



County of Santa Cruz

Civil Grand Jury
701 Ocean Street, Room 318-I
Santa Cruz, Ca 95060
(831) 454-2099

Jan 11, 2021

The Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors' Senior Receptionist left a voicemail message on the above date confirming that the Board of Supervisors approved its response to the *Ready? Aim? Fire!* report on 10/6/2020.

The Correspondence Committee on behalf of

Richard H. Goldberg

Richard H. Goldberg, Foreperson
2020–2021 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury



19-20 Grand Jury Report Responses

1 message

David Brown <David.Brown@santacruzcounty.us>
To: "grandjury@scgrandjury.org" <grandjury@scgrandjury.org>

Tue, Oct 20, 2020 at 9:42 AM

Greetings Grand Jury,

Please find the County responses to the 19-20 Grand Jury Reports attached for your records.

Thank you,

Dave

David Brown

Senior Administrative Analyst

County Administrative Office

County of Santa Cruz

O: (831) 454-3490

C: (831) 227-1661

My pronouns are: he/him/his

13 attachments

 **Fail in the Jail _BoS_Packet.pdf**
181K

 **Fail_in_the_Jail_CAO_Packet.pdf**
184K

 **BOS FireInspection BOS Response Packet.pdf**
181K

 **GSD FireInspection Response Packet.pdf**
174K

 **BOS Response - Homelessness - Big Problem Little Progress - It's Time to Think Outside The Box.pdf**
289K

 **CAO Response - Homelessness - Big Problem Little Progress - It's Time to Think Outside The Box.pdf**
207K

 **CAO Response - Ready Aim Fire!.pdf**
258K


 **SCCFD Response - Ready Aim Fire!.pdf**
239K

 **BOS Response - Ready Aim Fire!.pdf**
256K

 **2020.08.26 TangledWeb_BoS_Packet.pdf**
222K

 **2020.08.26 TangledWeb_CAO_Packet.pdf**
222K

 **Voter Data Clerk Response.pdf**
179K

 **VoterData_BoS_Packet.pdf**
180K



**The 2019–2020 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury
Requires that the
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors
Respond to the Findings and Recommendations
Specified in the Report Titled
Ready? Aim? Fire!
Santa Cruz County on the Hot Seat
by October 1, 2020**

When the response is complete, please

1. Email the completed Response Packet as a file attachment to grandjury@scgrandjury.org, and
2. Print and send a hard copy of the completed Response Packet to

The Honorable Judge John Gallagher
Santa Cruz Courthouse
701 Ocean St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Instructions for Respondents

California law PC §933.05 (included [below](#)) 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 therefor.
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 therefor.

Validation

Date of the Board's response approval: _____

If you have questions about this response form, please contact the Grand Jury by calling 831-454-2099 or by sending an email to grandjury@scgrandjury.org.

Findings

F1. Vegetation/fuel management and abatement are not receiving the attention nor funding needed from the County of Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors, and therefore are not adhering to California Government Executive Order 1.8.19-EO-N-05-19.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

Vegetation/fuel management and abatement is the responsibility of the property owner not the County of Santa Cruz. The County could do more to improve the clearing or removal of vegetation along County maintained roadways, more than just the sight line clear that may or may not occur annually. The removal of vegetation is expensive and labor intensive for a county that provides many services to the community. Funding is available through different grant opportunities to assist with fuel reduction and the County has benefited from such grants. An example of such grant funding is the fuel reduction project that was approved as part of the 35-statewide project as outlined in Governor Newsom's 45-day report and the Executive Order 1.8.19-EO-N-05-19 that was issued regarding fuel reduction in California. This project is in the unincorporated area of the County within CSA 48 area of Aptos Creek and Buzzard Lagoon roads near Corralitos. The project consisted of treating 225 acres to improve existing and create additional fuel breaks to protect vulnerable communities. Of the 225 treated acres, 150 acres is a shaded fuel break and has allowed for the use of prescribed fire to be used to help clear and maintain the area.

F2. Santa Cruz County residents are at increased risk of fire danger due to the lack of risk management for wildfire. Specific risks are not formally identified, tracked, assessed for impact, nor is progress reported by fire departments in the County. Therefore, leaders responsible for budgets and accountability are left unprepared to manage risk, impact, or performance.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

Responsibility for wildfire fire management is held with each fire agency within Santa Cruz County. Each jurisdiction monitors and tracks wildfire risk within its own jurisdiction. The approach and extent of this work is managed within each jurisdiction. The State responsibility area, which includes the majority of the rural area within the County, is controlled and managed by CAL FIRE.

