



SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE FINAL REPORTS OF THE 2022-2023 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

BACKGROUND

California Penal Code Section 933(a) requires the Grand Jury to “submit to the presiding judge of the superior court a final report of its findings and recommendations that pertain to county government matters during the fiscal or calendar year.” Section 933(c) requires a response and comments from the governing body, elected county officers, or agency heads to the presiding judge of the superior court on the findings and recommendations within the required period of time. Governing bodies of public agencies are required to respond no later than 90 days after the Grand Jury submits a final report, elected county officers and agency heads no later than 60 days. All Civil Grand Jury reports and the responses can be reviewed on the following website:

<https://sanmateo.courts.ca.gov/divisions/grand-jury/grand-jury-final-reports>

The Grand Jury’s practice is that, each year, the responses and comments submitted in response to prior reports are evaluated by the then-current Grand Jury in compliance with California Penal Code Section 933.05(b), which requires the agency head, county officer, or governing body to provide one of four possible responses to each recommendation:

- Has been implemented, with a summary of the action taken
- Will implement the recommendation, with a timeframe for the implementation
- Requires further analysis, with an explanation and a timeframe for the response of up to six months from the release of the report
- Will not implement because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The 2022-2023 Grand Jury issued three investigative reports that included recommendations to county, local or district agencies. This year, the 2023-24 Grand Jury reviewed the formal responses to recommendations that the affected agencies submitted in response to the 2022-23 Grand Jury reports.

The tables below summarize the responses to each of the investigative reports issued by the 2022-23 Grand Jury across all agencies. [Appendix A](#) presents more detail about the individual agencies’ responses to each of those reports, spelling out each report’s recommendations and each agency’s responses to those recommendations. One column indicates whether follow-up by a future grand jury is advisable. This information is designed to help the public evaluate whether and to what extent agencies have responded to recommendations of the Grand Jury.

The table below indicates the overall responses:

2022-2023 Aggregate Responses		
Response	Recommendations	% of Total
Implemented	62	20.5%
Will implement	92	30.5%
Needs study	41	13.6%
Will not implement (or n/a)	88	29.1%
Will partially implement	19	6.3%
Did not respond	0	0%
Totals	302	100%

The tables below indicate the specific responses:

Accessory Dwelling Units: Affordable Housing's Panacea or Prevarication?

Response	Recommendations	% of Total
Implemented	15	12.5%
Will implement	26	21.7%
Needs study	19	15.8%
Will not implement (or n/a)	42	35%
Will partially implement	18	15%
Did not respond	0	0%
Totals	120	100%

Bike Safety in San Mateo County: Making Bicycling Safer in the County

Response	Recommendations	% of Total
Implemented	44	31.4%
Will implement	61	43.6%
Needs study	13	9.3%
Will not implement (or n/a)	21	15%
Will partially implement	1	0.7%
Did not respond	0	0%
Totals	140	100%

Education is Everyone's Business: School-Business Partnerships Make an Impact in County's High Schools

Response	Recommendations	% of Total
Implemented	3	7.1%
Will implement	5	11.5%
Needs study	9	21.4%
Will not implement (or n/a)	25	60%
Will partially implement	0	0%
Did not respond	0	0%
Totals	42	100%

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE 2022-2023 SAN MATEO COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORTS

Accessory Dwelling Units: Affordable Housing's Panacea or Prevarication?

