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CONTINUITY

OVERVIEW

The 2002 Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) believed it important to study and to report on the responses to the Recommendations of the 2000-01 CGJ and to actions taken on Recommendations in the previous four CGJ Reports.

This study revealed several areas needing further attention and some new findings:

- The jail phone system, which requires payment of grossly inflated charges for prisoners' usage of the telephone, has not been updated as called for by the 1999 contract with Public Communications Services (PCS). The Sheriff's Department (SD) should consider voiding the contract with PCS for non-performance.
The increased use of absentee ballots requires additional controls, such as the regular updating of voter signatures on file and recording and transport of absentee ballots.

The hiring of Special Assistants needs continued scrutiny: the new Management Classification Compensation Plan (MCCP) should be monitored, as should be the Ethics Commission study of political activity by Special Assistants.

BACKGROUND

A cherished tenet of a Civil Grand Jury has been that a jury may choose for study whatever it deems best, seeking advice from individuals and groups, but, in the ultimate choices, free of pressure from anyone. This freedom to choose, and thereby to ignore the work of its predecessors, may result in a failure to assure that a previous CGJ’s work is completed. For the institution of CGJ to engender faith among the recipients of its recommendations - and to generate interest in and respect for its annual reports - there must be the assurance that CGJ recognizes the worth of the efforts of previous juries.

To achieve this goal, CGJ may include two or three items which assure the public of continuing attention to significant issues, while asserting CGJ’s right and duty to enter new fields of inquiry. To subject a city department/agency/office to intense scrutiny and then to publish findings and recommendations intended to affect the future is a responsibility which should not end with the published report. The 2002 CGJ determined to continue the unfinished work of its five predecessors.

Last year's (2000-01) CGJ "created a Continuity Committee to follow through on the issues and recommendations raised by the 1999-2000 CGJ report." The 2001 CGJ Report delineated the scope of this committee and, further, included a statement, "ADVICE TO FUTURE GRAND JURIES" (See Attachment 1).

Both of these statements were carefully studied by this year’s CGJ before it developed the five tasks (See Attachment 2) which formed a basis for its work this year.

INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS

Continuity became a matter of great interest to the 2002 CGJ. Concerned with an impression of a lack of CGJ follow-through on past Recommendations of CGJs, the 2002 CGJ expanded its study to include CGJ Reports from 1997 through 2001.

A matrix of the responses to the 2000-2001 CGJ Report was maintained. While most respondents were prompt and positive in their required responses, it was necessary to request of the Presiding Judge a letter to several agencies/departments/offices reminding them of their legal responsibility to respond.

From this matrix, from its study of the CGJ Reports of 1997 through 2000, and from the Controller's annual reports on the Status of Implementation of the Recommendations of the [previous year's] Civil Grand Jury, CGJ identified recommendations which, in this jury's opinion, merited follow up. The majority of these recommendations were ones with which the departments/agencies/offices had agreed, but which took time and/or budget adjustments to implement.

CGJ checked on the implementations. In most cases the departments/agencies/offices were found to be cooperative in providing the requested information, in some cases
proud to demonstrate progress toward the goal, and a few demonstrated delay, even intransigence. In studying these past CGJ Reports, three items were identified as meriting detailed follow ups and additional investigation by the 2002 CGJ:

- SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT - JAIL PHONE SYSTEM from 2000
- DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS from 2001
- SPECIAL ASSISTANTS from 2001

Following are the results of those studies and the subsequent Findings and Recommendations. THE NEW CGJ 2002 RECOMMENDATIONS APPEAR IN THIS TYPE FACE FOR EASIER DISTINCTION FROM PAST RECOMMENDATIONS

SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT - JAIL PHONE SYSTEM

BACKGROUND AND INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS

From Finding F in the 1999-2000 CGJ Report - the 2002 CGJ found that an April 1999 contract with Public Communication Services (PCS) to manage the telephone system in the San Francisco jails would result in substantially higher costs for the prisoners (an increase from 35 to 75 cents for a three-minute local call, for example. The contract included a 35-40% commission to be paid to the Sheriff’s Department (SD) and applied to the Prisoners Welfare Fund.