F4. Most of Santa Cruz County in addition to the City of Santa Cruz with its large eucalyptus groves are not being monitored by the ALERTWildfire Imaging Surveillance system and would be well served by the installation of cameras capable of monitoring coastal areas occupied by eucalyptus groves in areas harboring potential sources of ignition.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

Eucalyptus groves are a problem in general due to the abundant fuel loading they provide, but one fuel type in the county should not be singled out. Fires occur in areas of redwood forest as well, example, the Rincon Fire in 2018. The use of the ALERTWildfire camera system is a great way to provide for early confirmation of wildfire in the county. CAL FIRE/County Fire is working with ALERTWildfire and PG&E to determine locations to install cameras to provide a system for early confirmation of wildfires.

F5. Santa Cruz County would greatly benefit if steps were taken to implement the CAL FIRE, San Mateo - Santa Cruz Unit 2018 recommendation of developing detailed, site specific Community Wildfire Protection Plans for communities throughout the County.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F6. Response time data for fire departments in Santa Cruz County is challenging to obtain. Santa Cruz Regional 9-1-1 previously reported response time data in their annual reports, but did not do so in the 2018 or 2019 annual reports.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F7. Residents living in the CSA-48 receive a lower level of emergency medical support than those living in more urban areas where ALS is provided.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

The Grand Jury report identifies (Pg 35) that there are 11 fire agencies that provide ALS services in the county, that is incorrect, there is only 5 fire agencies providing ALS (Santa Cruz City FD, Scotts Valley FPD, Central FPD, Aptos FPD and Watsonville FD). The remainder of the fire agencies provide BLS with advanced/expanded scope medical services that allow BLS agencies to perform intubation, Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (CPAP), Pulse oximetry, Administer Narcan and Epinephrine (EpiPen).

F8. Santa Cruz County Fire, through its contract with CAL FIRE, has not been meeting the “two in, two out” requirement, reducing their ability to respond effectively and quickly to individuals or structures needing attention in a fire emergency. Proposition 218 was proposed and passed to be able to satisfy the “two in, two out” requirement, without a clear commitment by County Fire that that standard will be consistently met in all CSA-48 locations. In addition, no analysis was presented to quantify the effect on response time.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F10. Roadside vegetation in rural areas of the County is not being cleared consistently which could potentially increase emergency response time, putting life and property in unnecessary danger. Furthermore, evacuations could be restricted as there is no rule or program that mandates that roads, even critical evacuation routes, be kept cleared meeting defensible space requirements.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F11. There are only approximately 17,000 accounts for the Santa Cruz County opt-in CodeRED™ emergency system, which implies that a significant portion of the County may not receive emergency alert messages, which potentially reduces residents' opportunity to take action in a timely, life-saving manner.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F12. Long Range Acoustic Devices (LRADs), have been deployed in other areas of the state and have proven effective tools in alerting residents in urban and rural areas to a wildfire. However, Santa Cruz County has no such devices, increasing the risk to County residents.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

The use of Long-Range Acoustic Devices (LRADs) have proven too been useful in certain applications. The main factor is public compliance with the use. When activated will the public react? It has been difficult to gain compliance from the public even during evacuations use conventional methods such as reverse 911 or CodeRed alerts. The cost to purchase these systems is very high as well as the maintenance.

F13. High risk communities in the County are left unnecessarily vulnerable due to the lack of easily accessible, published information of refuge/assembly areas and structures.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

The vulnerability of the community is more directly related to the located and preventative maintenance of the home and surrounding site and less so related to published information regarding refuge and assembly areas. All communities refuge and assembly areas are commonly churches and schools and dependent on specific emergencies within the County.

F14. Because the County does not publish a “shelter in place” plan, when a fire expands rapidly, residents cannot make informed decisions about whether to shelter in place or evacuate.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

The decision to evacuate should always be based on the health and safety of the residents.

F15. Unlike the City of Santa Cruz, the County does not publish emergency evacuation routes, purportedly to avoid having old or untimely information being followed in an emergency. The County therefore withholds revealing evacuation routes until an emergency is in progress, likely creating unnecessary risk and potential for chaos.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

The evacuation routes utilized during an emergency must remain flexible to appropriately response to the emergency at hand.