Release date: June 12, 2023

FINDINGS

- F1. Due to recent changes in California ADU-related laws, local governments cannot condition ADU permits in San Mateo County on complying with affordability monitoring and verification.
- F2. San Mateo County and most of its municipalities rely on ADUs to meet their affordable housing commitments in their RHNA-6 plans.
- F3. Atherton, Hillsborough, Portola Valley, and Woodside rely on ADUs to meet as much as 80 percent of their affordable housing commitments in their RHNA-6 plans.
- F4. HCD has instructed San Mateo County jurisdictions to monitor and verify future ADU production and affordability every two years but has yet to specify how to verify whether very low-, low- or moderate-income households are occupying the ADUs as planned.
- F5. Other than Brisbane and Redwood City, San Mateo County and its jurisdictions have yet to articulate how they will monitor and verify ADU production or affordability.
- F6. Without effective ADU monitoring and verification, it will be impossible to evaluate whether the jurisdictions are meeting their RHNA-6 obligations for low-, very-low, and moderate-income housing units.
- F7. ADU affordability and occupancy could be monitored by agencies such as HIP Housing which has proven systems and processes to verify occupancy of deed-restricted rental properties in San Mateo County.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1. San Mateo County and each City should immediately stop using ADUs to meet their State-mandated very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing targets in their Housing Element submissions until they have also proposed an effective monitoring system that verifies how newly developed ADU's will be used.
- R2. By February 1, 2024, San Mateo County and each City should develop, adopt, and implement a verification system capable of monitoring and verifying how newly developed ADU's are being used.
- R3. By February 1, 2024, San Mateo County and each City should develop and adopt incentives for ADU owners which could be offered in exchange for deed restrictions that would include requirements for ADU tenants to participate in independent monitoring.
- R4. By February 1, 2024, San Mateo County and each City should track the intended use of ADUs – rented or non-rented – during the permitting process and offer incentives in exchange for deed restrictions that require ADUs to be used as rentals.
- R5. By April 1, 2024, San Mateo County and each City should develop and adopt a new ADU affordability distribution formula specific to each jurisdiction to the extent they are used for meeting the very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing requirements in their RHNA housing elements.
- R6. San Mateo County and each City should consider working together to address Recommendations 2 and 3.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW-UP YEAR
City of Belmont	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Needs study	---
City of Brisbane	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Implemented	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
City of Burlingame	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
City of Daly City	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Needs study	---
	R3	Needs study	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Needs study	---
City of East Palo Alto	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
City of Foster City	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---

	R6	Will be implemented	---
City of Half Moon Bay	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Needs study	---
	R3	Needs study	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Needs study	---
City of Menlo Park	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Needs study	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
City of Millbrae	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
City of Pacifica	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
City of Redwood City	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will implement by July '24	---
	R4	Will implement by Jan '25	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
City of San Bruno	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Needs study	---
	R4	Will partially implement	---

	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
City of San Carlos	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will be implemented	---
	R3	Needs study	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
City of San Mateo	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
City of South San Francisco	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Needs study	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
Town of Atherton	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Will partially implement	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
Town of Colma	R1	N/A	---
	R2	Will be implemented	---
	R3	Needs study	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
Town of Hillsborough	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
Town of Portola Valley	R1	Will not implement by	---

		the required date	
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will partially implement	---
	R4	Will partially implement	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
Town of Woodside	R1	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R2	Will partially implement	---
	R3	Will partially implement	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---

Bike Safety in San Mateo County: Making Bicycling Safer in the County

Release date: July 10, 2023

FINDINGS

F1. Bicycle policy and the approach to ensuring/improving bicycle safety is not consistent across San Mateo County due, at least in part, to:

- a. Topography
- b. Urban vs. suburban environments
- c. Types of bicyclists (commuter, recreational)
- d. Varying levels of enforcement of bicycle laws
- e. Differing knowledge of bicycle laws and safe practices.

F2. Bicycle ridership as an alternative means of transportation (e.g., commuting to work, school, or transit hubs, running errands) is not increasing due, at least in part, to perceived safety issues.

F3. Bicycle accidents and incidents (such as near misses) are underreported, if reported at all.

F4. Only bicycle accidents or incidents that trigger a 911 call are consistently logged in the State (SWITRS) database and law enforcement agencies do not log bicycle accident data consistently.

F5. The amount of enforcement of laws, as they pertain to bicyclists and how motorists and bicyclists interact, is inconsistent due to other priorities (e.g., criminal enforcement and general automobile traffic) and the requirement that a citation can generally only be written if the violation is witnessed by an officer.

F6. There is no official metric in San Mateo County and its cities to evaluate how safe it is to ride a bicycle.

F7. Bicycle safety education, for the bicyclist, pedestrians and motorists, is not consistently offered across San Mateo County.

F8. Communication between various entities with responsibility for bicycle safety, including Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees (BPACs), Law Enforcement, City Transportation Planning, and Public Works departments, is not formalized, resulting in inefficiencies, and missed opportunities (e.g., funding for improvements, shared bike safety education, or improving signage).

