July 18, 2018
NVTA Board of Directors
Meeting Handouts

1. **Draft NVTA Caltrans Report July 2018**

2. **2017-2018 Grand Jury – Grand Jury Report Implementation of Prior Recommendations 2012-2016**

1

PROJECT INITIATION REPORT

EA 4J820
Tulucay Creek Bridge Replacement; NAPA 121 PM 5.9 in City of Napa
Scope: Bridge Replacement

EA 0J890
5-Way Intersection; NAPA 121-PM 7.3 in City of Napa
Scope: Intersection Improvement

EA 0J760
Napa Valley Vine Trail; NAPA 29-PM 33.4/37.9 in County of Napa
Scope: Construct Class 1 Multiuse Path

EA 0P730
Advance Mitigation; NAPA 29 PM 15.6/22.8 in County of Napa
Scope: Mitigation Purchase under Roadside Protection and Restoration Program

EA 0Q690
Storm Damage; NAPA 12 PM 2.1/2.6 in County of Napa
Scope: Construct Rock Slope Protection (RSP) to prevent further slope washout.

EA 0Q820
Storm Damage; NAPA 29 PM 12.2 in City of Napa
Scope: Culver repair and grout injection at slipout

EA 0Q830
Storm Damage; NAPA 29 PM 46.1 in County of Napa
Scope: Construct CIDH segmented pile wall at slipout

EA 0Q790
Storm Damage; NAPA 121 PM 13.4/20.7 in County of Napa
Scope: Construct RSP at five slipout locations.

EA 0Q810
Storm Damage; NAPA 121 PM 16.1 in County of Napa
Scope: Construct Reconstruct embankment with lightweight fill.

EA 1Q620
Pavement Preservation; NAPA 121 PM 4.5/10.7 in City of Napa
Scope: Pavement repair
.
SHOPP ID 20511
Pavement Rehab; NAPA 29 PM 7.3/13.5 in County of Napa
Scope: Pavement rehabilitation.

SHOPP ID 17842
Pavement Rehab; NAPA 29 PM 42.1/48.6 in County of Napa
Scope: Pavement rehabilitation

PIR (Project Initiation Report) **PSR** (Project Study Report) **DED** (Draft Environmental Document)
PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document) **PSE** (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)
RWC (Right of Way Certification) **RTL** (Ready to List) **CCA** (Construction Contract Acceptance)
ADV (Advertise Contract) **BO** (Bid Open) **AWD** (Award Contract)

ENVIRONMENTAL

EA 2K420
Storm Damage; NAPA 128 PM 9.2 in County of Napa
Scope: Construct RSP to prevent further slope washout.
Cost Estimate: $0.8M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 04/2019 **PS&E:** 06/2020 **RWC:** 07/2020 **RTL:** 08/2020

EA 4J830
Hopper Slough Creek; NAPA 128 PM 5.1 in County of Napa
Scope: Bridge Replacement
Cost Estimate: $7.9M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 10/2020 **PS&E:** 04/2022 **RWC:** 04/2022 **RTL:** 05/2022

EA 0K000
ADA Compliance; NAPA 29 PM 0.0/14.6 in County of Napa
Scope: Upgrade Pedestrian Facilities
Cost Estimate: $990K Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 03/2020 **PS&E:** 09/2021 **RWC:** 10/2021 **RTL:** 01/2022

EA 0K630
Bridge Rails; NAPA 29 PM 14.1/19.04 in County of Napa
Scope: Upgrade / Replace Bridge Rails
Cost Estimate: $7.1M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 06/2020 **PS&E:** 12/2021 **RWC:** 01/2022 **RTL:** 04/2022

EA 2K150
Bridge Rails; NAPA 29 PM 28.43/29.3 in County of Napa
Scope: Upgrade / Replace Bridge Rails
Cost Estimate: $4.2M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 03/2021 **PS&E:** 05/2022 **RWC:** 04/2023 **RTL:** 04/2023

EA 4J990
Storm Water Quality Improvement; NAPA 29 PM 32.0/33.0 in County of Napa
Scope: Improve water quality and fish passage
Cost Estimate: $7.6M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 10/2020 **PS&E:** 04/2022 **RWC:** 05/2022 **RTL:** 06/2022

EA 2K810
Anti-Vandalism Measure; NAPA 29 121-PM 11.0/R21.0 in County of Napa
Scope: Replace Fencing
Cost Estimate: $3.1M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 06/2020 **PAED:** 12/2021 **RWC:** 01/2022 **RTL:** 04/2022

EA 4J300
Pavement Preservation; NAPA 29-PM 29.3/36.9From York Creek Bridge to Junction Route 128 in Calistoga
Scope: Roadway/ Pavement preservation (CAPM)
Cost Estimate: $9.7M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 10/2019 **PS&E:** 04/2020 **RWC:** 10/2020 **RTL:** 11/2020 **CCA:** 06/2021

PIR (Project Initiation Report) **PSR** (Project Study Report) **DED** (Draft Environmental Document)
PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document) **PSE** (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)
RWC (Right of Way Certification) **RTL** (Ready to List) **CCA** (Construction Contract Acceptance)
ADV (Advertise Contract) **BO** (Bid Open) **AWD** (Award Contract)

EA 4J410
Drainage Improvement; NAPA 29 PM 1.7/5.1 in City of American Canyon
Scope: Rehabilitate Culverts
Cost Estimate: $3.3M Construction Capital
Schedule: **DED:** 05/2020 **PAED:** 11/2020 **PS&E:** 12/2021 **RWC:** 5/2022 **RTL:** 06/2022 **CCA:** 9/2023

EA 2J88U
Garnett Creek, Garnett Branch and No-Name Creek: NAPA 29-PM .39.0 & 43.8 in County of Napa
Scope: Sub-structure rehabilitation and bridge scour mitigation
Cost Estimate: $3.9M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 02/2019 **PS&E:** 02/2020 **RWC:** 3/2020 **RTL:** 04/2020 **CCA:** 12/2021

EA 4J210
Capell Creek Bridge #21-0064; NAPA 121-PM 18.59 in County of Napa
Scope: Sub-structure rehabilitation and bridge scour mitigation
Cost Estimate: $1,400 K Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 09/2018 **PS&E:** 02/2020 **RWC:** 03/2020 **RTL:** 4/2020 **CCA:** 12/2021

EA 28120
Soscol Junction Improvement; NAPA 29 PM 5.0/7.1 and NAPA 221 PM 0.0/0.7 in County of Napa
Scope: Construct New Interchange at SR 221/29/12
Cost Estimate: $35M Construction Capital-**Not Programmed**
Schedule **DED:** 3/16/15 **PAED:** 06/2019

DESIGN

EA 4G920
Tulucay Creek Bridge Repair; NAPA 121-PM 6.1/6.2 in City of Napa
Scope: Bridge Repair
Cost Estimate: $2.2M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 10/19/16 **PS&E:** 3/27/2018 **RWC:** 3/27/18 **RTL:** 4/12/18 **CCA:** 06/2019

EA 4G21A
Env. Mitigation at Huichica Creek; NAPA 121-PM 0.75 in County of Napa
Scope: Environmental mitigation, monitoring and report at Huichica Creek
Cost Estimate: $1.0M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED: 04/2018** **RTL: 06/2022**

EA 2J100
Construct Roundabout; NAPA 29-PM 11.36 in City of Napa
Scope: Cooperative Project to construct a roundabout at northbound First St. Interchange.
Cost Estimate: $3.8M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 7/18/16 **PS&E:** 4/27/18 **RWC:** 4/27/18 **RTL:** 5/4/18 **CCA:** 12/2020

EA 1G430
Conn Creek Bridge Scour Mitigation; NAPA 128 PM R7.4 on Silverado Trail in County of Napa
Scope: Replace Bridge at Conn Creek
Cost Estimate: $7.1M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 10/5/15 **PS&E:** 6/2018 **RWC:** 6/20/18 **RTL:** 6/29/18 **CCA:** 12/2020

PIR (Project Initiation Report) **PSR** (Project Study Report) **DED** (Draft Environmental Document)
PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document) **PSE** (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)
RWC (Right of Way Certification) **RTL** (Ready to List) **CCA** (Construction Contract Acceptance)
ADV (Advertise Contract) **BO** (Bid Open) **AWD** (Award Contract)

EA 2J570
Storm Damage; NAPA 121-PM 20.06 in County of Napa
Scope: Culvert and erosion repair
Cost Estimate: $1.8M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 7/24/17 **PS&E:** 05/2/18 **RWC:** 05/2/18 **RTL:** 06/29/18 **CCA:** 06/2020

EA 3G64A
Env. Mitigation & Plant Establishment at Napa River Bridge; NAPA 29 PM 37.0 in City of Calistoga
Scope: Environmental mitigation at Napa River Bridge
Cost Estimate: $0.5M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 2/9/15 **RWC**: 06/2019 **RTL**: 06/2019

