



# Santa Cruz 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 2018–2019 Grand Jury Recommendations

---

#### Summary

The 2021–2022 Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury reviewed local government responses to three of the four 2018–2019 Grand Jury reports to determine whether local government officials honored their commitments in compliance with California Penal Code 933.05. The Code instructs agencies to either respond to Grand Jury recommendations or to implement those recommendations in the future. The reports reviewed are: *Patron Privacy at Santa Cruz Public Libraries*, *Santa Cruz County Probation*, and *Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts*.

Relative to these reports, the Grand Jury identified several major status updates:

- **Santa Cruz Public Library patrons can trust that their personal information is no longer at risk.**
- **Santa Cruz County Probation Officers are better equipped and safer in carrying out their important work.**
- **Santa Cruz County has replaced a long-standing and unwieldy contract with private sector attorneys with a dedicated Public Defender.**
- **Conflict Attorney contract and compensation issues remain.**

Each report section that follows covers the key findings and recommendations. Each section then describes the local agency commitments and actions taken to address those findings and recommendations. The value of the Grand Jury's reports is realized when government agencies apply the recommendations to improve transparency and efficiency for county residents. 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.

## Table of Contents

<b>Background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Scope and Methodology</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Investigations</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Patron Privacy at Santa Cruz Public Libraries</b>	<b>4</b>
Key Findings	4
Key Recommendations	5
Responses	5
2021 Update: Were Commitments Kept?	6
<b>2. Santa Cruz County Probation—Officers Inadequately Equipped and At Risk</b>	<b>6</b>
Key Findings	6
Key Recommendations	7
Responses	7
2021 Update: Were Commitments Kept?	8
<b>3. Santa Cruz County’s Public Defense Contracts—How Complex Contracts</b>	
Misled County Leaders	<b>9</b>
Key Findings	10
Key Recommendations	10
Responses	11
Notable Missing Invited Responses	12
2021 Update: Were Commitments Kept?	12
<b>2021–2022 Honoring Commitments in Review</b>	<b>13</b>
Findings	13
Recommendations	14
<b>Required Responses</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Sources</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix A—Santa Cruz County Grand Jury Response Packet</b>	
<b>Instructions for 2018–2019</b>	<b>17</b>

## 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 persons 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 by California Penal Code section 933(c).<sup>[1]</sup> 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.<sup>[2]</sup>

## Scope and Methodology

For this Honoring Commitments report, the Grand Jury reviewed responses to the following three 2018–2019 reports:

- ***Patron Privacy at Santa Cruz Public Libraries—Trust and Transparency in the Age of Data Analytics***
- ***Santa Cruz County Probation—Officers Inadequately Equipped and At Risk***
- ***Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts—How Complex Contracts Misled County Leaders***

The Grand Jury has followed up with the responding agencies for the above reports. This report summarizes the government responses to each report's recommendations, with special focus on the responses that fell under the categories "Has Not Been Implemented but Will Be Implemented in the Future" and "Requires Further Analysis." Without follow-up, these are the most susceptible to falling by the wayside and dropping out of public view.

# Investigations

## 1. Patron Privacy at Santa Cruz Public Libraries

**Summary:** Santa Cruz Public Libraries (**Libraries or SCPL**) had been utilizing data analytics tools to mine user data. Using these tools in libraries is a potential threat to patron privacy and trust. This report examined the Libraries' use of third-party data analytics in relation to current California law pertaining to:

- Confidential patron data
- Industry best practices for patron privacy
- Current Libraries' privacy policy and staff concerns regarding privacy, transparency, and patron consent
- The perceived usefulness of these analytical tools

The Grand Jury's report concluded with nine findings and eight recommendations.<sup>[3]</sup>

The Key Findings and Key Recommendations sections, below, provide context for the Response section. The Response section describes agency responses to the investigation report, including recent agency actions. In some cases, marked with an asterisk (\*), information is edited for clarity or brevity. Findings and recommendations where the agencies 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.