Recommendation 2 of the 2000 CGJ was that the Board of Supervisors enact legislation to require that telephone contract rates be negotiated to:

- provide the lowest possible costs to inmates
- pay for reasonable City costs of administering the system
- and, specifically, to exclude commissions for SD from the vendor selection criteria.

This recommendation was not acted upon, with the results noted below.

2002 CGJ Finding 1a - Jail Phone System

The 1999 contract called for development of an "automated debit card" system to be used for telephone calls as well as for the purchase of commissary items. This was to:

- provide a lower-cost option to a "collect calls only" system
- continue the objective of keeping petty cash out of the jails
- facilitate the monitoring of prisoner calls.

As of April 2002, the system has not been implemented: prisoners are allowed to make only collect calls. This results in higher costs and an inability to reach agencies, such as the Veterans Administration which does not accept collect calls. An option of selling manual debit cards to prisoners has been rejected by the company managing the commissary. The SD remains committed to the concept of an automated debit card system; a Request for Proposals has been initiated to replace the present company managing the commissary with a company better able to work with PCS in developing a workable system.

2002 CGJ Finding 1b - Jail Phone System

The 1999 contract was developed on a "sole source" basis with the objective of achieving a "leading edge" automated system. SD has the choice of:

- voiding the contract for non-performance now or of waiting until the contract expires in April 2004 and electing to:
• extend the PCS contract - presumably with a proven automated debit card capability;
• search for viable bidders for a workable automated debit card system; or
• solicit bids for a system based on manual debit cards which are readily available from many suppliers.

Under the current rate schedule, a three-minute call costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collect</th>
<th>Debit*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$2.98 - 3.10</td>
<td>$0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>$3.09 - 3.26</td>
<td>$2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance (w/in CA)</td>
<td>$5.07</td>
<td>$3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance (not CA)</td>
<td>$6.02</td>
<td>$5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This cost is shown even though debit cards are not now available because of automated system failure and commissary manager’s decision not to use manual cards.

2002 CGJ Finding 1c - Jail Phone System

Under the current contract, commissions to the SD have increased from about $500,000 per year to $800,000. Expenditures previously covered by the General Fund (e.g., rehabilitation counselors, reproduction costs, and data processing services) now are paid from the Prisoners Welfare Fund. While the California Penal Code (Section 4025) requires that the fund be used primarily for the benefit, education, and welfare of the inmates, it does give the sheriff latitude to determine what expenditures are appropriate. In essence, the 35-40% commissions and the absence of debit cards has resulted in the families of the prisoners funding items previously paid for by taxpayers.

2002 CGJ RECOMMENDATION 1 - JAIL PHONE SYSTEM

The Sheriff’s Department should aggressively pursue implementation of a reliable debit card system. SD should seriously consider taking action to void the current contract for non-performance. Future contract selection should:

• be based on the lowest cost to the inmates while covering related City expenses
• ensure that the commission rate paid to SD is not the primary factor in vendor selection
• be subject to competitive bidding in accordance with Chapter 21 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Required Response -

• Sheriff’s Department - 60 days

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS

BACKGROUND AND INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS

The 2001 CGJ performed oversight and review of the November 2000 election and of the subsequent December supervisor election runoff, issuing a number of recommendations relative to update of voter rolls, elimination of runoff elections, training, election materials, and use of the "election problem database" to improve processes.
The 2002 CGJ reviewed the results of these recommendations with Department of Elections (DOE) staff and observed the March 2002 election (including review of the "election problem data base") with the objectives of confirming the status of prior problem areas and determining the adequacy of controls in the various election processes.

OBSERVATION OF THE MARCH 2002 ELECTION

After studying the specific 2001 CGJ Recommendations (see chart, pages 14-15), members of the 2002 CGJ, on March 5, 2002, visited City Hall, 27 precincts, four uplink stations, and Pier 29. Four processes were monitored -

- casting through counting of precinct votes
- management of absentee ballots
- management of provisional ballots
- management of remake ballots

The election was observed with the objective of evaluating controls at each step in processing the ballots -

- activity at the polling sites
- operating procedures for each step
- handling of memory packs
- handling and control of absentee, provisional, and remake ballots

CGJ found that controls were satisfactory in most areas; however, CGJ identified several areas of concern which DOE should address -

- TRAINING - Training of election workers appears to be a continuing problem; although training sessions are now provided at a variety of times and places, attendance is neither mandatory nor tracked. Many workers remain untrained and incapable of handling the required tasks; there is no adequate method of ascertaining who these individuals are. Revised operating procedure memoranda or manuals - covering process stages applicable to activities to be performed at the site - should be at each site.

- POLLING SITE - There continue to be problems with time, equipment, personnel, and space.

- ELECTION OBSERVERS - As recommended by the 2000-2001 CGJ, DOE now has a comprehensive "Observer Guide." Knowledgeable DOE employees were generally available to guide observers at the City Hall locations. However, CGJ, election campaign, and other observers at Pier 29 were denied access (by the Sheriff’s Department) to the unloading and transfer areas until after 10 PM, despite numerous complaints to on-site and City Hall officials. Communication between DOE and the SD should be improved to ensure that all legitimate observers are allowed meaningful access to election functions without compromising election integrity and efficiency.

2002 CGJ Finding 2 - Department of Elections

The growing number of absentee ballots, combined with the present system for their handling, presents a potential problem for the security of, and the accuracy in counting, these ballots.
Of the 71,870 absentee ballots requested, 51,580 (72%) were voted. Absentee ballots returned to the polling sites were placed in the Red Elections Box until closing time. They were then -

- placed in a bag;
- transported on election evening to Pier 29, along with the bags of regular, provisional, and spoiled ballots;
- sorted;
- delivered to City Hall where, on the following morning, they were officially counted for the first time.

Once at City Hall, absentee ballots were scanned and signatures checked against electronically filed copies.

2002 CGJ Recommendation 2a - Department of Elections
Receipt of absentee ballots at the precincts should be recorded on the Roster of Voters by the name printed on the envelope. The total number of envelopes of each ballot type (absentee/provisional) should be recorded on the Ballot Card Statement. These numbers should be verified at City Hall before the ballots are processed - to avoid the possibility of absentee ballots not being counted.

Required Response -
- Department of Elections - 60 days
- Elections Commission - 60 days

2002 CGJ Recommendation 2b - Department of Elections
Since all signatures on absentee ballots are reviewed against the electronic file copy, it is important for the file copy to accurately reflect the current signature. Absentee voters should be required to update their signatures every 5 years to ensure that the signatures can be verified quickly.

Required Response -
- Department of Elections - 60 days
- Elections Commission - 60 days

SPECIAL ASSISTANTS

Background and Investigative Process

The 2001 CGJ reported that the number of Special Assistants had grown from approximately 240 to 634 employees between 1996 and 2001, with yearly salaries increasing from $15.6 million to $48.2 million. The CGJ made a number of recommendations to clarify the rules surrounding Special Assistants and to urge a more active role - by the Board of Supervisors and the Department of Human Resources (DHR) - in controlling expenditures for Special Assistants. Members of the 2002 CGJ attended an Ethics Commission hearing on the potential political activities of Special Assistants, reviewed updated data with DHR, and inquired about Board of Supervisors' efforts to control expenditures in this area.

2001 CGJ Recommendations

1a and b - "[T]he Board of Supervisors place a limit for total Special Assistant salaries" and require specific approval of all positions with a base salary above $100,000.
2a - "The Ethics Commission review the policies governing political activities by City employees."
2b - "The Board of Supervisors commission an independent audit of the Special Assistant hires . . . ."
3a and b - The Board of Supervisors prepare "a Charter amendment to . . . specifically provide a cap to Special Assistant hires";
4a-e - The DHR follow specific recommendations as to limitations on hiring; oversight and record keeping of evaluations on exempt personnel; maintaining personnel files; reviewing and updating guidelines for exempt personnel; and tracking the movement of exempt personnel from job to job.

CGJ 2002 Finding 3a - Special Assistants
Data from DHR as of June 3, 2002, (based on the same files as the 2001 CGJ report) indicate that the number of Special Assistants has been reduced to 265 (an approximately 58% reduction) - with 218 remaining from April 2001 and 47 hired as new employees during the intervening 13 months. The reduction was a result of transitioning 234 under the Management Classification and Compensation Plan (MCCP) and the balance being separated. The new MCCP is being extended to all departments with completion planned by May 2003. The DHR estimates that over 75% of the 265 remaining Special Assistants will be transitioned to the MCCP or separated by that time.

CGJ 2002 Finding 3b - Special Assistants
The Board of Supervisors has taken an active role in supporting the reduction in Special Assistants through the power to review specific positions (not individuals) in the budget process.

CGJ 2002 Recommendation 3 - Special Assistants
The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should encourage departments to cooperate fully and in a timely manner with the DHR to ensure that the MCCP roll-out schedule is completed by May 2003.

Required Responses -
• Board of Supervisors - 90 days
• Ethics Commission - 60 days
• Office of the Mayor - 60 days

CGJ 2002 Recommendation 4 - Special Assistants
The Ethics Commission should continue to ensure that Special Assistants are not improperly engaged in political activity.

Required Response -
• Ethics Commission - 60 days

Note: Future CGJs should review the results of the MCCP and investigate any allegations of improper political activity by Special Assistants.

Summary of Required Responses -
• Board of Supervisors - Recommendation 3
• Elections Commission - Recommendations 2a and 2b
PRIOR YEARS' FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1997-1998 CGJ Report

The 2002 CGJ did not identify any Recommendations from this report which were deemed to need further attention.

The remaining Recommendations from past CGJ reports which the 2002 CGJ studied are presented below in chart form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title within Report and Year</th>
<th>Past Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>2002 Suggested Action for 2003 CGJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT 1998-1999</td>
<td>1 - CGJ found that the brig on Treasure Island was not practical as a jail and &quot;further expenditures and use of this facility should be carefully considered.&quot;</td>
<td>A response from the Mayor's Office (12/5/01 - See Attachment 3) indicated that the SD was unable to &quot;appropriately staff&quot; the brig &quot;to house low-risk inmates.&quot; Subsequently, the brig was used &quot;as a training facility.&quot; The SD's &quot;2-year lease of the facility&quot; was to expire at &quot;the end of the current fiscal year [June 2002].&quot; At that time the Board of Supervisors &quot;will decide if funds will be appropriated for an extension of the lease.&quot;</td>
<td>Follow Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL 1999-2000</td>
<td>2 - Amend the Health Code to transfer the dog license program responsibility from the Tax Collector to the Animal Care and Control Department (ACCD),</td>
<td>On 1/7/02, an ordinance was passed by the Board of Supervisors allowing ACCD flexibility in agreements with entities - such as but not limited to, veterinarians, retailers of pet supplies and pet services - to issue the licenses. (See Attachment 4)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL CENTERS</td>
<td>1, 2, and 3 - concerned needed</td>
<td>2002 CGJ confirmed (via an e-mail from the Mayor's</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>2002 Suggested Action for 2003 CGJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>Infrastructure upgrades at the Bayview Opera House, the Mission Cultural Center and the South of Market Cultural Center (SOMARTS).</td>
<td>Office of Finance and Legislative Affairs) that the &quot;facilities maintenance funds allocated to the Arts Commission . . . were budgeted . . . and were almost fully ($1 left over) expended by the close of the 1999-2000 fiscal year.&quot; The response did not specify how the funds were spent.</td>
<td>Follow Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL EXAMINER 1999-2000</td>
<td>4 - Autopsy room door is marginally secure and needs replacing</td>
<td>A response dated 12/3/01, reported that the funds were approved in the 2001-2002 budget and the CGJ would be notified when the work had been completed. That has not happened. (See Attachment 5 )</td>
<td>Follow Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER AND POWER 1999-2000</td>
<td>1 - &quot;The PUC should conclude its housing study [of Moccasin Village] and take action to determine how the houses will be used.&quot;</td>
<td>A new housing policy took effect 7/1/01.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER AND POWER 1999-2000</td>
<td>2 - HMO-like health benefits should be provided to employees of remote facilities.</td>
<td>A monthly stipend to equalize (health care insurance) premium costs has been adopted. PUC suggested employees pursue collective bargaining to reach this goal.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER AND 1999-2000</td>
<td>3 - &quot;Consideration</td>
<td>The project to automate all</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title within Report and Year</td>
<td>Past Recommendation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>2002 Suggested Action for 2003 CGJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POWER 1999-2000</strong></td>
<td>should be given to installing an electronically-operated system to open and close valves that control the amount of water released at O'Shaughnessy Dam.”</td>
<td>valves is under way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER AND POWER 1999-2000</strong></td>
<td>4 - &quot;If [dam safety] plans have not been tested then they should be,&quot; training should be provided for these activities, and &quot;[T]he chain of command for action authorization should be streamlined.&quot;</td>
<td>PUC responded that training and testing are conducted regularly.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTINUITY 2000-2001</strong></td>
<td>1-2 The Board of Supervisors should develop changes to its &quot;Rules of Order&quot; to provide guidance to the Clerk of the Board about methods by which to ensure that required hearings are held regarding CGJ reports and required written responses are provided.</td>
<td>The preference to wait for departmental responses (a number of which were tardy) and a lack of clarity on the roles of the outgoing and incoming CGJs, meant that hearings on the 2001 Report were not held; responses from the Board were, therefore, not provided. In discussions with the President and the Clerk of the Board, the 2002 CGJ established an agreement that responses from the Board will be required when legislation is requested; creation of a Commission is requested; enactment of a Proposition is requested; recommendation is</td>
<td>Although the 2002 CGJ will provide testimony at any subsequent hearings on its Report, the 2003 CGJ is responsible to assure that all required responses to the 2002 Report are received and that reminders are sent out as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
made to change the
mission or significant
performance of a
department;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title within Report and Year</th>
<th>Past Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>2002 Suggested Action for 2003 CGJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS 2000-2001</td>
<td>3  DPH should &quot;recommit to monthly transmittal to DOE of voter roll updates.&quot;</td>
<td>For the 3/8/02 election, electoral rolls had been updated as of 12/31/01. However, updates do not seem to be occurring on a monthly, or on a regular, basis.</td>
<td>Follow Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS 2000-2001</td>
<td>6  The Board of Supervisors should pass legislation to &quot;remedy potentially costly runoff elections.&quot;</td>
<td>In March 2002, Proposition A was passed by voters; this is a potential remedy.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS 2000-2001</td>
<td>7  DOE staff training should be updated.</td>
<td>Programs have been updated, but additional improvement is necessary. (See Training on page 6)</td>
<td>Follow Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS 2000-2001</td>
<td>8  DOE &quot;should continue to use the</td>
<td>Database is maintained. However, analysis is not</td>
<td>Follow Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title within Report and Year</td>
<td>Past Recommendation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>2002 Suggested Action for 2003 CGJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYOR'S OFFICE ON DISABILITY 2000-2001</td>
<td>1-9 &quot;... that the MOD complete and publish the self-evaluation and transition plans.&quot; Specific changes in the MOD were recommended.</td>
<td>Investigation Incomplete</td>
<td>A study of the anticipated review is necessary to determine whether any of the detailed CGJ Recommendations were addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD PARKING 2000-2001</td>
<td>2 &quot;Reduce the size of bus zones... increase the number of bulb and bar stops... Evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2000-2001 | election problem database and analyze statistics.&quot; being undertaken to ensure problem resolution takes place. | None |
| DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS 2000-2001 | 9 Voter instructions should be &quot;reviewed for possible updating.&quot; (There were four specific suggestions.) This was done. | None |
| DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS 2000-2001 | 10 DOE printed materials should have &quot;revision dates.&quot; DOE prefers to prepare specific printed materials for each election which will be updated appropriately. | None |
| LITTER AND GRAFFITI 2000-2001 | 6 &quot;[M]onetary penalties&quot; should be increased for numerous violations of this nature. Responses from the Mayor (9/4/01); the Department of Public Works (9/24/01); and the Superior Court, San Francisco County (7/25/01) indicate that &quot;;;the Court set bail for violations 374.3 [dumping] and 374.4 [littering] of the California Penal Code at $270... [this] will apply to citations issued on or after August 1, 2001. Consideration of increased bails [sic] for the remaining violations listed... was referred to the Court's Traffic Committee for review and recommendation.&quot; | Study the effects of these two penalty increases on litter and graffiti in the City for determining whether other penalties were increased. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title within Report and Year</th>
<th>Past Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>2002 Suggested Action for 2003 CGJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD PARKING 2000-2001</td>
<td>4 &quot;Expand and complete angled parking on streets where appropriate.&quot;</td>
<td>The Department of Parking and Traffic agreed with the recommendation, but stated that any parking changes are subject to public hearing and to approval by the Parking and Traffic Commission and the Board of Supervisors.</td>
<td>Ascertain the status of public hearings regarding this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO FILM AND VIDEO ARTS COMMISSION (SFFVAC) 2000-2001</td>
<td>7 Consider the Parking and Traffic Commission recommendation that the Board in turn recommend the State Legislature &quot;to allow local jurisdiction on parking in driveways.&quot;</td>
<td>Investigation Incomplete</td>
<td>Follow Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO FILM AND VIDEO ARTS COMMISSION (SFFVAC) 2000-2001</td>
<td>1-4 _ Various recommendations regarding the permit process, the composition of the SFFVAC, the SFFVAC website, and the lack of a business plan.</td>
<td>The required responses from SFFVAC to the 2000-2001 Report were not only inadequate and unresponsive but also, unsigned. SFFVAC has stonewalled the CGJ Reports and requests for responses for the last three years.</td>
<td>See Suggested action below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO FILM AND VIDEO ARTS COMMISSION (SFFVAC) 2000-2001</td>
<td>5 The Controller should conduct an audit of the SFFVAC fund to assure that all fees have been appropriately assessed and collected.</td>
<td>In June 2001, the Controller's Office began an audit of SFFVAC.</td>
<td>The results of the Controller's audit should be studied to determine whether further CGJ attention would be appropriate. In light of non-responses to CGJ Reports, the CGJ should consult with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 1

"The 2000-2001 CGJ created a Continuity Committee to follow through on the issues and recommendations raised by the 1999-2000 CGH report. The scope of the committee was:

- To ensure that all departments were made aware of their requirement to respond to the recommendations made by the previous year’s CGJ report,
- To apprise the Board of Supervisors of their responsibility to hold hearings concerning the previous year’s CGJ reports and to elicit their cooperation in this regard.
- To follow up and elicit responses from non-responding departments, first by telephone and then, if necessary, by official letters of reminder.
- To evaluate the recommendations of the previous year's CGJ reports and determine if further examination was warranted based upon the responses."
To encourage future CGJs to maintain a historical file regarding these responses. This process allows grand jurors to gain a more thorough understanding of the past relationships between earlier grand juries and various agencies." (2000-2001 Civil Grand Jury Reports: Grand Jury Continuity Report p. 2)

That CGJ further included "ADVICE TO FUTURE GRAND JURIES:

In order to facilitate a Continuity Committee, the 2000-2001 CGJ advises future CGJS that:

- A CGJ Continuity Committee be a regular standing committee.
- The CGJ Secretary or other willing juror chair the Continuity Committee and be responsible for monitoring the status of required responses.
- Reports should be made regularly to the CGJ and Presiding Judge on late responses during the CGJ term. Agencies failing to respond should receive telephone reminders, followed by a formal letter from the Presiding Judge, if necessary.
- The results of Continuity Committee actions should be included as a part of future Civil Grand Jury Final reports.
- The CGJ review the received responses and, if warranted, consider selecting one or more reports for continued investigation (i.e., the 2000-2001 CGJ selection of the1999-2000 CGJ SFFVAC report).


ATTACHMENT 2

The Tasks of the Continuity Committee.

"Task 1 -- According to the requirements of the City Charter, record the responses to last year's CGJ's Report, remind those departments/agencies not responding of their responsibility to do so, and submit a report on such.

Task 2 - Identify items in the 2000-2001 Report that may need follow-up, describe the problem, and submit to the CGJ for consideration of action.

Task 3 - Carefully study Reports of 4 years previous to last year's, plus Controller's summary of Responses to each, plus original Responses to each. Identify items for possible study/restudy, describe the problem, and submit these to the CGJ for consideration of action.

Task 4 - During the studies of past Reports (and delving into further years past, if questions arise), identify those aspects of the Reports which have elicited strong positive/negative responses from those departments/agencies studied and from others. If possible, compile a listing of those aspects of the reports which made them most/least effective.

Task 5- Maintain and supplement the CGJ library, act as resource to other CGJ committees re: past issues studied, and prepare to bridge the gap between this year's and next year's CGJ."