenditures and budgets in County departments are not transparently reported so it is difficult to identify redundant and duplicative IT expenditures.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F9. Decentralized IT structures increase vulnerability to cyber-attacks.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F10. The County's IT structure is decentralized.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

F11. Based on interviews, Contra Costa County is at a disadvantage to hire IT staff with cyber security expertise due to increased compensation and perks offered by some private enterprises.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

Recommendations

R1. The Board of Supervisors direct the County Chief Information Officer by December 2022 to create a talent pool within DoIT that includes cyber security experts to relieve chronic staffing shortages in all IT departments.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

R2. The Board of Supervisors direct the County Administrator by June 2022 to require all IT departments to forbid use of personal devices on and with County computers (e.g., personal thumb drives).

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent partially agrees with this recommendation. <i>Response not among those allowed by PEN § 933.05 (b).</i> A summary was provided. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

- R3. The Board of Supervisors direct the County Administrator by June 2022 to require the installation of software on all County computers that can scan for threats and viruses on any device attached to them.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

- R4. The Board of Supervisors direct the County Administrator by June 2022 to authorize DoIT to require system vulnerability testing on all County computer systems.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

- R5. The Board of Supervisors direct the County Administrator by June 2022 to require all county employees to complete annual cyber security awareness training.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

- R6. The Board of Supervisors direct the County Administrator by June 2022 to have DoIT ensure mandatory updates are performed on all systems for all software applications.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

- R7. The Board of Supervisors direct the County Administrator by December 2022 to have all County departments identify and replace obsolete IT hardware.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

- R8. The Board of Supervisors direct the County Administrator by June 2022 to require County departments to identify their planned IT spending in their overall budgets for transparency.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Summary of Responses

Findings

| IN COMPLIANCE? | | | RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 11 | 100 | Respondent agrees | 9 | 82 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees partially | 2 | 18 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees wholly | 0 | 0 |
| No | 0 | 0 | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 11 | | Total | 11 | |

Recommendations

| IN COMPLIANCE? | | | RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|----------------|----------|---------|-------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 7 | 88 | Agrees | 7 | 88 |
| | | | Has not yet been implemented | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Requires further analysis | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Will not be implemented | 0 | 0 |
| No | 1 | 12 | Noncompliant Response | 1 | 12 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 8 | | Total | 8 | |

Compliance and Continuity Report

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2105 ■ IMPROVING ANIMAL SERVICES IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

The Report can be found at: [Improving Animal Services in Contra Costa County](#)
 Complete responses are found at: [Response from the Board of Supervisors](#)
[Response from the City of Antioch](#)

Findings

F1. There is a need for improved animal services throughout the County.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F2. CCAS facilities are concentrated in the northern part of the County.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|-------------------|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | No Response Given |

F3. AAS volunteers are often not assigned specific tasks and lack direction.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|-------------------------|---|
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent disagrees wholly with this finding. An explanation was given. |

F4. AAS does not have funding for a Volunteer Coordinator / Community Outreach staff position.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|-------------------------|--|
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F5. In some of the contracted municipalities, residents are not aware of CCAS-provided services, especially wildlife retrieval.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F6. Funding reductions to the CCAS budget have hindered live wildlife retrieval and rescue.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

F7. A satisfaction survey of the 18 CCAS-contracted cities revealed 40% satisfied, 40% somewhat satisfied, and 20% unsatisfied with the quality of overall CCAS services supplied.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F8. All CCAS contracts with municipalities provide identical services at the same cost per capita.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F9. Additional vaccination and spay and neuter clinics would reduce the number of homeless and surrendered animals in the shelters.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F10. There are private animal shelter facilities, The Milo Foundation and ARF, in the western and central parts of the County, respectively.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F11. A private animal shelter in Alameda County, East Bay SPCA, is located near the southern part of Contra Costa County

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F12. Measure X funding has not been allocated for CCAS operations

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

Recommendations

R1. The Antioch City Council allocate funding to fill the staff position of Volunteer Coordinator / Community Outreach at AAS.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|----------------------|--|
| Antioch City Council | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: 05/09/22 Implemented? Unknown |

Compliance and Continuity Report

R2. AAS improve volunteer training.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|----------------------|---|
| Antioch City Council | “This recommendation has already been implemented.” This is understood as the “Respondent agrees with the recommendation.” A summary was provided. |

R3. The County Board of Supervisors allocate additional funding to provide outreach to educate residents about available CCAS services.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |

R4. CCAS explore embedding Animal Control Officers at selected police stations to expand services, such as wildlife retrieval, throughout the county.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |

R5. CCAS engage a consulting firm to obtain guidance on the possible redistribution of animal services within the County.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |

R6. CCAS pursue a Memorandum of Understanding with ARF to coordinate resource sharing.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

R7. CCAS pursue a Memorandum of Understanding with the Milo Foundation to coordinate resource sharing.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

R8. CCAS pursue a Memorandum of Understanding with East Bay SPCA to coordinate resource sharing.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |

R9. CCAS management and City Managers pursue customization of the Animal Services contracts to include basic service plus extended services for an additional fee.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |

R10. AAS and CCAS explore sharing of resources for low-cost animal care clinics in the eastern part of the County.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation requires further analysis. An explanation was given. Due: Not stated (<i>Fails</i>) Analysis Complete? Unknown |
| Antioch City Council | The recommendation requires further analysis. An explanation was given. Due: "June 2022" Analysis Complete? Unknown |

R11. AAS and CCAS explore sharing of resources for low-cost animal care clinics in the eastern part of the County.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Summary of Responses

Findings

| City Council of Antioch IN COMPLIANCE? | | | City Council of Antioch RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|---|----------|---------|--|----------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 4 | 100 | Respondent agrees | 3 | 75 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees partially | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees wholly | 1 | 25 |
| No | | 00 | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4 | | Total | 4 | |

| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors IN COMPLIANCE? | | | Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|---|-----------|---------|--|-----------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 10 | 91 | Respondent agrees | 7 | 73 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees partially | 1 | 9 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees wholly | 1 | 9 |
| No | 1 | 9 | Noncompliant Response | 1 | 9 |
| | | | No Response Given | 1 | 9 |
| Total | 11 | | Total | 11 | |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Recommendations

| City Council of Antioch IN COMPLIANCE? | | | City Council of Antioch RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|---|--------------|----------------|--|--------------|----------------|
| <u>Compliant?</u> | <u>Count</u> | <u>Percent</u> | <u>Compliant?</u> | <u>Count</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
| Yes | 3 | 100 | Agrees | 2 | 67 |
| | | | Has not yet been implemented | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Requires further analysis | 1* | 33 |
| | | | Will not be implemented | 0 | 0 |
| No | 0 | 0 | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3 | | Total | 3 | |
| | | | *A follow-up for recommendations to receive future consideration is missing. It is unknown if any follow-up was done. | | |

| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors IN COMPLIANCE? | | | Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|---|--------------|----------------|--|--------------|----------------|
| <u>Compliant?</u> | <u>Count</u> | <u>Percent</u> | <u>Compliant?</u> | <u>Count</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
| Yes | 8 | 89 | Agrees | 3 | 33 |
| | | | Has not yet been implemented | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Requires further analysis | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Will not be implemented | 5 | 56 |
| No | 1 | 11 | Noncompliant Response | 1* | 11 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 9 | | Total | 9 | |
| | | | * A due date for the stated further analysis (R10) was not stated as required. | | |

Compliance and Continuity Report

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT 2106 ■ 911 MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS RESPONSE

The Report can be found at: [911 Mental Health Crisis Response](#)
Complete responses are found at: [Response from the Board of Supervisors](#)
[Response from the City of Antioch](#)

Findings

- F1. Professional crisis team response to mental health calls can de-escalate a crisis and reduce deaths.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

- F2. Law enforcement response to mental health calls reduce resources needed for serious crimes.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

- F3. Successful pilot programs in other states have earned voter funding support for program expansion.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

- F4. Community trust in mental health crisis response teams can only be developed over time.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

- F5. Educating the community about mental health crisis response teams is essential for their acceptance and use.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

F6. DHS efforts to educate the community about MCRT services have been ineffective and need improvement.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F7. Funding is required for all the phases of program development: start-up, pilot, and continuing operations.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F8. California funding grants, including AB-118, are available for pilot program creation and continuing operations.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent disagrees partially with this finding. An explanation was given. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F9. The current MCRT program does not provide standardized responses within the County due to limited hours of service and a single dispatch location.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

F10. The City of Antioch is a suitable community to serve as a pilot city for the MCRT expansion program.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | Respondent agrees with the finding. |
| City Council of Antioch | Respondent agrees with the finding. |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Recommendations

R1. By June 30, 2022, the Board of Supervisors approve funding for the expansion of the existing DHS/MCRT program to include a pilot project.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | "The recommendation has been implemented." Taken to mean the Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: June 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

R2. By June 30, 2022, the Board of Supervisors direct DHS to cooperate with the City of Antioch to develop a pilot project.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | "The recommendation has been implemented." Taken to mean the Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: June 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

R3. By September 30, 2022, the Antioch City Council collaborate with DHS to establish a pilot project.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|-------------------------|---|
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: September 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

R4. By October 30, 2022, the City of Antioch apply for grants, including AB-118, to fund its participation in the pilot program.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|-------------------------|---|
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: October 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

Compliance and Continuity Report

R5. By June 30, 2022, the Board of Supervisors direct DHS to establish a joint team including representation from community partners for administration of the pilot project.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: June 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

R6. By September 30, 2022, DHS and the City of Antioch begin a comprehensive program to inform and educate the community members about the project and the specific resources that will be available at the outset of the pilot project.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: September 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

R7. By December 31, 2022, the Antioch Police Department and its 911 dispatchers augment their training to include the new MCRT alternative response options available.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: September 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

Compliance and Continuity Report

R8. By September 30, 2022, DHS apply for all available state, county, and private grants (e.g., AB-118), as well as money available through Measure X, as a source of funding.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | “The recommendation has been implemented.” Taken to mean the Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: September 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

R9. By December 31, 2021, DHS implement ongoing monitoring of the proposed CAHOOTS Act (S.4441) as an additional source of funding.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | “The recommendation has been implemented.” Taken to mean the Respondent agrees with the recommendation. A summary was provided. |
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: December 31, 2021 Implemented? Unknown |

R10. By September 30, 2022, if Antioch is not willing to be a pilot program city, DHS identify and approach an alternate city and work with it on the recommendations related to Antioch.

| RESPONDENT | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION |
|--|--|
| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors | The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. An explanation was given. |
| City Council of Antioch | The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. By: September 30, 2022 Implemented? Unknown |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Summary of Responses

Findings

| City Council of Antioch IN COMPLIANCE? | | | City Council of Antioch RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|---|-------|---------|--|-------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 10 | 100 | Respondent agrees | 10 | 100 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees partially | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees wholly | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| No | 0 | 0 | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 10 | | Total | 10 | |

| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors IN COMPLIANCE? | | | Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|---|-------|---------|--|-------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 10 | 100 | Respondent agrees | 8 | 80 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees partially | 2 | 20 |
| | | | Respondent disagrees wholly | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| No | 0 | 0 | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 10 | | Total | 10 | |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Recommendations

| City Council of Antioch IN COMPLIANCE? | | | City Council of Antioch RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|---|-------|---------|---|-------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 10 | 100 | Agrees | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Has not yet been implemented | 10* | 100 |
| | | | Requires further analysis | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Will not be implemented | 0 | 0 |
| No | 0 | 0 | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 10 | | Total | 10 | |
| | | | *A follow-up for recommendations to be implemented in the future is missing. It is unknown if any follow-up was done. | | |

| Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors IN COMPLIANCE? | | | Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors RESPONSE COUNT? | | |
|---|-------|---------|--|-------|---------|
| Compliant? | Count | Percent | Compliant? | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 8 | 100 | Agrees | 4 | 50 |
| | | | Has not yet been implemented | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Requires further analysis | 0 | 0 |
| | | | Will not be implemented | 4 | 50 |
| No | 0 | 0 | Noncompliant Response | 0 | 0 |
| | | | No Response Given | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 8 | | Total | 8 | |

Compliance and Continuity Report

Endnotes

¹ (P. C. §933 (c))
No later than 90 days after the grand jury submits a final report on the operations of any public agency subject to its reviewing authority, the governing body of the public agency shall comment to the presiding judge of the superior court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the governing body, and every elected county officer or agency head for which the grand jury has responsibility pursuant to Section 914.1 shall comment within 60 days to the presiding judge of the superior court, with an information copy sent to the board of supervisors, on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of that county officer or agency head and any agency or agencies which that officer or agency head supervises or controls. In any city and county, the mayor shall also comment on the findings and recommendations. All of these comments and reports shall forthwith be submitted to the presiding judge of the superior court who impaneled the grand jury. A copy of all responses to grand jury reports shall be placed on file with the clerk of the public agency and the office of the county clerk, or the mayor when applicable, and shall remain on file in those offices. One copy shall be placed on file with the applicable grand jury final report by, and in the control of the currently impaneled grand jury, where it shall be maintained for a minimum of five years.

(P. C. §933 (d)): As used in this section “agency” includes a department.

² PC 933.05(a).
(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.

³ See Endnote ¹

⁴ PC 933.05(b).
(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.

⁵ See Endnote ¹