EA 4G210
Widen Roadway at Huichica Creek; NAPA 121-PM 0.75 in County of Napa
Scope: Remove existing triple box culverts and replace with a new single span bridge
Cost Estimate: $8.7M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 04/09/18 **PS&E:** 04/2019 **RWC:** 05/2019 **RTL:** 05/2019 **CCA:** 12/2021

EA 4G840
Capell Creek Bridge; NAPA 128-PM 20.2 in County of Napa
Scope: Bridge Replacement
Cost Estimate: $12.1M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 6/16/16 **PS&E:** 6/4/18 **RWC:** 6/28/18 **RTL:** 6/29/18 **CCA:** 12/2022

CONSTRUCTION

EA 4G490
Concrete Barrier; NAPA 29 PM 11.9 at Solano Ave. Southbound Onramp in City of Napa
Scope: Install Concrete Barrier (Type 60)
Cost Estimate: $1.3M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 1/06/16 **RTL:** 3/2/17 **AWD**: 10/11/2017(FBD Vanguard Const) **CCA:** 6/28/18

EA 4H200
Pavement Preservation; NAPA 29-PM 13.5/25.5 from 0.4 mile north of Trancas St. to Mee Ln. in County of Napa
Scope: Resurface existing pavement
Cost Estimate: $17.1M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 1/29/16 **RTL:** 6/14/17 **AWD:** 11/30/17 (Ghilotti Bros Inc) **CCA:** 12/2019

EA 3J740
Wooden Valley Earthquake Damage; NAPA 121-PM 14.80 in County of Napa
Scope: Earthquake damage permanent restoration/ Install anchored wire mesh
Cost Estimate: $890K Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 8/15/17 **RTL:** 9/15/17 **AWD:**4/4/18(American Civil Contractors) **CCA:** 11/2018

EA 3G140
ADA Curb Ramps; NAPA 29 and 128; in City of Calistoga
Scope: Upgrade and construct curb ramps at various locations.
Cost Estimate: $1.4M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 4/29/16 **RTL:** 7/3/17 **AWD:** 2/28/18 (Granite Const.) **CCA:** 11/2018

PIR (Project Initiation Report) **PSR** (Project Study Report) **DED** (Draft Environmental Document)
PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document) **PSE** (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)
RWC (Right of Way Certification) **RTL** (Ready to List) **CCA** (Construction Contract Acceptance)
ADV (Advertise Contract) **BO** (Bid Open) **AWD** (Award Contract)

EA 3G641
Napa River Bridge Scour Mitigation; NAPA 29 PM 37.0 in City of Calistoga
Scope: Replace Bridge at Napa River Bridge
Cost Estimate: $9.2M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED:** 2/9/15 **RTL:** 6/30/16 **AWD:** 3/17/17 (Valentine Corp.) **CCA:** 12/2019

ACTION ITEMS:

PIR (Project Initiation Report) **PSR** (Project Study Report) **DED** (Draft Environmental Document)
PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document) **PSE** (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)
RWC (Right of Way Certification) **RTL** (Ready to List) **CCA** (Construction Contract Acceptance)
ADV (Advertise Contract) **BO** (Bid Open) **AWD** (Award Contract)

NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY
1754 Second Street, Suite D
Napa, California 94559
1718 –113

CONFIDENTIAL
July 16, 2018

Affected Public Agency or Official

Re: Grand Jury report Implementation of Prior Recommendations
2012 - 2016

Greetings:

Enclosed please find a copy of the above report by the 2017-2018 Napa County Grand Jury. It should remain confidential until we release it on Wednesday, June 27.

Unlike our other reports, the Grand Jury has not requested any response for this report although it makes a single finding and recommendation. The purpose of the report is to report to the public the results prior Grand Jury reports have achieved.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at 707-666-5351 or at the above address.

Very truly yours,

Alan Charles Dell'Ario
Foreperson

NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY
2017-2018

June 25, 2018

FINAL REPORT

IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW
2012 - 2016

2012 -2106 IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

June 22, 2018

SUMMARY

The 2017-2018 Napa County Grand Jury reviewed the governmental agency response to the recommendations contained in the final reports prepared by the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 Grand Juries. Where these responses indicated future action (i.e., "the recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future" or "the recommendation requires further analysis"), the Grand Jury requested that the appropriate agency provide an updated status.

With minor exceptions, the requested updates were provided. The initial Grand Jury recommendation, the initial agency response, and the updated responses are provided in Appendices A through D to this report.

Not all the updated responses adequately addressed the status of the initial response. In at least one case, the agreed-to action has not yet been completed. The Grand Jury found that, in many cases, the initial agency comments did not comply with the specific requirements of the Penal Code. The Grand Jury also found that wording of its recommendations could, in general, be improved.

BACKGROUND

California Penal Code § 916 requires "…that all problems identified in a [grand jury] final report are accompanied by suggested means for their resolution." The identified problems and suggested resolutions are identified in a report as "Findings" and "Recommendations."

Section 933(c) of the Penal Code specifies in part:

> No later than 90 days after the grand jury submits a final report on the operations of any public agency subject to its reviewing authority, the governing body of the public agency shall comment to the presiding judge of the superior court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the governing body, and every elected county officer or agency head for which the grand jury has responsibility pursuant to Section 914.1 shall comment within 60 days to the presiding judge of the superior court…

Each grand jury reviews the responses to the previous year's reports to verify that they have been submitted in the required time frame and are in the proper format. The 2017-2018 Grand Jury Final Report entitled *Review of Responses to the 2016-2017 Grand Jury Reports* documents the current jury's review.[1]

---

[1] This report can be found at http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018, Grand Jury, 2017-2018, *Review of Responses*

The Penal Code, however, neither requires responding agencies to report when or how a "future" recommendation has been implemented nor does it require the responding agency to report the results of the promised "further analysis." The agencies do not report this information to the grand jury or to the public. For this reason, the 2017-2018 Grand Jury voted to investigate the status of agency responses to the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 Grand Jury Reports in which the agencies indicated future action was required.

This report details the completion status of an agency response where an agency "agreed" with a recommendation or promised "further analysis." The Grand Jury does not opine on the nature or merits of the agencies' promised future action.

METHODOLOGY

Section 933.05 of the California Penal Code specifies in part that "…as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

(1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
(2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.
(3) 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 head 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 publication of the grand jury report.
(4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor."

Sub-paragraphs (2) and (3) above denote future action. Each response to the recommendations identified in the reports for the subject four years was reviewed. With minor exceptions, where the response of the person or entity indicated future action, the Grand Jury requested that the person or entity update the status of their initial response. These requests were initiated by letter which included the final report Recommendation and the initial response which had been submitted to the presiding judge.

DISCUSSION

Each grand jury issues a series of reports reflecting the areas of government investigated during their grand jury term (i.e., July 1 – June 30). For reports issued early in the grand jury's term, responses may be received while the requesting grand jury is still in session. More often, the formal responses are received during the subsequent grand jury's term. In either case, the status of "future action" items are not reported. This Grand Jury elected to review responses to reports issued by the 2012-2013 through the 2015-2016 Grand Juries.

The Grand Jury's effort to ascertain the status of "future action" items was hampered to a degree by the Napa County Board of Supervisors' decision, in some cases, to lump together more than

one recommendation in its response and/or apparently to rewrite the initial response by way of an update. In addition, several agencies that responded individually to an original grand jury report apparently deferred to the Board of Supervisor's updated response.

The above notwithstanding, it appears that in general, the "future action" items were completed. The District Attorney's implementation of Recommendation No. 5 of the 2012-2013 Grand Jury's report on the Napa County Sheriff Coroner Services Operations (see Appendix A) was to have been completed by December 31, 2013. The District Attorney's updated response, October 31, 2017, reported that "we are optimistic that the digital evidence module may be incorporated into CJNET by December 31, 2018."

SUMMARY

Overall, the Grand Jury is gratified to find that agencies responding to grand-jury recommendations have followed-up and implemented those recommendations as this report reflects.

AGENCY	**2012-2013 Update**	**2013-2014 Update**	**2014-2015 Update**	**2015-2016 Update**
Auditor-Controller	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A
Board of Supervisors	Y	Y & N	Y & N	N/A
Chief Probation Officer	Y & N	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Calistoga	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of St. Helena	Y & N	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Napa	N/A	N/A	N	N/A
County Counsel	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A
District Attorney	Y & N	N/A	N/A	N/A
Health & Human Services	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A
Napa City Manager	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A
Napa County Fire Chief	N/A	N/A	N	N/A
Napa County Executive Officer	N/A	N/A	N	N
Napa Valley Transportation Authority	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A
Recorder County Clerk	Y & N	N/A	N/A	N/A

AGENCY	2012-2013 Update	2013-2014 Update	2014-2015 Update	2015-2016 Update
Registrar of Voters	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sheriff	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tax Collector	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: N/A = Not Applicable

FINDINGS

F1. Napa County agencies that agreed to implement Grand Jury recommendations in years 2012-2013 through 2015-2016 did so with minor exception.