F9. City Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans or Active Transportation Plans, have not been adopted/created by all SMC cities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

R1. By December 2023, all law enforcement agencies and the County Sheriff should submit bicycle related data to SWITRS monthly, and regularly post and update their websites with all reported bicycle accident data.

R2. By December 2023, all law enforcement agencies should begin sending warning letters to motorists for violations of the 3 ft. law.

R3. By June 3, 2024, all law enforcement agencies should provide a means for citizens to report bicycle-related incidents that are not currently reported to law enforcement, similar to the SMC Sheriff's Department Online Crime Reporting portal.

R4. By June 3, 2024 each city, town, and unincorporated SMC should offer a bike safety education program for riders and motorists about the laws and safety facts related to bicycles on the road.

R5. By June 3, 2024, each city, town, and unincorporated SMC should update or generate a new Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (or Active Transportation Plan) if their current plan is older than five years; consistent with the 2021 C/CAG San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

R6. By June 3, 2024, each city, town, and the county should apply (or reapply) online to generate the Bicycle Friendly Community Report Card.

R7. By February 1, 2024, the County should meet with cities within the County that are willing to participate, to consider establishing a regional effort that integrates the cities' bicycle plans and to discuss how the cities and County could work together to apply for grant opportunities as a region.

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	FOLLOW-UP YEAR
City of Belmont	R1	Will implement by Dec '23	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
City of Brisbane	R1	Will implement by Dec '23	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Will implement by June '24	---
	R4	Will implement by June '24	---
	R5	Needs study	---
	R6	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---

City of Burlingame	R1	Implemented	---
	R2	Will be implemented	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Needs study	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
City of Daly City	R1	Implemented	---
	R2	Will be implemented	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
City of East Palo Alto	R1	Partially implemented	---
	R2	Needs study	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will be implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
City of Foster City	R1	Implemented	---
	R2	Needs study	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will implement by June '25	---
	R6	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
City of Half Moon Bay	R1	Needs study	---
	R2	Needs study	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Implemented	---
	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
City of Menlo Park	R1	Implemented	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R7	Implemented	---
City of Millbrae	R1	Will implement by Dec '23	---
	R2	Implemented	---

	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Will implement by June '24	---
	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
City of Pacifica	R1	Implemented	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Will implement by June '24	---
	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Implemented	---
City of Redwood City	R1	Needs study	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Needs study	---
	R4	Implemented	---
	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
City of San Bruno	R1	Partially implemented	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Needs study	---
	R7	Implemented	---
City of San Carlos	R1	Implemented	---
	R2	Implemented	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Will implement by June '24	---
	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Implemented	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
City of San Mateo	R1	Implemented	---
	R2	Will be implemented	---
	R3	Will be implemented	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Needs study	---
City of South San Francisco	R1	Partially implemented	---
	R2	Will be implemented	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Implemented	---

	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Implemented	---
Town of Atherton	R1	Implemented	---
	R2	Partially implemented	---
	R3	N/A	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will be implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
Town of Colma	R1	Will be implemented	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---
Town of Hillsborough	R1	Partially implemented	---
	R2	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will be implemented	---
	R6	Will be implemented	---
	R7	Needs study	---
Town of Portola Valley	R1	Will be implemented	---
	R2	Implemented	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Will partially implement	---
	R5	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R6	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R7	Will not implement by the required date	---
Town of Woodside	R1	Implemented	---
	R2	Implemented	---
	R3	Implemented	---
	R4	Will be implemented	---
	R5	Will be implemented	---
	R6	Will not implement by the required date	---
	R7	Will be implemented	---