F16. In the Wildland Urban Interface zone, and in many town centers, traffic choke points exist, and in some instances have roadway obstacles to traffic flow such as overgrown vegetation, concrete medians, curbs, and lane reductions resulting in roads that are inadequate for mass evacuations.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F17. Santa Cruz County residents, and especially those living in District 5, would benefit if the 2019 San Lorenzo Evacuation Study performed by KLD Engineering was made available on a County agency web site and publicized.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F18. Santa Cruz County has not sufficiently implemented lessons learned from Butte County's Paradise Fire on the importance of traffic management during an evacuation. It is imperative the County Office of Emergency Services ensures coordination between neighboring communities to manage traffic light sequencing and conversion of two-way roads into one-way evacuation routes, enabling mass evacuation during a wildfire.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

The County did. During the CZU fire, evacuations were staged well in advance (approximately 77,000 people) and two-way roads were converted into one-way evacuation routes.

F20. The FireWise institution provides a valuable fire prevention program and, as of March 2020, there were eight FireWise communities registered in the County. Marin County, by contrast, with a similar population, has sixty registered communities, highlighting the need for more FireWise promotion and participation in Santa Cruz County.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F21. The County Office of Emergency Services and fire agencies in the County encourage residents to be prepared for an emergency, however the passive mechanisms such as web sites used to encourage preparedness are not proving to be sufficient.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

Sustaining public interest and engagement in emergency preparation is a difficult and ongoing task that is never complete. Local fire agencies engage in outreach and education activities to encourage residents to be prepared for emergencies.

F22. Property owners in the County are responsible for their own vegetation management, yet they are often not sufficiently educated about vegetation management practices, or do not have the capability, financial resources, or desire to create defensible space.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F23. No single organization in the County is assuming a leadership role in Fire Hazard Mitigation. It is not clear whose responsibility it is to minimize this County wide risk.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

Due to jurisdictional responsibility, it may be difficult to narrow the leadership role down to one agency. Fire agencies in general can take a more proactive approach in their respective jurisdictions to gain greater buy-in from the communities. The Santa Cruz Fire Safe Council has taken some role in the effort but funding is the single most difficult obstacles to overcome. The second obstacle is obtaining property owner permissions or buy-in on fuel reduction can be difficult.

F24. The annual report to the County Board of Supervisors and the County Administrative Office by County Fire/CAL FIRE does not provide data or analysis of resources, response times, code enforcement, inspection, or education. This information is necessary to show what gaps exist between current performance and community needs in order for informed budget decisions to be made. Without adequate background information, the Board of Supervisors is unable to hold CAL FIRE accountable for the specific responsibilities specified in their contract.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

The County Fire/CAL FIRE Chief gave a State of the State presentation to the Board during Budget Hearings, which provided both data and analysis of resources, response times, code enforcement, inspection, and education. This is aligned with the budget process. This presentation is also given to the Fire Dept Advisory commission (FDAC), holds responsibility to provide oversight of these.

F26. Reporting data, statistics, and formats utilized by fire agencies throughout the County are highly inconsistent, uncoordinated, and therefore not readily evaluated and compared. The standard Insurance Services Office (ISO) rating system would be useful to adopt. Response time data are not well described or consistently reported by the jurisdictions, making accurate assessment difficult, especially by other agencies or by the public.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F27. The 2015 County of Santa Cruz Emergency Operations Management plan does not adequately address evacuation, and references data too outdated to be useful, such as a population density map from the 2000 census.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F28. The 2016 LAFCO Municipal Service Review of Fire Districts report and its 2006 predecessor do not adequately address district performance in the areas of Fire Risk Reduction (specifically: inspections, vegetation management, and education).

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

F29. The Grand Jury finds that formally specified baseline and target performance statements, in alignment with the Center for Public Safety Excellence Assessment Process, neither currently exist nor are they reported by fire departments in the County as required by best practice standards. There are no goals set or measures made of progress for review by the Board of Supervisors regarding County Fire/CAL FIRE performance. Other fire districts in the County are similarly remiss in reporting to their governing bodies. Appropriate goals would include progress on response times, vegetation management, and code inspection progress, all of which are necessary to properly quantify the budget and resources required for full-time, volunteer, and prison inmate workforces, in appropriate, affordable proportions.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

The prison inmate workforce is a State level program administered by the California Department of Corrections. The incarcerated inmates are not a budgetary item for the County to measure since it is a state level program. Any reference to the analysis of the program should be included as part of the CAL FIRE report.