RECOMMENDATIONS

R1. Napa County agencies that are required or invited to respond to future Grand Jury recommendations do so in accordance with the provisions of Penal Code section 933.05.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A, 2012-2013 Updated Responses

Appendix B, 2013-2014 Updated Responses

Appendix C, 2014-2015 Updated Responses

Appendix D, 2015-2016 Updated Responses

APPENDIX A
2012-2013 REPORT RESPONSES

I. Integrity of Grand Jury Investigations

A. Recommendation No. 1 was: That the County Board of Supervisors, the City Council of each incorporated jurisdiction, the County Counsel, and every publicly elected official not under the authority of the foregoing provide instructions to all county employees within their jurisdiction regarding their duties and responsibilities toward the Grand Jury process and that said instructions be completed prior to the end of this calendar year.

1. Auditor Controller
Initial response (2013): The County Board of Supervisors adopted a Code of Ethics in 2005. This document is discussed and provided to all new employees and is available to all employees on both the County's internal and external websites. I agree to review this document with my staff at a minimum annually and this year I will emphasize the importance of it in the context of Grand Jury investigations.
Updated response (2017): The Auditor-Controller meets with staff regularly during the year and at least annually. She discusses their role, expectations and confidentiality of their discussions with the Grand Jury.

2. County Counsel
Initial response (2013): I agree to implement this recommendation in County Counsel's office this year.
Updated response (2017): The Office of County Counsel and its attorneys and staff are of course well aware of their responsibilities and the duties of County departments in the context of responding to Grand Jury inquiries and requests. County Counsel prepared and provides the attached instructional documents to clients and staff (attached in their current form; updated periodically as needed). County Counsel attorneys keep apprised of the legal requirement for responding to Grand jury inquiries and do so without any formally designated annual training within the office itself.

3. District Attorney
Initial response (2013): I agree to implement this recommendation this year.
Updated response: None

4. Mayor, City of Calistoga
Initial response (2013): The City of Calistoga agrees to implement this recommendation prior to the end of the calendar year.
Updated response: None

5. Mayor, City of St. Helena
Initial response (2013): The City of St. Helena agrees to implement this recommendation prior to the end of the calendar year.
Updated response (2018):
The City has no institutional memory of its follow-up to Recommendation No. 1, now five years in the past. The City responds to Grand Jury information requests in accordance with law. If the current Grand Jury has "best practices" for formal responses to Grand Jury inquires, it would be appreciated if you would provide a copy. The City will take them into consideration when next called upon to respond to a Grand Jury inquiry. Further, if there are such "best practices," it is respectfully suggested that they be attached to any future inquiry from the Grand Jury.

6. Napa County Sheriff
Initial response: I agree to implement this recommendation this year.
Updated response: All Sheriff's Office personnel are provided, via County email, instructions regarding duties and responsibilities toward the Grand Jury process. These instructions are provided annually.

7. Treasurer – Tax Collector
Initial response (2013): I agree to implement this recommendation this year before the end of this year.
Updated response (2017): Consistent with that response, those County employees that work under my supervision were trained on Grand Jury protocol at a November 7, 2013 staff meeting.

II. Public Employment Retirement

A. Recommendation No. 3 was: Develop plans to control future health care costs including the concepts advocated by the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) of accessing increased-deductible or higher co-pay insurance plans.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2013): The recommendation requires further analysis. The County will continue to work with CalPERS, our health insurance provider, to identify options for controlling employee health care costs in the years ahead. With the implementation of the Affordable Care Act over the next few years, the County must meet increasingly complex criteria when providing employee health insurance, including minimum value and affordability tests. Developing cost effective approaches to providing quality employee health benefits will be a priority for the County and other employers in the years ahead.
Updated response (2017): Together with County staff, the Board continues to analyze the costs of the County's employee health and retirement benefits. As part of negotiations with bargaining groups, the Board works toward a fair and equitable benefit package that provides the ability to recruit and retain qualified employees. In addition, as

part of the budget preparation process each year, staff reviews Other Post Employment Benefit (OPEB) charges, health insurance increases, and retirement costs to make funding recommendations to the Board. Regarding Recommendation No. 6, litigation has not been conclusive, however; staff continues to monitor the situation and will make recommendation(S) as warranted when more information becomes available.
NOTE: This response apparently applies to Recommendations 3, 4, and 6.

B. Recommendation No. 4 was: Implement a side-fund to offset the risk of overly optimistic discount rate assumptions by CalPERS, if a budget surplus or another opportunistic funding source becomes available.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2013): The recommendation requires further analysis and would likely require negotiation with employee labor representatives because of the County's cost sharing formulas.
Updated response (2017): See II.A.1. Updated response above.

C. Recommendation No. 6 was: If favorable rulings result from federal bankruptcy proceedings concerning California jurisdictions, investigate freezing earned pension benefits of active employees who were beneficiaries of the SB400 retroactive formula enrichments and reset to the lower formulas in effect when the employees joined the County.

1. Board of Supervisors.
Initial response (2013): The recommendation requires further analysis. There continues to be significant debate as to whether an employer can reduce previously agreed to pension benefits. Any future reduction in benefits would likely require negotiation with employee labor representatives before a change could be made and would almost certainly face significant legal challenges.
Updated response (2017): See II.A.1. Updated response above

III. Napa County Jail

A. Recommendation No. 1 was: It is recommended that the NCDC and Probation fully define recidivism and work with Napa County Information Technology Services to extract meaningful information concerning past recidivism in order to gauge success of ongoing alternative programs. This should be implemented by IQ2014.

1. Chief Probation Officer
Initial response (2013): The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but is in the process of being implemented. The Criminal Justice agencies have defined recidivism as being a new conviction. Additionally, the tracking of violations of probation is also part of recidivism, but tracked separately to provide more detailed analysis. In order to evaluate programs and monitor trends in the criminal justice population, there has been an extensive project to

develop a new County-wide criminal justice information management system. This has been a collective project of the Criminal Justice Department Directors, Chief Information Officer, and County Executive Office. It is anticipated that implementation will occur by the end of fiscal year 2014-2015.
Updated response: None

IV. Napa County Election Division

A. Recommendation No. 1 Was: The Napa County Board of Supervisors change the elected status of *ex officio* Registrar of Voters to an appointed office.

1. *Board of Supervisors*
Initial response (2013): The recommendation requires further analysis. On September 15, 2009, the Board did an extensive review of the Election Division and concluded that it was more cost effective and efficient to remain as an elected position.
Updated response (2018): The Board completed its analysis. In May of 2013, the Board concluded that it was more cost effective and efficient to have the Registrar of Voters remain an elected position. In October of 2013, the Board discussed election processes with Mr. Tuteur. No advisory body was created. The County's facility master plan (Dated December 2010) priority is replacing the existing jail. However, the facility master plan continues to envision a consolidation of a number of general government functions including the Election Division when funding becomes available. This plan includes more space for storing and processing ballots, and easy public access.
NOTE: This update apparently covers Recommendations 1, 2, and 9.

B. Recommendation No. 2 was: Upon establishment of an appointed Registrar of Voters, the Napa County Board of Supervisors should establish an oversight committee of Napa County voters that would be charged with monitoring the performance and procedures of the Registrar of Voters.

1. *Board of Supervisors*
Initial Response (2013): The recommendation requires further analysis. At its meeting on October 22, 2013 the Board will discuss the establishment of an advisory body however it is important to note that the body will be charged with making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors -the delegation of oversight responsibilities cannot be abdicated under current law.
Updated response (2018): See IV.A.1 updated response above.

Recommendation No. 3 was: The Napa County Election Division publishes periodic interim election results in addition to the initial voting results on Election Day.

1. Recorder County Clerk
Initial response (2013): This recommendation requires further analysis. The

Registrar of Voters is conducting a survey of the 16 counties which use the same ballot tabulation and vote reporting system. The results of that survey will be reported to the Board of Supervisors at a study session on October 22, 2013. Following that session, the Registrar of Voters will review the current policy on not releasing interim results between the election night result and the final certified result.

Updated response (2017): 11-7-2017 Following an October 22, 2013 Study Session with the Napa County Board of Supervisors, the Election Division began releasing interim election reports beginning with the June 3, 2014 Statewide Primary Election:

June 3, 2014:
Election Night Reports
6/11/2014 1st Interim Report
6/16/2014 Final Certified

November 4, 2014:
Election Night Reports
11/14/2014 1st Interim Report
11/19/2014 Final Certified

June 7, 2016:
Election Night Reports
6/14/2016 1st Interim Report
6/23/2016 2nd Interim Report
6/29/2016 Final Certified

November 8, 2016:
Election Night Reports
11/16/2016 1st Interim Report
11/23/2016 2nd Interim Report
11/30/2016 Final Certified

Napa County is a pilot project for the Voter's Choice Act (VCA) for the June 5, 2018 Primary Election which will bring several changes for Napa County voters including an impact on how interim election reports are released. The major changes are that all voters will receive vote by mail ballots; polling places will be replaced by vote centers; eligible citizens will be able to register to vote up to and including Election Day. With vote centers replacing polling places, there will not be a delivery of polling place ballots on Election Day after the close of polls at 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday June 5, 2018. Thus, there will only be a release of results from vote by mail ballots processed through noon Saturday June 2 at 8:01 p.m. on Election Night. This first release of results usually accounts for approximately 50% of all ballots that will be cast in the election.

The Election Division will then begin releasing a series of interim results over the days following the election as vote center and vote by mail ballots received and processed after noon on Saturday June 2 are counted. We expect the rolling release of results to continue through final certification of the results which must be within 30 days of Election Day, i.e. by July 5, 2018. We expect to complete our certification before that deadline as in past years.

C. Recommendation No. 7 was: The Registrar of Voters publish the voter information pamphlet on the Election Division website.

1. Registrar of Voters

Initial Response (2013): The recommendation requires further an analysis. The

Registrar of Voters has been reviewing the publication of voter information pamphlet on the election division website in a manner so that each voter can access the correct voter information pamphlet in the language they have requested. We will survey those counties that do publish their sample ballot pamphlets to see how many voters access the pamphlet on those websites. We will make a final decision on this recommendation prior to December 1, 2013.
Updated response (2017):
The Napa County Election Division will publish sample ballot material for the June 5, 2018 Primary Election on our website approximately 45 days prior to the election, i.e. April 23, 2018. The actual publication date will depend on receipt of the sample ballot material from our typesetter.

D. Recommendation No. 9 was: Napa County Board of Supervisors establishes an election office facility with more space for storing and processing ballots and easier access for the public.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2013): The recommendation requires further analysis. The County's facility master plan envisions a consolidation of a number of general government functions including the Election Division. The Board of Supervisors has prioritized the various components of the master plan placing the jail and the Health & Human Services Agency campus first with other space considerations taken into account as funding and conditions become available.
Updated response (2017): See IV.A.1 updated response above.

2. Recorder – County Clerk
Initial Response (2013): This recommendation requires further analysis. The Registrar of Voters is conducting a survey of the 16 counties which use the same ballot tabulation and vote reporting system. The results of that survey will be reported to the Board of Supervisors at a study session on October 22, 2013. Following that session, the Registrar of Voters will review the current policy on not releasing interim results between the election night result and the final certified result.
A. **Updated Response (2017)**: See IV.A.1 updated response above.

3. Recorder – County Clerk

Initial Response (2013): The recommendation requires further analysis. The Registrar of Voters has been reviewing the publication of the voter information pamphlet on the election division website in a manner so that each voter can access the correct voter information pamphlet in the language they have requested. We will survey those counties that do publish their sample ballot pamphlets to see how many voters access the pamphlet on those websites. We will make a final decision on this recommendation prior to December 1, 2013.
Updated Response: None

V. Napa County Sheriff Corner Services Operations

A. Recommendation No. 1 was: The Coroner's Division immediately begin a program of entering data from the old system of typewritten index cards into the current computerized system.

1. *Sheriff's Department*

Initial Response (2013): I agree with this recommendation. The Coroners Division will develop a process to enter older cases into the database and eliminate the step of typing an index card. The index card system has been maintained strictly as a back-up should the computerized database fail. All data has been entered into the database for the past several years.

Updated response (2017): The Sheriff's Office agreed with the response and the Coroners Division no longer maintains a typewritten index card system. All information is maintained by a computerized database.

4. Recommendation R2 was: The NSO seek assistance, as appropriate, from the BOS, the Napa County Executive Office. and/or County Counsel to secure an agreement with a third-party credit/debit card merchant service to allow the NSO to accept credit and debit cards for payment of fees and services and pass related costs to the customer.

1. Sheriff's Department

Initial response (2013): I agree with this finding. The NSO will begin the process immediately with the Napa County Executive Office to secure an agreement with a third party credit/debit service to allow the NSO to accept credit and debit cards for payment of fees and services.

Updated response (2017): The Napa Sheriff's Office now accepts credit and debit cards for payment of fees and services.

5. Recommendation R3 was: The NSO. County IT and the NSO budget analyst work together to develop a cost benefit analysis for a secure server with the state-of-the-art software to store, index, manage and retrieve crime scene photographs that are now routinely stored on CDs.

1. Sheriff's Department

Initial response (2013): I agree with this finding. We recognize that the CD storage system is not ideal, but it does provide a secure and stable storage system for photograph files for the time being. We are currently researching various systems and vendors providing digital evidence storage, and are already using server-based storage for some video evidence: This is-a growing field with technology improving and changing daily almost a daily basis. We are striving to find a long-term, sustainable and secure system with back-up(s) that will provide a method of storing this type of evidence in a manner compliant with the Evidence Code.

Updated response (2017): The Napa Sheriff's Office now stores all digital media (crime scene photos and videos) on a secure server which is in compliant with the Evidence Code.

6. Recommendation No. 4 was: The NSO develop full documentation of policy and procedures for the collection and preservation of DNA evidence. This documentation should include the currently used standard operation procedures for handling DNA evidence.

1. Sheriff's Department

Initial response (2013): I agree with this finding. It has always been the policy of Department Crime Lab to use the most current and up to date procedures for the collection and preservation of DNA evidence. A formal Lab Policy Manual is currently being prepared which will include recommended procedures recommended by California DOJ and the Journal of Forensic Identification for handling DNA evidence.

Updated response (2017): The Napa Sheriff's Office has developed and implemented policies and procedures for the collection and preservation of DNA evidence. Additionally, employees receive continued training in the proper collection and processing of DNA evidence**.**

7. Recommendation No. 5 was: That no later than December 31, 2013, the NSO and District Attorney's office develop a joint policy and procedure which effectively obtains and enforces proper court orders for appropriate destruction of evidence in NSO custody in cases either fully adjudicated, dismissed or beyond the statute of limitations.

1. District Attorney

Initial response (2013): I agree to implement this recommendation this year. Our office has already created a form for all law enforcement agencies to request destruction. Once the form is received by our office, our Chief Deputy District Attorney reviews and, as appropriate, signs the form and requests a court order to proceed with evidence destruction. This order and process will be integrated into CJNET, the county's case management system accessible by both NSO and the District Attorney. We will develop a joint policy and procedure within this framework by December 31, 2013 as requested.

Updated response (2017): Prior to December 31. 2013. the Napa County District Attorney's Office improved the manual process by which NSO was assisted with evidence destruction. Additionally, the DA's Office agreed to integrate an automated evidence management module into the CJNET case management system. We have spent significant time working with NSO to improve our analogue tracking system with our intent to have this integrated into our computerized case tracking system by January 1, 2014 While the manual process is significantly improved, unfortunately other priorities (such as adding Napa County Department of Corrections and Napa County Probation to the system) of the coding team (who work for a different County Department) responsible for implementation of the evidence module delayed the

evidence component from being incorporated as intended Due to finite recourses such as funds and staffing. the automated process remains a work in progress. While integration of the evidence system remains an important priority, adding the Juvenile Justice component to CJNET has a higher priority (due to the legacy system nature of the software). At this time we are optimistic that the digital evidence module may be incorporated into CJNET by December 31. 2018.

2. Sheriff's Department

Initial response (2013): I agree with this finding. The backlog of destruction orders awaiting approval witnessed by the members of the Grand Jury during their investigation has been cleared and the items are being processed out of the Property/Evidence room at this time. Working with the District Attorney's office, we have gone to a more stream-lined process of smaller orders over time instead of large orders a few times a year. The current turn- around time for an order is 2 to 3 weeks. The District Attorney's office is working on a process that should dramatically reduce the need for processing these orders through their office. The NSO will continue to work with the District Attorney's office to develop a procedure by December 31, 2013.

Updated response (2017): The Sheriff's Office, along with the District Attorney's Office has implemented this recommendation.

APPENDIX B
2013-2014 REPORT RESPONSES

I. NCTPA Vine: Management & Ridership for the Future

A. Recommendation No. 3: The Grand Jury recommends the BOD to explore ways to improve NCTPA management retention such as merit pay or other incentives, and put in place for the coming fiscal year.

1. NCTPA
Initial response (2014): This recommendation requires further analysis. The NCTPA Board appreciates the Grand Jury's suggestion and will take it under advisement. It should be noted, however, that the agency has been existence since 1998 and has only had four executive directors in its 16 year history; and two of them retired from NCTPA.
Updated response (2018): In response to your specific inquiry, you refer to Recommendation No. 3 of the above-mentioned report which "recommends that the BOD to explore ways to improve NCTPA management retention such as merit pay or other incentives and put in place for the coming fiscal year." In our response we underscored the managerial stability of the agency by noting that the agency had been in existence since 1998 and that there were only four executive directors in the agency's 16-year history. Two of the executive directors retired from the agency, one resigned and the fourth executive director is still with the agency. Nevertheless, the agency has made several changes that will help retain and advance staff and draw new employee talent to the agency. First, in 2017 two "director" level management classifications were added and two internal employees were promoted into the new positions overseeing Planning, Projects, and Programs and Accounting, Policy, and Administration. Second, the executive director has informed the chair and vice chair that staff is working on improving employee medical retirement benefits. Third, I have discussed with the Chair and the Vice Chair my concern about being able to fill the engineering manager position at its current salary level. The position will be open this fall when the current engineering manager retires. The position has been posted with an open salary. It should be noted that the latter two items have not yet been approved by the board, but they are scheduled to be heard by the Board this spring or early summer.

B. Recommendation No. 8 was: NCTPA should implement within the current fiscal year a coordinated VINE marketing strategy with each Napa County jurisdiction so that NCTPA's transit services are readily available and consistently communicated across all public, community and visitor websites.

1. NCTPA
Initial response (2014): This recommendation will be implemented within 90 days. NCTPA will work with the jurisdictions and visitor sites and request that information about the VINE and its ancillary services are consistently communicated. It should be noted that NCTPA has no authority to demand that Napa's jurisdictions or its visitor sites comply with this request.

Updated response (2018): Your second request refers to Recommendation No. 8 of the above-mentioned report which recommends implementation of "a coordinated VINE marketing strategy with each Napa County jurisdiction so that NCTPA's transit services are readily available and consistently communicated across all public, community and visitor websites." At the time, NVTA staff contacted each of the jurisdictions and requested that they make corrections. A recent scan of each of the 6 jurisdictions' sites indicate that some of the jurisdictions maintain a link to NVTA and profile the Vine system but others do not. We sent the jurisdictions a request to add the Vine to the appropriate pages just prior to sending this letter. Since the report was originally published, the agency also created a marketing and communications position. That position is currently open, but we will make sure that the staff member is on top of coordinating marketing efforts with the jurisdictions when the position is filled.

II. Veteran's Service and Outreach

A. Recommendation No. 1 was: The Napa CVSO should set a goal of scheduling a meeting with a veteran within a two-week period.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial Response (2014): The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. With the addition of a new Veterans Representative staff person, the CVSO anticipates being able to reach this goal within one year (no later than April 2015).
Updated response (2017): This recommendation has been implemented. The Napa CVSO now sees veterans within two weeks of a request for a meeting unless a later date is requested. This has been the case since the beginning of 2015. The Veterans Representative position became vacant in August 2017 which will result in a temporary potential of a longer waiting period until the position is filled and the new Veterans Representative is trained.

B. Recommendation No. 2 was: The Napa CVSO should develop an outreach program that ensures that veterans in Napa County are fully aware of its services, including that it will make home visits.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial Response (2014): The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The VSO had previously done only limited outreach, due to low staffing levels. With the new Veterans Representative hired, the VSO will more frequently attend events and arrange presentations throughout Napa Valley. In addition to outreach, the VSO anticipates being more available to perform home visits as the Veterans Representative takes on an increasing workload over the next year.
Updated response (2017): This recommendation has been implemented. The Napa CVSO regularly conducts outreach including a monthly Vet Connect program with a dozen local agencies providing assistance to veterans. Attendance has average averaged about eight veterans per month. The Napa CVSO opened a

satellite office in Calistoga in 2016 but discontinued the program in August 2017 due to lack of attendance. The Napa CVSO continues to provide local meetings with veterans as requested in the upper Napa Valley and in American Canyon. The Napa CVSO also conducts a monthly orientation to veterans' benefits with an average attendance of 10 veterans and dependents. The Napa CVSO has a monthly column in the Napa Register ("Vets 2 Vets") and related area on-line newspapers discussing veterans' benefits and issues. The Napa CVSO regularly conducts home visits to assist veterans and their surviving spouses with information, referral and development of VA claims for benefits.

C. Recommendation No. 3 was: The Napa CVSO should report annually, in writing, to the Board of Supervisors on the effectiveness of its outreach programs, including not just what it has done but what in its assessment should be done.

1. Board of Supervisors

Initial response (2104): The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. The VSO will:

- Track outreach activities and claims activity starting with Fiscal Year 2014-15;
- Assess effectiveness and seek opportunities to increase outreach; and
- Report these finding to the Board of Supervisors annually beginning in November 2015 (to coincide with Veterans Day).

Updated response (2017): The recommendation is in progress. The Napa CVSO provides an annual report of activities. A detailed report with assessment was last provided in November 2015 and is in preparation for 2017.

C. Recommendation No. 4 was: Napa County should implement changes to its website that facilitate the finding of veteran services on its website.

1. Board of Supervisors

Initial Response (2014): This recommendation requires further analysis. Using the search feature on the County of Napa's website will take users directly to Veterans Services information and contacts. However, there may be additional changes to information or links on the website that would assist users. The County' s website is under continual review for possible improvements. The Webmaster and CVSO staff will review the information and evaluate whether additional changes should be made.

Updated response (2017): The recommendation is in progress. The Napa CVSO provides an annual report of activities. A detailed report with assessment was last provided in November 2015 and is in preparation for 2017.

2. Recommendation No 5 was: The Napa CVSO should make available a Veteran Identification Card for Napa County veterans to enable veterans to receive additional benefits from Napa County businesses with special benefits for veterans.

1. Board of Supervisors

Initial Response (2014): The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. Equipment to make Veteran

Identification cards has been ordered and received, and staff is currently designing the identification card. Staff is also communicating with the local Chamber of Commerce to identify the most effective way to encourage businesses to offer veteran benefits and communicate the availability of these benefits to patrons with a Veteran ID card or other military identification. Staff expect to start advertising the availability of these cards no later than September 2014, with a "soft roll out" starting in July for veterans who are already at our office for other services.
Updated response: None

III. Forming Partners with the Community Through Youth Sports

A. Recommendation No. 1 was: That the Superintendent of the NVUSD and the City of Napa Parks and Recreation Department re-establish within the next six months a new Joint Use Agreement for Maintenance of School Sports Fields for School and Community use.

1. City Manager
Initial response (2014): The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented within the time frame recommended. The City of Napa Parks and Recreation Department and NVUSD have met and initiated discussions regarding the development of a new Joint Use Agreement.
Updated response (2017): The City of Napa and NVUSD entered into a two-year agreement on July 21, 2015 to provide for maintenance of school sports fields to ensure continued community use. This agreement was intended to serve as a bridge while the NVUSD and the City of Napa developed a broader based, comprehensive agreement to address the City of Napa's and community's access to all the District facilities; including sports fields, swimming pools, gymnasiums, tennis courts, classrooms and other related facilities. Currently, the City of Napa and the NVUSD are actively working together to finalize terms and conditions of the comprehensive Joint Use Agreement with plans for adoption no later than July 2018.

B. Recommendation No. 14 was: That the City of Napa and the NVUSD continue to work in collaboration in the development of more playing fields on city-owned land for community use such as Kennedy Park.

1. City Manager
Initial response (2014): The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The City of Napa's Parks and Facilities Master Plan, adopted February 16, 2010 recommended new recreational sports fields focused on soccer, junior baseball and junior softball with additional space for casual play. The plan highlights the important collaboration between the City of Napa and the NVUSD to provide a mix of casual, individual and organized activities across the city. The next step toward meeting the Plan's recommendations and specifically the Grand Jury's recommendation R 14 will be accomplished with the development of a Master Plan for Kennedy Park. The City is in the process of

contracting with a firm that will develop the Master Plan. This Master Plan will be completed within the next seven months.

Updated response (2017): The Master Plan for Kennedy Park was completed and subsequently accepted by the Napa City Council on December 15, 2015. The Plan was developed with extensive community input and included a representative of the NVUSD staff on the planning team. The plan includes two additional softball fields, a baseball field in a stadium setting, batting cages, multi-purpose sports fields suitable for accommodating soccer, football, rugby, lacrosse and cricket activities. Additionally, the Plan calls for a variety of other facilities including a 30,000-square foot community center with a gymnasium and classrooms, picnic areas, playgrounds, trails and other site amenities that will encourage community gathering.

APPENDIX C
2014-2015 REPORT RESPONSES

I. Health and Human Services Agency Vast and Visionary

A. Recommendation No. 2 was: By December 31, 2015, HHSA to review the application process for obtaining the MSA grant, and redesign the process for less burdensome completion and administration.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2015): The recommendation requires further analysis. The Board agrees to have the process evaluated by an outside consultant to suggest improvements for the next funding cycle by December 31, 2015. This evaluation may or may not result in a redesign of the process.
Updated Response (2017): Regarding Recommendation No. 2, the Board did hire a consultant who evaluated the process, which did result in a redesign of the MSA grant process effective with the Fiscal Year 2016-17 grant cycle. Regarding Recommendation Nos. 5, 6, and 9, the Board and HHSA have long recognized the need for and utility of the ability to combine data sources to be able to get an all-inclusive view of individuals' needs and service utilization and of the community's needs and service utilization. In FY 2016-17, the Board approved HHSA funding to create a data warehouse that will give the Agency the ability to look at data across divisions within HHSA. This is a large undertaking that will take several years to complete. Once completed, it will be a tool to look at service needs and usage individually and collectively and will help to quantify demographics and geographic needs. The Live Health Napa County initiative, for which HHSA provides backbone support, has begun the process of mapping health and social indicators.

B. Recommendation No. 5 was: By December 31, 2015, HHSA to establish a mechanism for measuring services located Up Valley more often than or more specifically than "as needed."

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2015): The recommendation requires further analysis. Currently, there are several different statewide data systems that collect information on clients based on the type of services received. These data systems do not warehouse the data in a common location. While the project scope is too large to commit to a December 31, 2015 completion, HHSA has recognized the need for, and plans to allocate resources in Fiscal Year 2015-2016 to develop, refine and report on data sources to better target programs and services. As mentioned previously, the work accomplished through LHNC will also be useful in this regard.
Many services that HHSA provides are appropriately offered on an "as needed" basis in homes, schools, hospitals and other sites. "As needed" is a common specification for health and human service providers and allows for flexibility

based on individual needs. These services, such as mental health, public health, Public Guardian, Adult Protective Services, In Home Supportive Services, veterans services, child welfare, adoptions, and emergency preparedness trainings are available countywide.

In an attempt to evaluate and improve Up Valley services, the Agency worked with the mayor of Calistoga and the Calistoga Family Center in December 2013. Currently, mental health, Women Infants and Children (WIC), Medi-Cal and CalFresh applications assistance, Adult Protective Services, Public Health Medical Therapy Program, school based alcohol and drug prevention and early intervention programs, indigent medical care and employment, education and training services to youth enrolled in Workforce Investment Act (WIA) services are offered in Calistoga at the Up Valley Family Center, schools, Calistoga Clinic and in homes.

Similarly, services offered at various locations in St. Helena include WIC, mental health, Adult Protective Services, public health, indigent medical care and WIA education and training programs.

Updated Response: None

C. Recommendation No. 6 was: By December 31, 2015, HHSA to review case reporting information within HHSA Divisions to ascertain the frequency and actual locations where Up Valley services are reportedly being provided.

1. Board of Supervisors

Initial response (2015): The recommendation requires further analysis. As mentioned previously, HHSA plans to allocate resources to develop, refine and report on data sources to better target programs and services. Some of this work will be accomplished through LHNC and its Data Workgroup.

Updated Response: None

D. Recommendation No. 8 was: HHSA to institute a reporting requirement regarding demographic locations of service for all HHSA Divisions and include in future nonprofit contracts.

1. Board of Supervisors

Initial response (2015): The recommendation requires further analysis. HHSA believes the Grand Jury is referring to a reporting of "geographic locations of services". HHSA will implement the recommendation on a case by case basis where it makes sense to do so. Based on the population health work, HHSA has begun data mapping different neighborhoods throughout Napa County. By using a geographic information system (GIS), a wide variety of data sets have been mapped, including demographic information and other pertinent health and social indicators.

Updated response: None

II. Management of Groundwater & Recycled Water

A. Recommendation No. 2 was: By June 30, 2016, the Napa County Public Works Department to require major groundwater users to meter and report their water usage on a quarterly basis to ensure all well owners are following prescribed usage rates.

1. Board of Supervisors

Initial response (2015): The recommendation requires further analysis. This recommendation will be considered in the context of the Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan, due to the State between June 30, 2016 and January 1, 2017. Development of the plan will include significant outreach to and input from the public. The Board of Supervisors will consider and determine the necessary amount of metering and reporting in the context of this public discussion.

Updated response (2017): The recommendations were considered in the preparation of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan-alternative (Plan), which was submitted to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR); it is expected DWR will complete its review of the Plan expected by early to mid-2018. The County's groundwater monitoring program is outlined in the Plan, which addresses the monitoring needs to insure long-term groundwater sustainability. The Plan and monitoring program were developed with an extensive public outreach process. Napa County also prepares a Comprehensive Groundwater Monitoring Program Annual Report, which provides a review and update of the program, and is presented to the Board of Supervisors and submitted to the State/DWR.

The Planning, Building and Environmental Services (PBES) Department develops project specific recommendations for groundwater monitoring based upon the Water Availability Analysis(WAA) and CEQA environmental review of a project. PBES also recently updated its Conditions of Approval, which require well monitoring data quarterly and volume of water withdrawn monthly if the Director determines that substantial evidence indicates water usage is affecting or would potentially affect groundwater supplies or nearby wells. In addition, the well monitoring data will be provided to the County if the Director of Public Works determines it could be useful in supporting the County's groundwater monitoring program.

Napa County also has a comprehensive groundwater outreach program to encourage on-going public participation, education, and the sustainability of our groundwater resources. The following websites provide additional information:

- The Watershed Information and Conservation Council (WICC) has taken on the role of groundwater outreach, at BOS direction, and has conducted many public meetings on the subject. The WICC's groundwater information web-portal contains up to date reports, interactive maps and other groundwater and watershed resources. littps://vvww.napawatersheds.or0uoundwater
- A newly revised groundwater program brochure can be found on the County website and on the WICC website.
- A Napa County Well Owners Guide was published in July 2017: https://www.napawatersheds.org/documents/view/8773 Well Owners Guide Final.pdf.

- A video was published in July 2017 that overviews our groundwater monitoring program and its objectives: haps://voutu.be/yyGHAWvegK0
- A video was published in August 2016 that promotes and describes the County's groundwater self-monitoring program, "DIY Groundwater Monitoring": baps://voutu.beipqM2-UQQF2Q
- A DIY Monitoring webpage was created with information, links and resources that promote and explain the free program. A new targeted Groundwater News List Serve was created in March 2016 and has over 110 subscribers.

B. Recommendation No. 3 was: By June 30, 2016, the Napa County Public Works Department to adopt policies to encourage all other groundwater users to meter and monitor their well water usage.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2015): The recommendation requires further analysis. This recommendation will be considered in the context of the Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan, due to the State between June 30, 2016 and January 1, 2017. Development of the plan will include significant outreach to and input from the public. The Board of Supervisors will consider and determine the necessary amount of metering and reporting in the context of this public discussion.
Updated response: None

III. Napa County Fire Department Career and Volunteer Firefighters

A. Recommendation No. 1 was: By September 1, 2015, the Fire Service Advisory Committee to establish a regular meeting schedule, circulate the meeting minutes and update the FSAC website within 10 days of every meeting, in order to inform the community and firefighter ranks of scheduled meetings and agendas. In addition, the minutes for each FSAC meeting are to be circulated within 10 days of each meeting to all the members of the Napa County Fire ranks to keep them informed of the issues and the efforts to address them.

1. Napa County Fire Chief
Initial response (2015): This recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented by September 1, 2015. The Fire Services Advisory Committee adopts a meeting schedule at the first meeting of each calendar year. The Fire Services Advisory committee meets the second Thursday of the odd months (January, March, May, July, September, and November) at l:OOpm in the Napa County Board of Supervisors Chambers located at 1195 Third Street in Napa. Special meetings may also be called by the Chair of the committee. Staff is completing the upload by the end of August of all prior meeting agendas, minutes and documents which will be located on the Fire Services Advisory Committee link by accessing: http://www.countyofnapa.org/CountyFire/
Any volunteer member or interested community member may be added to the

email distribution list by contacting Stacie McCambridge at stade.mccambridge@countyofnapa.org. Agendas and minutes are sent to each Volunteer Fire Chief. Per the current communication protocol, it is the responsibility of the Volunteer Fire Chiefs to forward the agenda and minutes to their company members.
Updated response: None

2. Napa County Executive Office
Initial response (2015): The Napa County Executive Office concurs with the response of the Napa County Fire Chief.
Updated response: None

3. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2015): The Board of Supervisors concurs with the response of the Napa County Fire Chief.
Updated response (2017): Both recommendations [No. 1 and No. 3] were completed by the dates indicated. The Fire Service Advisory Committee continues to meet regularly with one representative from the Board of Supervisors appointed to it each year. Meeting minutes are circulated and FSAC website is update within 10 working days of every meeting. Minutes are circulated to all members of the Napa County Fire ranks. A survey was conducted of the volunteer firefighters and training issues were resolved based on responses received.