Release date: June 26, 2023

FINDINGS

- F1. Students benefit greatly from personal exposure to specialized work environments and gain experience from trained professionals in project-based instruction.
- F2. Businesses can provide schools with much-needed resources, from state-of-the-art equipment and facilities to curriculum development and instructor support.
- F3. San Mateo County's schools vary substantially in their CTE and work-centered offerings based on individual school district's available revenue, availability of qualified instructors, appropriate facilities, and connections to local businesses.
- F4. The availability of qualified CTE teachers which limits the choice of CTE pathways is a critical problem because of low pay compared to industry salaries and credentialing hurdles. This problem will become more acute as school districts try to respond to students and businesses demand for more CTE pathways.
- F5. The loss of San Mateo County's Regional Occupation Center and Program (ROCP) facility reduced the number of CTE offerings, especially among those pathways requiring expensive equipment and facilities, and disproportionately impacts smaller school districts.
- F6. Many comprehensive schools focus primarily on preparing students for college admissions based on the UC and CSU A-G course requirements, relegating CTE programs to secondary status, and ignoring data that demonstrates CTE offerings provide a vital gateway for vocation and college preparatory education.
- F7. For optimum effectiveness school districts' CTE coordinators must develop relationships with, and access to high-level decision-makers at prospective business partners.
- F8. SMCOE, school districts, and schools should leverage their relationships with local governments and networks to connect with business decision-makers.
- F9. There is a need for a Countywide forum to facilitate regular active discussions among the school administrations, business entities, and SMCOE on creating new school/business partnerships, reviewing the ones in operation, and confirming the actual benefits reported by students, teachers, and businesses.
- F10. Evaluation of students' results from CTE pathway courses and school-business partnerships after graduation is incomplete, inconsistent, and rarely beyond anecdotal among San Mateo County high schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1. By February 1, 2024, the SMCOE should prepare a plan, by which it supports and facilitates on an annual basis, initial contacts and meetings between school administrators and business leaders to explore potential partnerships, including financial support, curriculum development, internships, professional mentors, and on-site exposure to work environments.
- R2. By February 1, 2024, the SMCOE and the school districts should consider proposing to the State's Department of Education a review of required credentials for CTE instructors to find ways to streamline, accelerate, and broaden approvals, thereby increasing the number of qualified CTE instructors.
- R3. By February 1, 2024, the SMCOE should consider sponsoring regular conferences to review

and discuss ongoing and planned future school-business partnerships in the County with decision-makers among business leaders, school and CTE administrators, and community/government leaders.

R4. By March 1, 2024, SMCOE and school districts should investigate providing transportation for students to existing CTE facilities within the County without regard to a student’s home school district.

R5. By March 1, 2024, the SMCOE and school districts should investigate the feasibility and appropriateness of re-establishing at least one Regional Occupation Center and Program facility in the County and publicly report the outcome of the investigation.

R6. By March 1, 2024, SMCOE and school districts should develop and apply metrics and procedures to evaluate their CTE pathways and, if applicable, business partnership programs’ effectiveness

RESPONDING AGENCY	APPLICABLE RECOMMENDATIO	RESPONSE	FOLLOW-UP YEAR
	N		
San Mateo County Office of Education	R1	Will be implemented	---
	R2	Will not be implemented by the required date	---
	R3	Estimated by Jan '24	---
	R4	Will not be implemented by the required date	---
	R5	Will not be implemented by the required date	---
	R6	Estimated by Feb '24	---
Cabrillo Unified School District	R1	N/A	---
	R2	Needs study	---
	R3	N/A	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Needs study	---
	R6	Needs study	---
La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District	R1	N/A	---
	R2	Needs study	---
	R3	N/A	---
	R4	Needs study	---
	R5	Needs study	---
	R6	Needs study	---
Jefferson Union Unified School District	R1	N/A	---
	R2	Will not be implemented by the required date	---
	R3	N/A	---
	R4	Will not be implemented by the required date	---
	R5	Will not be implemented by the required date	---
	R6	Implemented	---
San Mateo Union Unified School District	R1	N/A	---
	R2	Will not be implemented by the required date	---

	R3	N/A
	R4	Will not be implemented by the required date
	R5	Will not be implemented by the required date
	R6	Implemented
Sequoia Union Unified School District	R1	Will be implemented
	R2	Will not be implemented by the required date
	R3	Will be implemented
	R4	Will not be implemented by the required date
	R5	Will not be implemented by the required date
	R6	Implemented

South San Francisco Union Unified School District	R1	N/A
	R2	Will not be implemented by the required date
	R3	N/A
	R4	Will not be implemented by the required date
	R5	Will not be implemented by the required date
	R6	Needs study

Release Date: July 15, 2024
2023-2024 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury