



## Santa Cruz County Civil Grand Jury

### 2014-2015 Response Packet

#### Santa Cruz County Fire Protection Districts

Response Times, Mutual Aid, and Consolidation

Board of Directors, Zayante Fire Protection District

**Due date: 90 Days (by September 24, 2015)**

When finished, email the completed response packet as a file attachment to:

[grandjury@co.santa-cruz.ca.us](mailto:grandjury@co.santa-cruz.ca.us)

## **Instructions for Respondents**

California law PC § 933.05 requires that those responding to a Grand Jury report must provide a response for each individual finding and recommendation within a report, not a generalized response to the entire report. Explanations for disagreements and timeframes for further implementation or analysis must be provided.

Please follow the format below when preparing your response.

### **Response Format**

1. Find the Responses Required table that appears near the end of the report. Look for the row with the name of the entity you represent and then respond to the Findings and/or Recommendations listed in that row using the custom packet provided to you.
2. For Findings, indicate one of the following responses and provide the required additional information:
  - a. AGREE with the Finding,
  - b. PARTIALLY DISAGREE with the Finding and specify the portion of the Finding that is disputed and include an explanation of the reasons therefor, or
  - c. DISAGREE with the Finding and provide an explanation of the reasons therefor.
3. For Recommendations, select one of the following actions and provide the required additional information:
  - a. HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED, with a summary regarding the implemented action,
  - b. HAS NOT YET BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE, with a timeframe or expected date for implementation,
  - 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,
  - d. WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.

If the respondent is a governing body, please provide the voted response of the body as a whole. Individual responses from members of a governing body will not be published.

If you have questions about the response report please contact the Grand Jury by calling 831-454-2099 or by sending an e-mail to [grandjury@co.santa-cruz.ca.us](mailto:grandjury@co.santa-cruz.ca.us).

## **How and Where to Respond**

1. Please download and fill out the Response Packet provided to you for your responses. Please respond to each finding and recommendation. Be sure to save any changes you make to the packet.
2. Print and send a hard copy of the Response Packet to:  
The Honorable Judge Rebecca Connelly  
Santa Cruz Superior Court  
701 Ocean Street  
Santa Cruz, Ca 95060
3. Email the completed Response Packet, as an attachment, to the Grand Jury at [grandjury@co.santa-cruz.ca.us](mailto:grandjury@co.santa-cruz.ca.us).

## **Due Dates**

Elected officials or administrators are required to respond within 60 days of the Grand Jury report's publication. Responses by the governing body of any public entity are required within 90 days.

## **Penal Code § 933.05**

1. For Purposes of subdivision (b) of § 933, as to each Grand Jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:
  - a. the respondent agrees with the finding,
  - b. the respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor.
2. For purpose of subdivision (b) of § 933, as to each Grand Jury recommendation, the responding person shall report one of the following actions:
  - a. the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action,
  - b. the recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation,
  - c. the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of the publication of the Grand Jury report, or
  - d. the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.
3. However, if a finding or recommendation of the Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a County department headed by an elected officer, both the department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Grand Jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision-making authority. The response of the elected department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her department.
4. A Grand Jury may request a subject person or entity to come before the Grand Jury for the purpose of reading and discussing the findings of the Grand Jury report that relates to that person or entity in order to verify the accuracy of the findings prior to their release.
5. During an investigation, the Grand Jury shall meet with the subject of that investigation regarding that investigation unless the court, either on its own determination or upon request of the foreperson of the Grand Jury, determines that such a meeting would be detrimental.

A Grand Jury shall provide to the affected agency a copy of the portion of the Grand Jury report relating to that person or entity two working days prior to its public release and after the approval of the presiding judge. No officer, agency, department or governing body of a public agency shall disclose any contents of the report prior to the public release of the final report.

## **Findings**

**Finding 1:** The consolidation of Fire and Emergency Medical System dispatch services at the Santa Cruz Regional 911 center and mutual aid agreements between districts have created an efficient virtual single service district for those services in the entire county.

**AGREE**

**PARTIALLY DISAGREE** - explain disputed portion below

**DISAGREE** - explain below

**Response explanation (required for responses other than “Agree”):**

**Finding 2:** Shared services between fire districts have improved response times, training, and services across the county.

**AGREE**

**PARTIALLY DISAGREE** - explain disputed portion below

**DISAGREE** - explain below

**Response explanation (required for responses other than “Agree”):**

**Finding 11:** The differences in policies and procedures of the four fire protection districts in the San Lorenzo Valley inhibit future consolidation.

**AGREE**

**PARTIALLY DISAGREE** - explain disputed portion below

**DISAGREE** - explain below

**Response explanation (required for responses other than “Agree”):**

## **Recommendations**

**Recommendation 7:** The four fire protection districts in the San Lorenzo Valley should further align their policies and procedures in anticipation of future consolidation.

- HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED**  
 **HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE**  
- indicate timeframe below  
 **REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS** - explain scope and timeframe below (not to exceed six months)  
 **WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED** - explain below

**Response summary, timeframe or explanation:**

Due to the diversity and differences within the four fire protection districts in the San Lorenzo Valley, we, the Board of Directors of the Zayante Fire District do not believe it feasible to consider consolidation at this time. Each district encompasses distinct differences in population, geography, and relationships with the people within the communities that would make it difficult for a singular entity to reasonably control or manage all the districts. Further, the wealth of knowledge and understanding of the communities held by the existing management in each district, would be lost if consolidated. While consolidation might look good on paper, we believe it would ultimately be not cost effective, a detriment to response times, difficult supervision over long distances and lack of understanding of the people at each station, their skills, needs, schedules and moral.