IV. Napa County Wineries

A. Recommendation No. 1 was: By January 1, 2016, the Planning Department to increase the number of yearly winery code enforcement audits from the current rate of 20 audits per year so that every winery would be audited at least every five years or at such intervals that the Planning Commissioners or County Supervisors deem to be appropriate.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2015): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this recommendation. At their meeting on March 3, 2015, the Board directed staff to bring back recommendations on expanding the wine audit. The Agricultural Protection Advisory Committee (APAC) is expected to make its tentative recommendation on the structure of the wine audit (including expansion of the audit) on July 27, 2015. The APAC recommendations will be forwarded to the Planning Commission on September 2, 2015. The Commission, in tum, will forward their recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on November 24, 2015.
NOTE: The Grand Jury was advised that yearly winery code enforcement audits were suspended in 2016.
Updated response (2017): Board of Supervisors: The Board of Supervisors has held several public workshops over the past several years regarding the issue of code enforcement, and the annual winery audit. Workshops were held on March 3, 2015;

August 11, 2015; September 13, 2016; February 7, 2017; August 27, 2017; and September 11, 2017. This is in addition to the Board of Supervisors discussions on the recommendations of the Agricultural Protection Advisory Committee on December 8, 2015; January 5, 2016; and March 1, 2016, which included consideration of winery code compliance. As a result of these discussions, the Board gave the following tentative direction to staff:

- Require that all wineries within the unincorporated area annually report the following information to the PBES Director: (A) number of gallons of wine produced in the previous calendar year; and (B) number of gallons crushed and juiced in the previous year from grapes that that were grown in Napa County.
- Evaluate all production reporting pursuant to the County Winery Production Process, including the use of a rolling three-year average. For the first year of reporting only, wineries will submit data for the previous three years to determine current compliance with production requirements. Production data will be required annually thereafter.
- Acknowledge that the Winery Production Process is not equally applicable to all winery operations. Those wineries that wish to submit alternative calculations may submit an amended report, which explains the methodology proposed to calculate a winery's production and/or grape source percentage.
- Require that all wineries within the unincorporated area annually report the following information to the PBES Director: (A) number of gallons of wine produced in the previous calendar year; and (B) number of gallons crushed and juiced in the previous year from grapes that that were grown in Napa County. Those pre-WDO wineries that do not have to comply with the 75% Napa County grape source requirement would not be required to annually submit sourcing data. However, such wineries must provide annual production level reports in order to verify that they are staying within those pre-WDO established production levels.
- Require scanned Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) documents to be submitted as attachments to verify the information submitted to the County. Al! information submitted to the County will be treated as proprietary and will be maintained in a secure database with limited access. Once reporting has been reviewed by staff to verify compliance, production and grape source data will be destroyed, except when used as part of an ongoing violation investigation.
- Beginning in 2018, require annual reporting for production and grape crush activities conducted in calendar year 2017.
- Conduct an inspection and full evaluation of all entitlement requirements and conditions of approval, when the reporting data submitted to the County indicates that a winery is in violation of either their production limit and/or their grape sourcing requirement. Staff will send a Notice of Violation to the owner, which will clearly list all violations and how compliance can be achieved.
- Create the software and Internet interface necessary to minimize the burden for wineries to report their annual data to the County electronically. In

addition, a database/spreadsheet will be developed to evaluate the production data in accordance with the County Winery Production Process. The software programs shall be designed to ensure that all data and analysis obtained through annual winery reporting is fully secured with restricted staff access. Staff will work with Information Technology Services (ITS) to develop the program. If additional expertise is required, ITS may hire a consultant to assist with the development of the software program. Budgets may be adjusted as necessary to accommodate the additional expenditure, following approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Final confirmation of staff direction regarding the winery audit will be considered by the Board of Supervisors early in 2018.

As noted above, the Board of Supervisors has directed staff to focus future winery audits on production and grape sourcing. Both of those reports are proprietary and protected a confidential under State and Federal law. As such, individual reporting information cannot be disclosed to the public. The Frequently Asked Questions were posted on line in August of 2015. They can be found at the bottom of this page: http://www.countyofnapa.org/Pages/DepamrtmentContent.aspx?1d=4294986786

With regard to inspection reports of non-compliant use permits, staff will continue to make copies of the Notices of Violation available to the public. All other details related to any violation is part of the ongoing violation investigation and are not available to the public.

The Board of Supervisors provided direction to staff on March 1, 2016. The Board determined that the WDO as adopted provides an appropriate framework for processing winery applications and did not direct that any changes be made to the ordinance. It directed staff to prepare guidelines concerning variances, residential development, outdoor hospitality, locational criteria, and production comparison charts, but did not direct that any ordinance amendments be made to the WDO.

B. Recommendation No. 3 was: By January 1, 2016, the Planning Department to make the inspection reports of non-compliant wineries more transparent to the public in much the same fashion as health code violations of restaurants are reported.

1. Board of Supervisors

Initial response (2015): The Board of Supervisors partially agrees with this recommendation. More transparency in the code enforcement process would allow both residents and visitors to know which wineries are in compliance and which are not, as well as the nature of the violations. However not all information can be made publicly available. For instance, it is County Counsel's opinion that the production, crush, and grape sourcing data provided by individual winery operators **in** forms submitted to the ATTB and California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) are proprietary under State and Federal law and may not be disclosed to the public. Similarly, although the

names of non-compliant wineries are not released as a part of the wine audit, staff does make copies of Notices of Violation available to the public upon request, which includes the name of the property owner where the alleged violation occurred. Any other details of cases where there are ongoing violation investigations would not be available to the public. The Board will take up the issue of transparency within the overall context of the wine audit recommendations being forwarded to it by the APAC and the Planning Commission.
Updated response: None

C. Recommendation No. 4 was: By June 30, 2016, the county Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commissioners to determine whether the Winery Definition Ordinance (WOO) as written provides the regulatory framework necessary to maintain a winery industry that is consistent with the Agriculture Preserve Ordinance.

1. Board of Supervisors:
Initial response (2015): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this recommendation. Due to growing concern regarding the rate, location, and intensity of winery development projects in the unincorporated area, the Board of Supervisors formed the APAC on March 17, 2015. The intent of the APAC was to make recommendations to the Planning Commission regarding revisions to the standards governing the development and expansion of wineries, operations, activities, and related matters. The APAC is required to report on its recommendations to the Planning Commission by September 2, 2015. The Planning Commission is then mandated to make its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors by November 10, 2015.
Updated response: None

D. Recommendation No. 5 was: By June 30, 2016, the Planning Commissioners to establish and publish a range of penalties and/or operating restrictions for non-compliance infractions of use permit requirements. Such action should encourage wineries to be more cognizant of the cost of non-compliance.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2015): The Board of Supervisors agrees with this recommendation. Staff is currently working on a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) hand-out, which would include information regarding the types of fines and penalties that may be assessed for non-compliance. The hand-out will be posted on-line and will be included in future compliance workshop presentations provided by staff to the wine industry and other interested members of the public.
Updated response: None

APPENDIX D
2015-2016 REPORT RESPONSES

I. Napa County Performance Measurements

A. Recommendation No. 1 was**:** Discontinue publication of the Performance Measurement Report in its current form. If the Board of Supervisors finds the activity tracking and/or division overviews useful, produce them in a more condensed and efficient way. Use the website to do so whenever possible.

1. County Chief Executive Officer
Initial response (2013): Recommendation will be implemented. Effective this fiscal year, the PMR will no longer be produced. In the future, staff will be developing performance measures that align with the strategic goals developed by the Board of Supervisors at their next Strategic Planning retreat. Rather than require specific number of measures, direction to departments will be to develop Performance Measures that measure progress toward the goals that the Board of Supervisors wants to achieve.
Updated response: None

2. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2016)*:* Recommendation No. 1 will be implemented.
Updated response (2017): Recommendation No. 1 was implemented.

B. Recommendation No. 2 was: Post key activity levels ("Community Indicators") on the county website annually, or more frequently if data are available, and no later than 60 days following the end of the period being report.

1. Board of Supervisors
Initial response (2016): Recommendation No. 2 may be implemented in the future.
Updated response (2017): Recommendation No. 2 continues to be a possibility. The Board has not established new Strategic Goals, so no performance measures likewise have been developed for them. When those two actions occur, Community Indicators could be included**.**

2. County Chief Executive Officer
Initial response (2013): The Recommendation may be implemented in the future. Community Indicators are interesting, but not necessarily tied to the County's activities or performance. When staff develops performance measures to align with the Board's Strategic Goals, Community Indicators could be included in any publication or related website.
Updated response: None

II. Napa County Website Needs Improvement

A. Recommendation No 2 was: In response to finding F2, clean up the website and keep it current. Verify that information is accurate, up-to-date, and easy to find.

1. Board of Supervisors, County Executive Officer and Director of Library Services and Community Outreach

Initial response (2016): County Executive Officer and Director of Library Services and Community Outreach agree with this recommendation. It is incumbent on County departments to ensure content is up to date and accurate, as they are the departmental subject matter experts. The Webmaster is available to assist the subject matter experts in updating, analyzing, troubleshooting and cleaning up the department pages.

Updated response (2017): The Board of Supervisors identified the need to keep the website current and upgrade the website search function n, directing staff to make this a priority. Regarding Recommendation No. 4, the Board authorized the creation of a new position – Webmaster – and successfully recruited and filled the position in 2014. The Webmaster, together with department users meets regularly to share best practices and recommend changes to the website. In addition, the County conducted a Request for Proposal, purchased a new software system, with more advanced content management capabilities, and is implementing a new enhance and more intuitive website. A project point person from each County department has been engaged in the development of the new website.

NOTE: This response apparently applies to Recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

B. Recommendation No. 3 was: In response to finding F3, the county should upgrade the website search function.

1. Board of Supervisors, Count Executive Office and Director of Library Services and Community Outreach

Initial response (2016): The County Executive Officer and Chief Information Officer agree with this recommendation. In the RFP for a new CMS software system, the enhanced search tool is a key requirement. This RFP is planned to be posted during the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2016-17.

Updated response (2017): See II.A.1 Updated response.

C. Recommendation No. 4 was: Based on findings F4 and FS, the Jury recommends that the county form an expert user group to share best practices and new web functionality among divisions.

1. Board of Supervisors, County Executive Officer and Director of Library Services and Community Outreach

Initial response (2016): Outreach agree with this recommendation. A bi-weekly drop in session is available to content providers to work one on one with the Webmaster. The Webmaster meets with departments individually when needed and constantly is reviewing analytics, website chat data and seasonal/scheduled events to enhance the user's experience. Until further resources become available, a recommendation by department heads to the Director of Library Services and Community Outreach to realign the content providers into two distinct users groups will be implemented in Fiscal Year 2016-17. Representatives from each department will serve on the Users Experience (UX) group to ensure County-wide consistency in the user experience from department to department. A group of application experts will also be convened. The application experts will work closely with the department's UX contributor to assure that any changes made are done with the end user in mind.

Updated response (2017): See II.A.1 Updated response.

D. Recommendation No. 5 was: In response to findings F4 and F5, recognize the website's importance as a communication, productivity, and service tool, by providing sufficient up front resources *to* department/division managers and to Information Technology Services to be able to implement all systems enhancements that can be cost justified through improvements in productivity and customer service.

1. *Board of Supervisors, County Executive Officer and Chief Information Officer*

Initial response (2016): Agree with the recommendation. The Information Technology Services Division works on a bi-monthly basis with a countywide ITS Leadership Committee (made up of a representative set of County department directors) *to* prioritize projects *that* cross the entire County. This committee has already made the improvement of the County website a top priority. Funding is provided in the Fiscal Year 2016-17 budget for improvement and once the RFP responses have been reviewed the contract for a new CMS will be brought to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

Updated response (2017): See II.A.1 Updated response.

E. Recommendation No. 6 was: In response to Finding F5, the Board of Supervisors should challenge department and division managers to identify opportunities to improve productivity and/or customer service through the use of technology and provide the necessary up front resources to implement those opportunities that can be justified based on cost/benefit analyses.

1. *Board of Supervisors, County Executive Officer and Chief*

Information Officer
Initial response (2016): County Executive Officer and Chief Information Officer agree with this recommendation.
Updated response (2017): See II.A.1 Updated response.

III. Gang Activity in Napa County

A. Recommendation No. 2 was: Continue the Legacy Program at Vintage High School and use as a model for other high schools, in particular Napa High School and Valley Oaks High School.

1. City of Napa
Initial response (2016): The recommendation to continue the Legacy Program at Vintage High School and to use as a model for other high schools has been implemented by the Napa Police Department. The recommendation to use the Legacy Program as a model for other high schools, in particular Napa High School and Valley Oaks High School will require further analysis by the Napa Police Department in collaboration with NVUSD. The analysis to use the Legacy Program as a model for other high schools, in particular Napa High School and Valley Oaks High School will include a review of staffing, fiscal, and needs considerations. This analysis will be completed by September 30, 2016.

As noted in the Report, the Legacy Program at Vintage High School has shown great success. Vintage High School has not replaced AVID with Legacy. Enrollment in the AVID program has been increasing annually and has doubled since it began. Vintage High School attributes its student academic success and a sense of belonging to this increased AVID enrollment in partnership with the Legacy Youth Project that also builds academic success and student connections.

NVUSD will be expanding the Legacy Program to Silverado Middle School, Redwood Middle School and the sixth grade class at Napa Valley Language Academy for the 2016-17 school year.

Napa High School uses the AVID and LAYLA programs to build academic success and a sense of belonging for students. Due to funding restraints, we will be analyzing where we can expand the Legacy program after the 2016-17 school year.

Valley Oak will be implementing an advisory period next year to continue to strengthen its community. Valley Oak will continue to work with Napa and Vintage High Schools in a multi-year partnership with the Acosta Consulting Team to develop more culturally responsive curriculum. Napa High will be joining the training in 2016-17.
Updated response: None

IV. Facility Management

A. Recommendation No. 2 was: The County Board of Supervisors should direct

the County Executive Officer to compile a list of contracts for the maintenance of critical equipment and services and to institute a policy that RFPs for replacement contracts be distributed at least sixty days in advance of the expiration dates of such contracts. This policy should be in place by December 31, 2016. Any deviations from this policy should be approved by the County Executive Officer on a case by case basis.

1. Board of Supervisors

Initial response (2016): The Board of Supervisors disagrees with this recommendation. The recommendation will be implemented as follows: It is the responsibility of the Director of Public Works to establish departmental policies, procedures and goals. A policy will be in effect by May 31, 2016 which will provide for the timely contracting of maintenance services. The Public Works Department has compiled a list of contracts for the maintenance of critical equipment and services, including:

- Elevators: Awarded to KONE, Inc. on April 19, 2016
- Generators: Awarded to Peterson Power Systems, Inc. on April 19, 2016
- Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC): Awarded to Bell Products, Inc. on May 10, 2016
- Fire alarms and sprinklers: Expected award date is August 2, 2016

The Director of Public Works will annually review services provided beginning in June, 2017, will track changes to equipment that may impact the scope of work included in the contract, and will develop a timeline to ensure that a request for proposal process will be undertaken and a new contract is in place at least 60 days prior to expiration of the existing service contract.

Updated response (2017): The policy was not put into place by May 31, 2016, because the policy became unnecessary once the Public Works Department reviewed County policies regarding contracting for maintenance services. The Department did create list of contracts for the maintenance of critical equipment and services and continues to maintain a listing of contracted maintenance services, including contract budget amounts and expiration dates. Contracts are amended as needed pursuant to County policy when there are changes in the scope of work, which may include addition equipment or an increased scope of services. Expiration dates are reviewed annually, and the Department takes appropriate steps to conduct competitive procurement process as required by the County's Purchasing Policy.

V. <u>Is Napa County Financially Healthy</u>

A. Recommendation No. 1 was: As a result of F3, the Grand Jury recommends that Napa County institute a schedule in the Management's Discussion and Analysis Section of the CAFR that explains the negative variance from "Actual

Amount (Budgetary Basis)" and "Variance with Final Budget" in "Aid from other governments." The Grand Jury believes that including the information outlined below will clarify the actual situation for the average citizen.

Explanation of Aid from other governments

County Capital Project No.	County Project Description	Date Project Initiated	Total Amount Budgeted	Actual Amount Realized in Previous Years	Actual Amount Realized This Year	Amount Carried Forward
The amount carried forward for the total of all projects will be the same as the Negative Variance in Aid from other governments						

1.Auditor-Controller

Initial response (2016): The Auditor-Controller agrees with this recommendation and can appreciate providing the public with additional information to make the CAFR more useful. Due to restrictive requirements by Governmental Accounting Standards Board in respect to the content of the CAFR, staff will work with the County's external auditors to determine the best placement and display of the information.

Updated response (2018): Due to the highly regulated nature and specific requirements of the County's Comprehensive Annual Finance Report (CAFR), the Auditor-Controller will continue to determine what changes, if any, can be made to that report. (see attached letter dated October 30, 2017)