F30. Due to the inconsistent reporting of response times provided by CAL FIRE in Proposition 218, conflict with information supplied by document request to the Grand Jury, and due to lack of performance standards for response times, voters may have been ill-informed when voting on the proposition.

AGREE

PARTIALLY DISAGREE – explain the disputed portion

DISAGREE – explain why

Response explanation (required for a response other than **Agree**):

Not having the specific details of the finding or having the opportunity to address any conflicts, it is difficult to provide a response to the finding. The area County Fire provides services to is approximately 266 square miles and has remote area that the public frequently visit and have emergencies that take longer to responded to. County Fire is working to clarify the data to ensure it is accurate.

Recommendations

R1. Santa Cruz County, under the auspices of the Emergency Management Council (EMC) with LAFCO support, should study a governing structure that would tie all fire agencies in the County together with common leadership, objectives, sharing of data, and maximized use of resources. (F23, F25)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

The Santa Cruz Fire Chiefs Association serves as a governing structure for all County fire agencies in the County together with common leadership, objectives, sharing of data, and maximized use of resources. This structure includes sections such as operations, planning, training, and data sharing to address needs and maximize use of resources.

R2. The Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors should require CAL FIRE and County Fire to provide quarterly and annual reports to the County General Services Department with specified data and success metrics for each of the contract requirements, beginning with the current fiscal year. (F2, F24, F26, F29)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

CAL FIRE/County Fire will continue to work with the Santa Cruz County Director of General Services in weekly meetings, as well as the Fire Department Advisory Commission (FDAC) to determine a reasonable reporting structure and timeline for the reporting.

R3. The Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors should require CAL FIRE, in conjunction with the General Services Department, to provide annual operations reviews with performance metrics and annual improvement objectives, beginning with the current fiscal year. (F2, F24, F26, F29)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

CAL FIRE/County Fire will continue to work with the Santa Cruz County Director of General Services in weekly meetings, as well as the Fire Department Advisory Commission (FDAC) to determine a reasonable reporting structure and timeline for the reporting.

R6. The County Board of Supervisors should request that the County Fire Chief submit an analysis and a recommended plan to assess whether to provide Advanced Life Support (ALS) year round to the County Fire service area by the 2021-2022 budget. (F7)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

This would require significant analysis and research to determine the feasibility of an Advanced Life Support response program for County Fire.

R7. County Fire should provide a plan to the County Board of Supervisors by September 30, 2020 identifying how and when the new CSA 48 tax revenue will result in the addition of six more firefighters to the response team, enabling the required “two in, two out” in a fire emergency. (F8)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

This has been implemented as of July 1, 2020. The funding for the six additional Firefighters has been included in the FY20/21 County Fire Budget. The newly approved three-year cooperative fire protection agreement with the County of Santa Cruz that was approved in May 2020 includes the increase in staffing.

R8. The County Board of Supervisors should set an objective for County Fire to increase the number of volunteer firefighters by July 1, 2022, as well as a plan for use of the prison workforce or an alternative. This needs to be done in concert with a comprehensive resource plan for County Fire. (F9)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

The use of prison workforce is not an option. The inmates at the Ben Lomond Conservation Camp (BLC) are not trained in structural fire suppression or technical rescue, they are only trained to a minimal level for wildland fire response. In addition, this would require agreement between the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and CAL FIRE. The mission of the BLC is to provide wildland response and vegetation management project support and as needed support to other emergencies such as flooding to provide sandbagging operations.

R9. Each year, during the budget presentation, the County Board of Supervisors should require County Fire to provide a vegetation management plan, including a priority list of projects and a timeframe for their completion. (F1, F10, F16, F29)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

There is currently no funding for a vegetation management plan for the County Fire Department. We currently coordinate with CAL FIRE on a priority list of projects that have timeline related to available funding. In order to implement such and process will require additional analysis and potential funding.

R10. Santa Cruz County and Cities should create and/or update Hazard Mitigation Plans by July 1, 2021. Any new or existing plans should be updated a minimum of every three years. All plans should address wildfire risk, evacuation and shelter in place plans, emergency alerts, vegetation management, and confirm compliance with California SB 821. (F1, F2, F10, F11, F14–F16, F29)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

The County updates its Hazard Mitigation Plan every five years per State requirements. It is current, through 2020 and is available on the County Offices of Emergency Services website. An updated plan is in process and on track.

R11. The CAL FIRE Ready for Wildfire website should be actively promoted and shared within the community via all available means, including printed descriptive materials inserted into utility and property tax bills, by December 31, 2020. (F19–F21)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

This will require additional analysis and discussion to determine the feasibility and cost associated with adding the additional information to the utility and tax bill mailings.

R12. The Santa Cruz County Office of Emergency Services should create and publish shelter in place plans, with the cooperation of all county fire protection districts and cities, and should inform citizens of safe building locations, and on what to expect and what to do in case of wildfire, by March 31, 2021. (F14)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

The County creates, in conjunction with fire, law, and human services agencies, shelter plans for all hazard response. The plans are published on the County Office of Emergency Services website.

R15. All fire districts in Santa Cruz County should coordinate with utility companies to provide information to residents, via information inserted in utility bill mailings, describing how to sign up for emergency notifications by December 31, 2020. (F19)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

This is completed through the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) mandate that PG&E have coordinated communications directly to all residents that includes how to sign up for emergency notifications, reduced utility costs, and medical base-line. In addition, the County agencies working to ether provide information, response, and resources to residents in the event of a public safety power shutoff. The County response plan is available on the County Office of Emergency Services website.

R17. The County Office of Emergency Services should evaluate, quantify, and report to the County Board of Supervisors on the specifics of the public state of preparedness for a large-scale emergency such as wildfire by June, 2021. (F11, F23)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

An after-action review is conducted after every major incident and disaster response. Due to the CZU Lightning Complex Fire, these areas will also be addressed during the after-action review, identifying operational effectiveness as well as areas for improvement.

R19. The Board of Supervisors should require the CAO to appoint a county Risk Manager, by December 31, 2020. The Risk Manager should report to the CAO, who will be responsible for ongoing identification, analysis, quantification, and remediation planning of all fire risks across the County. This role should be considered as a service to all four cities in the County as well. (F2, F3, F24)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

The County has a Risk Manager position. This responsibility does not fall under fall under the Risk Manager’s purview. This scope of responsibilities fall under the Fire Chiefs Association.

R24. The County Board of Supervisors should update regulations to require evacuation routes be kept clear for fire prevention, not just for line of sight, but also for access by fire engines and other emergency equipment by the beginning of the 2021 fire season. (F15–F18, F27)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

Regulations and code enforcement would need to be reviewed to determine the need for regulatory updates. This review can be completed by June 2021.

R25. The County Board of Supervisors should explain to the public why the Proposition 218 information on response times is inconsistent with the response time data available from County Fire by December 31, 2020. (F6, F8, F30)

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED** – summarize what has been done
- HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE** – summarize what will be done and the timeframe
- REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** – explain scope and timeframe (not to exceed six months)
- WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** – explain why

Response explanation, summary, and timeframe:

CAL FIRE/County Fire is in the process of developing better methods of extracting data from of Computer Aided Dispatch System (CAD) in order to provide more accurate information.

Penal Code §933.05

1. For Purposes of subdivision (b) of §933, as to each Grand Jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:
 - a. the respondent agrees with the finding,
 - b. 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.
2. For purpose of subdivision (b) of §933, as to each Grand Jury recommendation, the responding person shall report one of the following actions:
 - a. the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action,
 - b. the recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation,
 - c. 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 director 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 the publication of the Grand Jury report, or
 - d. the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.
3. However, if a finding or recommendation of the Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a County department headed by an elected officer, both the department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Grand Jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision-making authority. The response of the elected department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her department.
4. A Grand Jury may request a subject person or entity to come before the Grand Jury for the purpose of reading and discussing the findings of the Grand Jury report that relates to that person or entity in order to verify the accuracy of the findings prior to their release.
5. During an investigation, the Grand Jury shall meet with the subject of that investigation regarding that investigation unless the court, either on its own determination or upon request of the foreperson of the Grand Jury, determines that such a meeting would be detrimental.
6. A Grand Jury shall provide to the affected agency a copy of the portion of the Grand Jury report relating to that person or entity two working days prior to its public release and after the approval of the presiding judge. **No officer, agency, department, or governing body of a public agency shall disclose any contents of the report prior to the public release of the final report.**