### Key Findings

The use of Gale Analytics On Demand by Santa Cruz Public Libraries was inconsistent with the Libraries' long-standing policy on Confidentiality of Library Records and was not clearly addressed in Library Policy.*	Findings 1, 2
Santa Cruz Public Libraries did not adequately inform its patrons about the Libraries' use of Gale Analytics On Demand or obtain their consent for this use.	Finding 3
Santa Cruz Public Libraries used Gale Analytics On Demand without examining the contract for this service, thus raising potential liability issues related to data ownership, data breaches, and patron privacy.	Finding 5
The use of Gale Analytics On Demand by Santa Cruz Public Libraries is inconsistent with best practices in the library community regarding patron privacy.	Finding 7

## Key Recommendations

Santa Cruz Public Libraries, in coordination with the Library Advisory Commission ( <b>Advisory Commission</b> ) and Library Joint Powers Authority ( <b>JPA</b> ) board, should revisit the Libraries' revised privacy policy (adopted June 6, 2019) to specifically address the use of data analytics and other tools utilizing patron information.	Recommendation 1
Libraries should implement a system for obtaining and managing patron consent for data analytics and other tools that use patron information.	Recommendation 2
Library management and staff, in coordination with the Advisory Commission and the JPA board, should stay abreast of changes to state law, especially as it concerns patron privacy and evolving technology, and update Library policies and practices in response to such changes.	Recommendation 3
Libraries should review the contracts for all third-party digital services used by the Library, including those provided by library consortia.	Recommendation 4

## Responses<sup>[4]</sup>

Santa Cruz Public Libraries JPA approved a new patron privacy policy at their June 6, 2019, meeting after a six-month consultation process that included staff groups and citizen members of the Advisory Commission, which meets the intent of the Jury's recommendation.	Addresses Recommendation 1
Library staff plan on participating in training prior to making decisions with broad implications on informing patrons and/or requiring their consent.*	Addresses Recommendation 2
Library staff drafted a new policy that was reviewed by several staff groups, the Advisory Commission, and approved by the JPA Board in June of 2019.	Addresses Recommendation 3 New policy <sup>[5]</sup>
Libraries developed a web page which now has the Libraries' policies and a list of third-party vendors and their privacy agreements with the Libraries.	Addresses Recommendation 3 New Policy <sup>[6]</sup>
Libraries implemented a data-breach procedure.	Addresses Recommendation 3
Library IT does privacy audits with all third-party vendors (including those provided by a library consortia) asking each a list of vendor security questions and publishing their privacy statements for the public to review.	Addresses Recommendation 4

## 2021 Update: Were Commitments Kept?

We commend Santa Cruz Public Libraries' response to the Grand Jury's recommendations. In addition to updating general privacy policies, the Santa Cruz Public Libraries put a moratorium on any additional use of Gale Analytics On Demand software in 2018. Libraries' leadership voted to end use of the product and delete all files in January 2019.<sup>[7]</sup>

## 2. Santa Cruz County Probation—Officers Inadequately Equipped and At Risk

**Summary:** The role of the Probation Department (**Department**) in Santa Cruz County has changed significantly in recent years due to legislation and voter-approved propositions. As a result, prison inmates with a higher level of criminal sophistication are frequently released on probation. Many of them have prior felony criminal histories. These persons can require probation officer supervision at the community level.

This Grand Jury report identified concerns about the dangers and unnecessary risks Adult Division Deputy Probation Officers (**Probation Officers**) face in supervising some high-risk offenders. The report found that inadequate or faulty safety equipment, lack of training, limited law enforcement support, and lack of an armed unit all contributed to an unsafe working environment.<sup>[8]</sup>

The Grand Jury concluded its report with five findings and made four recommendations that required responses.

The Key Findings and Key Recommendations sections, below, provide context for the Response section. The Response section describes agency responses to the investigation report. In some cases, marked with an asterisk (\*), information is edited for clarity or brevity.

### Key Findings

Probation Officers' lack of safety equipment impedes their ability to do their assigned field visits without jeopardizing their own safety.	Finding 1
The Department collects and stores, but does not track, serious incident reports involving Probation Officers with offenders.	Finding 2
The Department meets the minimum state requirements for annual Probation Officers training, but does not provide sufficient safety training for Probation Officers in the field.	Finding 3

Law enforcement is not always available to accompany Probation Officers in high-risk situations, resulting in fewer contact visits by Probation Officers.	Finding 4
The failure of the Department to include an armed unit supporting Probation Officers increases safety risks to Probation Officers in the field.	Finding 5

### **Key Recommendations**

The Department should provide Probation Officers with standardized safety gear (individually fitted vests, functioning radios, tasers, OC spray, identifiable clothing, and Narcan) for their field visits.	Recommendation 1
The Department should provide all Probation Officers with mandatory initial and ongoing field safety training in collaboration with the Department's Safety Committee.	Recommendation 2
The Department should coordinate with local law enforcement to develop policies and procedures for law enforcement officers to accompany Probation Officers during field visits.	Recommendation 3
The Department should commission a needs assessment by an independent consultant to ascertain the potential harm to unarmed officers doing field work with high-risk offenders, with a focus on developing an armed unit.	Recommendation 4

### **Responses<sup>[9]</sup>**

The Sheriff and the Chief Probation Officer did not agree that sworn staff were inadequately equipped. They added that tasers would be implemented in 2019 and that in FY 19/20, the department will be ordering individually fitted vests over time as fiscally allowable. Narcan is available for checkout as of July 2019.	Addresses Finding 1
The Chief Probation Officer responded that the Incident Report form has been enhanced to include more detailed areas for follow-up and debriefing when needed (with a Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, and Threats analysis model noted for consistency in response).	Addresses Finding 2
In August 2018, the Probation Department implemented a Pilot Field Training Program. This is facilitated by Probation Officer II/III staff who are trained as Field Training Officers.*	Addresses Finding 3

<p>The Sheriff and the Chief Probation Officer stated that law enforcement officers are always available to assist probation officers with high-risk work, but conceded that there may be significant wait times based on other public safety priorities.</p>	<p>Addresses Finding 4</p>
<p>The Chief Probation Officer stated that the Department was not aware of any research supporting the arming of probation officers.*</p>	<p>Addresses Recommendation 4 Additional information<sup>[10]</sup></p>

**2021 Update: Were Commitments Kept?**

The Sheriff and the Chief Probation Officer agreed to assign a full-time deputy to the Probation Department to assist probation officers with higher-risk assignments. These assignments include searches, arrests, transportation, and other work prioritized by the Probation Department. The County Board of Supervisors approved funding for one additional deputy for this purpose for the 2019–2020 fiscal year budget. The Sheriff and the Chief Probation Officer will work together toward implementation. The assigned deputy was scheduled to start with the Probation Department in September 2019. As of November 15, 2021, the County reports that the Probation Department has a full-time deputy assigned to the department to assist with higher-risk assignments.<sup>[11]</sup>



### 3. Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts—How Complex Contracts Misled County Leaders

**Summary:** Santa Cruz County (**County**) has contracts with criminal defense attorneys who in turn represent accused criminal defendants who cannot afford to pay for their own defense. These contracts are called the County's **public defense contracts**.

This report investigated two closely related topics concerning the administration and fiscal management of the public defense contracts:

- Gaps in management and accountability of public defense contracts for services provided by private sector defense attorneys which have led to excessive costs.
- How County practices and processes for contract creation, tracking, and reporting obscured the scope and cost of complex contracts, such as the public defense contracts.

For almost fifty years the County's main public defense contract was with the law firm of Biggam, Christensen and Minsloff (**Biggam**). In addition to the contract with Biggam, the County has contracts with two other private law firms that specialize in criminal defense. These additional contracts are needed to avoid conflicts in having Biggam represent multiple defendants charged in the same case (**Conflict Attorneys**).<sup>[12]</sup>

The *Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts* report focused on the cost of the County's public defense contracts, which had risen more than the rate of inflation over the prior 20 years. The Grand Jury considered whether caseloads, number of felony jury trials, or minimum staffing requirements explained the increase.

The Grand Jury also investigated whether the public defense contracts followed the County's contract rules and processes and whether the County administered the public defense contracts in accordance with the County's standard contract practices.

The Grand Jury found that the County's management of the public defense contracts did not provide adequate oversight of the services and costs. The Grand Jury also found that the Board of Supervisors approved increases to contract payments and provision of complimentary office space without a clear understanding of the true cost of the services, or why the costs were increasing.<sup>[13]</sup>

The Key Findings and Key Recommendations sections provide context for the Response section. The Response section describes agency responses to the investigation report. For items marked with an asterisk (\*), information has been edited for clarity or brevity. Findings and Recommendations where the agencies 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. The investigation produced 12 Findings and 27 Recommendations.

## Key Findings

The County Administrative Office ( <b>CAO</b> ) was responsible for management of the public defense contracts but did not have the resources or expertise to manage them.*	Finding 1
Each of the three contracts had different provisions for compensation and reimbursable expenses, making the total cost of public defense services difficult to track.*	Finding 3
The County’s portrayal of its public defense services is not transparent.	Finding 4
In addition to County payments under the contracts, the County paid separately for some of the public defense contractors’ employer costs (liability and employee health insurance, for example). Because of the manner in which these payments were authorized (outside of the contract), the County’s accounting system did not track these separate payments as part of the contract payments, causing the County to understate the total cost of the County’s public defense contractors in line-item budgets and in reports to the Board of Supervisors.*	Finding 5
The County provided the public defense contractors with free office space in Watsonville without a written agreement for use of the space or limitation that the space be used <i>only</i> for services to County clients. Because there is no written agreement, the County Auditor, responsible for reporting compensation to relevant taxing authorities, may not be correctly reporting the value of complimentary office space to these contractors.*	Findings 6, 7
The County’s policies and contract forms are not coordinated, are difficult to use, and in some cases are poorly written.*	Finding 8

## Key Recommendations

The Board of Supervisors should only approve additional or increased compensation to a public defense contractor after receiving evidence called for in the contract or County’s contract policies that justify the increased compensation.*	Recommendation 2
The CAO should enter into a license or lease agreement for the attorneys’ use of County office space and the County’s Auditor should ensure that the office space provided to the contractors is properly reported to the Internal Revenue Service.*	Recommendations 3, 9, 10

In the interest of transparency, the County and its public defense contractors should not use the term “public defender” when referring to these services or attorneys providing these services.*	Recommendation 4
The County should not pay the defense contractors’ employer costs if not required under the applicable contract.*	Recommendation 6
The County’s Auditor should work with County staff to ensure all contract costs are properly tracked and accounted for so the Board of Supervisors understands the total cost of public defense services.*	Recommendation 8
The Board of Supervisors should within the next 90 days instruct the County Administrative Officer to work with the Auditor-Controller, the Purchasing Agent, and County Counsel to propose a timeline for revising the County’s policies and procedures generally, including the implementation of the recommendations in this report concerning contract rules that Board of Supervisors decides to implement.	Recommendation 11
The County’s contract policies and contract forms should be integrated so they provide consistent and clear direction to County staff managing contracts with centralized oversight.*	Recommendations 17, 18
The County’s contract rules should identify, or have a procedure for identifying, an individual who, with respect to each contract, will be responsible for ensuring that the County’s contract rules are followed.	Recommendation 20

## **Responses**

The County CAO took issue with most of the Grand Jury’s findings and recommendations.<sup>[14]</sup> The County maintained that:

The CAO had the resources to adequately manage the public defense contracts.* <sup>[15]</sup>	Addresses Finding 1
The CAO will analyze and, if necessary, address the issue of the contractors’ use of free County office space.* <sup>[16]</sup>	Addresses Recommendation 9
The CAO regularly recommends that the Board approve revisions to the County’s contract policies every six months and the accepted recommendations would be handled under this process.* <sup>[17]</sup>	Addresses Recommendation 11
Each County department is responsible for meeting the requirements of the County’s contract policies and the County will continue with decentralized oversight of the contracting policies.* <sup>[18]</sup>	Addresses Recommendation 20

## ***Notable Missing Invited Responses***

**County Counsel.** The County Counsel's Office plays an important role in controlling risks arising from all aspects of contract formation and administration. The County Counsel elected not to respond to recommendations R11, 17, and 18 directed to the County Counsel and referenced above. Filing a response might help the Grand Jury and the public better understand the issues brought to light.

## ***2021 Update: Were Commitments Kept?***

### **Public Defender's Office Created!**

Perhaps the most telling and positive outcome from this Grand Jury report is the County's recent decision to create and appoint a Public Defender to provide these vital publicly funded services. This change eliminates the need for the Biggam contract. The County created the Public Defender job classification and the County Board of Supervisors will establish the Office of the Public Defender's annual operating budget.

Heather Rogers has taken on the Public Defender position as of September 2021.<sup>[19]</sup> Case management is scheduled to begin in 2022. Ms. Rogers reports directly to the County Board of Supervisors. This appointment will allow the Board to better track the Public Defender's costs and ensure this constitutionally required public service is carried out in a manner appropriate for the clients. The Office of the Public Defender will serve in accordance with these requirements and with the public's interest in cost-effective, publicly funded services.

Also of importance, Public Defender offices can serve an important community role in highlighting issues with police misconduct in a way that private attorneys under contract to the County cannot. Since the Grand Jury's report in 2018–2019, issues around police conduct have risen to the front page of national and local newspapers, indicating an area of concern for many in our community.

Creating this office is a significant step for Santa Cruz County in bringing another voice and perspective to the public discourse around explicit and implicit bias in police activities. All of the Public Defender's clients will be low-income citizens, and likely not in a position to challenge a discriminatory pattern or policy that impacts them. Establishing this Office will give the Public Defender a perspective and position to address such issues that a private contract attorney will not have. The Grand Jury commends the County for taking this important step.

### **Little improvement in Conflict Attorney contracts and reimbursement procedures**

The Conflict Attorney contracts must remain in place even with the new Public Defender's office. If the CAO continues managing these contracts, the problems the Grand Jury identified in 2018–2019 may persist. The CAO's ability to manage the Conflict Attorney contracts is questionable given the County's failure to honor its commitment in the CAO's response to this report. For example,

- The CAO has not yet addressed the Conflict Attorneys' free use of office space in Watsonville.<sup>[20]</sup>
- A written agreement for the Conflict Attorneys' use of County property is still outstanding. Such an agreement would also support the Auditor's commitment to correctly report this use of space in total compensation paid to these private attorneys.
- Also outstanding is whether the Conflict Attorneys are being reimbursed for expenses outside their agreements.

While it is important to have a presence in South County, clear contracts are required to ensure wise use of public funds.

### **Improvements made to contract practices**

The County's Policy and Procedures Manual, which governs County staff's solicitation and contracting, has been updated. It now includes a clear statement on how staff may request changes to the manual, and when/how the Board will consider approval of recommended changes.<sup>[21]</sup> The contracting policies have been amended several times since the Grand Jury's report. The contracting provisions appear to offer sufficient guidance.<sup>[22]</sup>

## **2021–2022 Honoring Commitments in Review**

### ***Findings***

- F1.** Government agencies made all **required** responses to the 2018–2019 reports within the requested time frame.
- F2.** The Santa Cruz Public Library system has honored the commitments it made to the Grand Jury's 2018–2019 report, *Patron Privacy at Santa Cruz Public Libraries*.
- F3.** Santa Cruz County honored the commitments it made to the Grand Jury's 2018–2019 report, *Santa Cruz County Probation—Officers Inadequately Equipped and At Risk*.
- F4.** Santa Cruz County honored the commitments it made to the Grand Jury's 2018–2019 report, *Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts—How Complex Contracts Mised County Leaders*, that related to revisions to the County's contract policies.

- F5. Santa Cruz County considered the Conflict Attorneys’ use of the County’s Watsonville office space, as committed in its response to the Grand Jury’s 2018–2019 report *Santa Cruz County’s Public Defense Contracts—How Complex Contracts Misled County Leaders*, but has deferred action to the next round of contract renewal.
- F6. The County’s failure to address the Conflict Attorneys’ use of free office space means the value of this benefit may not be apparent to the Auditor and reported to appropriate tax officials, and there is no binding obligation on how the Conflict Attorneys may use this space.
- F7. Several invited responses to the 2018–2019 reports were not made, most notably from the Santa Cruz County Counsel’s Office with regards to the report on the County’s Public Defense Contracts.

**Recommendations**

- R1. The CAO should enter into a written agreement with private attorneys using County office space outlining the basic understanding of the attorneys’ use of this space. (F5, F6)

**Required Response**

<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Respond Within/ Respond By</i>
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	F5, F6	R1	90 Days August 15, 2022

**Sources**

**References**

1. State of California Penal Code, Part 2, Title 4, Ch. 3, Art. 2, § 933.05. Effective January 1, 1998. Accessed February 2, 2022. [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN&sectionNum=933.05](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN&sectionNum=933.05)
2. 2018–2019 Grand Jury Reports and Responses. Accessed March 19, 2022. <https://www.santacruzcounty.us/Departments/GrandJury/2018-2019GrandJuryReportsandResponses.aspx>
3. 2018–2019 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury. June 24, 2019. *Patron Privacy at Santa Cruz Public Libraries*. Accessed February 2, 2022. [https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/SantaCruzPublicLibrariesReport.pdf](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/SantaCruzPublicLibrariesReport.pdf)

4. Director, Santa Cruz Public Libraries. September 23, 2019. Responses to the *Patron Privacy at Santa Cruz Public Libraries* Report. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/SCPLDirResponse.pdf](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/SCPLDirResponse.pdf)
5. Santa Cruz Public Libraries. June 6, 2019. “Confidentiality of Library Records and Patron Data Privacy Policy.” Accessed February 20, 2022.  
[https://www.santacruzpl.org/files/docs/policies/303\\_confidentiality-library-records.pdf](https://www.santacruzpl.org/files/docs/policies/303_confidentiality-library-records.pdf)
6. Santa Cruz Public Libraries. Undated. “Data Privacy.” Accessed February 20, 2022.  
[https://www.santacruzpl.org/data\\_privacy/](https://www.santacruzpl.org/data_privacy/)
7. Director, Santa Cruz Public Libraries. September 23, 2019. Response to the *Patron Privacy at Santa Cruz Public Libraries* Report, Finding 8, p. 10. Accessed February 20, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/SCPLDirResponse.pdf#page=10](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/SCPLDirResponse.pdf#page=10)
8. 2018–2019 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury. June 25, 2019. *Santa Cruz County Probation—Officers Inadequately Equipped and At Risk*. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/SantaCruzCountyProbation.pdf](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/SantaCruzCountyProbation.pdf)
9. Santa Cruz County Chief Probation Officer. July 26, 2019. Responses to the *Santa Cruz County Probation—Officers Inadequately Equipped and At Risk* Report. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/ProbationCPOResponse.pdf](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/ProbationCPOResponse.pdf)
10. Santa Cruz County Chief Probation Officer. July 26, 2019. Response to Recommendation 4 in the *Santa Cruz County Probation—Officers Inadequately Equipped and At Risk* Report, p. 11. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/ProbationCPOResponse.pdf#page=12](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/ProbationCPOResponse.pdf#page=12)
11. Confidential Grand Jury document.
12. 2018–2019 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury. June 27, 2019. *Santa Cruz County’s Public Defense Contracts*, p. 3. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/PublicDefenseContracts.pdf#page=3](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/PublicDefenseContracts.pdf#page=3)
13. 2018–2019 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury. June 27, 2019. *Santa Cruz County’s Public Defense Contracts*. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/PublicDefenseContracts.pdf](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/PublicDefenseContracts.pdf)

14. Santa Cruz County Administrative Officer. September 25, 2019. Responses to the *Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts* Report. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/CAO%20Response.pdf](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/CAO%20Response.pdf)
15. Santa Cruz County Administrative Officer. September 25, 2019. Response to Finding 1 in the *Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts* Report, p. 3. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/CAO%20Response.pdf#page=4](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/CAO%20Response.pdf#page=4)
16. Santa Cruz County Administrative Officer. September 25, 2019. Response to Recommendation 9 in the *Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts* Report, p. 22. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/CAO%20Response.pdf#page=23](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/CAO%20Response.pdf#page=23)
17. Santa Cruz County Administrative Officer. September 25, 2019. Response to Recommendation 11 in the *Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts* Report, p. 23. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/CAO%20Response.pdf#page=24](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/CAO%20Response.pdf#page=24)
18. Santa Cruz County Administrative Officer. September 25, 2019. Response to Recommendation 20 in the *Santa Cruz County's Public Defense Contracts* Report, p. 32. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
[https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019\\_final/CAO%20Response.pdf#page=33](https://www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/Portals/0/County/GrandJury/GJ2019_final/CAO%20Response.pdf#page=33)
19. Jessica York. September 18, 2021. "Santa Cruz County hires local attorney as new Public Defender," *Santa Cruz Sentinel*. Accessed February 2, 2022.  
<https://www.santacruzsentinel.com/2021/09/18/santa-cruz-county-hires-local-attorney-as-new-public-defender/>
20. Confidential Grand Jury document.
21. Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors. January 14, 2020. *County Policy and Procedures Manual*, Title V. Section 400.  
<https://sccounty01.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/personnel/vpolandproc/ProceduresManual/PM5400.pdf>
22. Confidential Grand Jury document.
23. Internal Grand Jury documents.



## Appendix A—Santa Cruz County Grand Jury Response Packet Instructions for 2018–2019<sup>[23]</sup>

### *Instructions for Individual Respondents:*

#### **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 therefore, 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.

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](mailto:grandjury@scgrandjury.org).

## ***Instructions for Board or Commission Respondents:***

### **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 therefore, 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.

#### ***Validation***

Date of governing body'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](mailto:grandjury@scgrandjury.org).