



**NAPA COUNTY GRAND
JURY 2018-2019**

FINAL REPORT

June 24, 2019

**REVIEW OF RESPONSES
TO THE 2017-2018 GRAND
JURY REPORTS**

Review of Responses to the 2017-2018 Grand Jury Reports

Published June 24, 2019

SUMMARY

California Penal Code §933 requires elected officials or agency heads to respond within 60 days of the issuance of a grand jury report that requires their response, and requires governing bodies to respond within 90 days.¹ Section 933.05 specifies the way the responding parties are to make their responses. These responses are transmitted to the presiding judge of the superior court.

The response to a FINDING must be provided in one of the two following formats:

- (1) The respondent agrees with the finding.
- (2) 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 for the reasons therefor.

The response to a RECOMMENDATION must be provided in one of the four following formats:

- (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* (emphasis added).

¹ Subdivision (c) provides 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, with an information copy sent to the board of supervisors, on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of that county officer or agency head and any agency or agencies which that officer or agency head supervises or controls.”

- (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* (emphasis added).
- (4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.

The 2017-2018 Napa County Grand Jury issued its Consolidated Final Report on June 30, 2018. The report consisted of ten individual final reports, one of which was a review of responses to the 2016-2017 Grand Jury reports. The Grand Jury made findings and recommendations in all its investigative reports. As part of the Grand Jury's commitment to continuity, to its processes, and to the law, the 2018-2019 Grand Jury has analyzed for statutory compliance all the required responses by elected officials, agency heads, and government agencies to all ten of the 2017-2018 Grand Jury's investigative reports.² The Grand Jury concludes that the vast majority of the responses did comply with the provisions of Section 933.05.

METHODOLOGY

The 2018-2019 Grand Jury evaluated responses to the 2017-2018 Grand Jury's recommendations to ensure compliance with §933 and §933.05 using the statutory criteria.

§933(c) Were responses received by the presiding judge within the legal time limits from the date of each final report's release (90 days for a public agency and 60 days for an elected official)?

§933.05(a) Did the response to a finding satisfy requirement of §933.05(a)?

- (1) The respondent agrees with the finding, or
- (2) 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 Those comments to last year's Continuity Report are not included.

§933.05(b) Did the response to a recommendation satisfy the requirement of §933.05(b)?

- (1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action; or
- (2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation; or
- (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; or
- (4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with explanation therefor.

DISCUSSION

Timelines

Details of 2017-2018 report publishing dates and the due dates of the responses are shown below in Table 1. All responses were provided within the specified time requirements.

Table 1

Review of Response to 2016-2017 GJ Reports

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Climate Action Plan – A Work in Progress

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
Board of Supervisors	6/18/18	9/18/18	8/14/18	N/A

Emergency Alerts Lacking During Fires

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
Board of Supervisors & Napa County Executive Officer	6/13/18	9/13/18	8/14/18	N/A

Juvenile Hall

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
Board of Supervisors	6/14/18	9/14/18	8/14/18	N/A

Financial Challenges Persist at NVUSD

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
NVUSD Superintendent and Board of Education	6/5/18	8/5/18	7/3/18	N/A

Implementation Review 2012-2016

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
Board of Supervisors	6/25/18	N/A	N/A	N/A

Measure H Watchdog Isn't Barking

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
NVUSD Superintendent and Board of Education	5/29/18	7/29/18	7/3/18	N/A

Napa County Farmworker Housing

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
Board of Supervisors	6/5/18	9/5/18	8/21/18	N/A

New Napa County Jail – Who's Paying for All of This?

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
Board of Supervisors	6/18/18	9/18/18	8/21/18	N/A

The Williamson Act—Subsidizing A Lifestyle

RESPONDENT	Date Published	Reply Due	Date Received	Update Request
Board of Supervisors, Director PBES, County Assessor	6/15/18	9/15/18	8/21/18	N/A

FINDINGS

F1. All responses to the 2017-2018 Napa County Grand Jury reports were completed and returned within the required timeframe.

F2. With two small exceptions, all the responses complied with §933 and §933.05 of the Penal Code:

a. No response was given to R3 of the Jail Report due to a mix-up in printing of the Consolidated Report.

b. The Board of Education misunderstood R2 of the Jury’s “Financial Challenges Persist at NVUSD” report and therefore failed to properly respond to the recommendation to increase district recruitment efforts.

REPORT: Climate Action Report

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
F1. The Planning Department, the agency responsible for bringing unincorporated Napa County a CAP, has generally been responsive to stakeholder groups' critiques of and suggestions for the Plan.	Napa County Director of Planning and Board of Supervisors	The Director of PBES and the BOS agree with this Finding.
F2. Ten years after adoption of Napa County's (updated) General Plan, the County is not in compliance with the General Plan's action item to prepare and adopt a CAP. While specifically the County's jurisdictional area, a CAP covering only the unincorporated areas of the County runs contrary to the comprehensive countywide approach favored by the County entities we interviewed and does not target GHG emissions reductions countywide.	Napa County Director of Planning and BOS	The Director of PBES and the BOS disagree with this Finding.
F3. There is no effort to coordinate Climate Action Plans between each of the jurisdictional communities within Napa County, which complicates the ability to identify, target, and reduce GHG emissions countywide in compliance with CEQA and BAAQMD regulations.	Napa County Director of Planning and BOS	The Director of PBES and the BOS disagree with this Finding.
F4. The County delayed its timeline for completion of the Plan because of the legal challenges that arose from the court ruling in the Sonoma County CAP lawsuit.	Napa County Director of Planning and BOS	The Director of PBES and the BOS agree with this Finding.
F5. The existing draft CAP does not take into consideration all sources of GHG emissions, most notably winery operations emissions.	Napa County Director of Planning and BOS	The Director of PBES and the BOS disagree with this Finding.
F6. Tools exist to measure winery GHG emissions enabling the County to include winery emissions reductions in its CAP.	Napa County Director of Planning and BOS	The Director of PBES and the BOS disagree with this Finding.

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
R1. The Planning Commission and the Planning Department continue its community outreach efforts with more public hearings for a 60-day period starting in January 2019	Napa County Director of PBES	This Recommendation will not be implemented.
R2. The CAP should consider including incentives starting in 2019 for carbon sequestration and woodland preservation and/or restoration projects under the guidance of the Planning Department.	Napa County Director of PBES and BOS	This Recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
R3. The Planning Department should consider including a proposal to quantify and mitigate winery	Napa County Director of Planning	This Recommendation has been implemented.

operations GHG emissions in the next CAP draft revision expected in January 2019.	and BOS	
R4. The County finalize and adopt the Napa County CAP by June 30, 2019, executing under the terms of the current amendment to the professional services agreement.	Napa County BOS	This Recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
R5. As follow-up upon completion of the CAP: In February, 2019 the Planning Department take the lead to bring all the County jurisdictions to the table to discuss ways to coordinate all the existing climate change mitigation efforts in the County geographical area. We suggest each jurisdiction furnish the department (as a clearinghouse) with emissions targets and reduction results for inclusion in countywide reporting.	Napa County Director of Planning	This Recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented by July, 2019.

REPORT: Emergency Alerts Lacking During Fires

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
F1. The fires that ravaged the North Bay during October 2017 were the most destructive in our history. Given the dry, ferocious winds, warm temperature, and our natural landscape, fires were predictable. Yet, there were no Nixle alerts preceding the fires.	Napa County Executive Officer	The Napa County Executive Officer agrees with this finding.
F2. Reliance on the Nixle cellular communications platform proved to be insufficient in warning Napa County residents in a timely and accurate way. A small percentage of residents, and very few visitors, were registered, and for those in the danger areas, it became moot as the cell infrastructure quickly became inoperable.	Napa County Executive Officer	The Napa County Executive Officer disagrees in part with this finding.
F3. The understaffed OES personnel was initially hampered by the fire's fury and location, causing delay in issuing the first Nixle alert.	Napa County Executive Officer	The Napa County Executive Officer disagrees with this finding.
F4. While Napa County OES, the Sheriff's Department, the Fire Department, and other public safety agencies' have developed versions of disaster action and hazard mitigation plans, information about emergency alerts and warnings from these agencies is lacking.	Napa County Executive Officer	The Napa County Executive Officer disagrees with this finding.
F5. Since power, Internet and cell towers were lost in many areas of Napa County, local radio station KVON provided a valuable platform for fire updates, evacuation locations, and critical information from public officials.	Napa County Executive Officer and BOS	The Napa County Executive Officer and the Board of Supervisors agree with this finding

F6. Proposed legislation in Sacramento is focused on numerous issues regarding disaster planning, including standardizing the approach to alerts since many disasters cross county lines.	Napa County Executive Officer and BOS	The Napa County Executive Officer and the Board of Supervisors agree with this finding
F7. The professional, coordinated and extraordinary response by Napa County OES, law enforcement and fire personnel, focused on saving lives and livestock, resulted in minimal loss of life despite what the Napa County Fire Chief described as a "once in a lifetime" fire.	Napa County Executive Officer and BOS	The Napa County Executive Officer and the Board of Supervisors agree with this finding

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
R1. Nixle or other alerts should always be sent out when there is an official red flag weather warning. The Napa County OES manager should investigate automating this capability in certain severe situations. Additionally, when this type of warning goes out, there should be notification sent to the Emergency Operations Center team to be prepared to turn up at the center in the event a fire or other disaster erupts. Both recommendations should be addressed by October 31, 2018.	Napa County Executive Officer	This recommendation has been implemented to the extent feasible.
R2. Napa County OES should lead the effort to order and deploy iPaws, which will enable use of Wireless Emergency Alerts, throughout Napa County now that the FCC has mandated that it be improved. Further, OES should develop a check list and detailed procedures to coordinate its use among the multiple alert platforms and operators by December 31, 2018.	Napa County Executive Officer	This recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The County IPAWS application was submitted on February 1, 2018 and was approved on July 13, 2018. Implementation, training and procedures development is underway and will be completed in fall 2018.
R3. Napa County should investigate or commission plans to deploy where feasible other alert and warning technologies such as mobile and fixed sirens, aerial drones, etc. to reach more residents in the event of power or cellular communications loss of service by March 31, 2019.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	This recommendation has been implemented.
R4. Increase staffing for Napa County Office of Emergency Services through grants or reallocation of budgets for emergency response planning, education and training, and to update and expand written alert and warning policies and procedures on the appropriate public websites by June 30, 2019.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation requires further analysis.
R5. Napa County should negotiate an agreement, in conjunction with the County's municipalities, to formally incorporate plans to utilize local radio station KVON into existing and future Disaster and Hazard mitigation plans in the County by June 30, 2019.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Napa County Executive Officer agrees with this recommendation. Discussions with the radio station are underway.

REPORT: Empty Beds – Juvenile Hall Review

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
F1. A multi-county consolidation of juvenile detention facilities is not optimal for serving Napa County youth.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.
F2. Present and future state initiatives may increase the utilization of the NCJH facilities.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.
F3. With the September 2018 implementation of CJNet in the Napa County Juvenile Hall, juvenile justice information technology will be fully integrated with the county's criminal justice system.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.
F4. NCJH programming aligns with the current juvenile justice philosophy of rehabilitation as opposed to incarceration.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
R1. No later than December 31, 2018, the BOS commission a study to determine whether excess Juvenile Hall physical capacity and staffing above near-term projected needs can be put to an alternate use. The results of the study should be published.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

REPORT: Financial Challenges Persist at NVUSD

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
F1. The FY2018/19 Budget Overview Presentation to the BOE in March 2018, indicates the likelihood of budget cuts for the next three years, but does not include a detailed, long-term plan for the future.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE agrees with this finding.
F2. Over the past 3 years of budget deficits, District emphasis has been on cutting costs, not growing revenue.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE agrees with this finding.
F3. The NVUSD has made significant strides to communicate budget issues as well as invite input from the community.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE agrees with this finding.

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
R1. By the end of calendar year 2018, the Napa Valley Unified School District should develop a detailed, five-year financial plan for the District.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE will not implement this recommendation but will continue reporting on a three-year cycle as required.
R2. In calendar year 2018, the District should develop and implement a comprehensive marketing program designed to increase attendance.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE misunderstood the Jury's recommendation to increase marketing efforts to add to enrollment. Instead the BOE answered with regard to decreasing truancy as a means to increase average daily attendance.
R3. In calendar year 2018, the Napa Valley Unified School District should develop a website link devoted to budget news and post regular quarterly updates.	NVUSD Board of Education	This Recommendation will be implemented.

REPORT: The Measure H Watchdog Isn't Barking

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
F1. The \$505 million Facilities Master Plan and budget, which were created in 2014, are outdated and underfunded, and do not reflect 2018 (or later) construction costs.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE agrees with this finding.
F2. Construction costs for many projects in the NVUSD Facilities Master Plan are running 30-500% higher than the District originally estimated.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE disagrees partially with the finding.
F3. The District's ability to fund all the projects in the Facilities Master Plan is at further risk because the State of California has not disbursed District-anticipated funds and has not guaranteed it will do so.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE agrees with this finding.
F4. The new \$346 million "Implementation Plan" introduced by NVUSD staff in May 2018, does not clearly identify which items from the original FMP are being reprioritized.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE disagrees with this finding.
F5. The Bylaws of the Bond Oversight Committee have not been followed as written with regard to the creation of subcommittees, the creation of staggered terms, and the frequency of meetings.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE agrees with the finding with regard to the creation of staggered terms and the creation of subcommittees. The BOE disagrees with the finding in regards to the frequency of meetings.
F6. Neither the NVUSD nor the citizens' Bond Oversight Committee are fully informing Napa County taxpayers on a timely basis of the status of Measure H bond expenditures or cost escalations.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE disagrees with this finding.
F7. By not issuing the required annual report nor communicating with the public in any way during its first 18 months, the Bond Oversight Committee has not lived up to its obligations to the taxpayers of Napa County.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE disagrees with this finding.

F8. There is a high likelihood that Napa County taxpayers will be asked to fund yet another bond measure in order to complete the many FMP projects that will not be completed under the Measure H bond issuance.	NVUSD Board of Education	The BOE disagrees with this finding. The BOE has made no indication that another bond measure is being considered. The finding is speculative.
---	--------------------------	--

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
R1. The Bond Oversight Committee fulfill its duty to inform the public about the expenditure of Measure H bond funds by communicating to the public at least twice annually about Measure H project status and costs.	NVUSD Board of Education	This Recommendation has been implemented.
R2. The Board of Education strengthen the independence of the Bond Oversight Committee by revising the BOC bylaws no later than August 31, 2018 in order to allow the creation of subcommittees by the BOC, and also to establish a set meeting frequency.	NVUSD Board of Education	The recommendation will be partially implemented.
R3. The NVUSD Staff revise the original \$505 million Facilities Master Plan to reflect which projects will be executed through the new Implementation Plan, and which projects will be deferred until new funds become available. This revised FMP should be posted to the NVUSD website no later than October 31, 2018, and kept current.	NVUSD Board of Education	This recommendation requires further analysis.
R4. The NVUSD Board of Education provide training to the BOC from organizations such as the 21st Century School Fund or the California League of Bond Oversight Committees so that the BOC has access to best practices for citizen oversight of public school construction programs. This access to training should take place commensurate with the seating of the next committee in the fall of 2018.	NVUSD Board of Education	This recommendation requires further analysis.

REPORT: Napa County Farmworker Housing

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
F1. Napa County does not have a current farmworker housing needs assessment.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors disagrees in part with this finding.
F2. There is a lack of affordable farmworker housing in Napa County.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.
F3. A shortage of farmworkers can be attributed to changing immigration policies, competition from other agricultural demands, competition from other sectors such as construction and food service, and the lack of affordable housing.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors (BOS) neither agrees nor disagrees with this finding.

F4. With an increasing number of long-term farmworkers, the simultaneous closure of two units of Farmworker Housing results in a housing demand which exceeds capacity	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.
F5. There is virtually no publicly subsidized housing for female farmworkers in Napa County.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.
F6. The River Ranch Farmworker Center appears to be well maintained.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
R1. The Napa County Board of Supervisors commission an update to the 2012 Final Report: Napa County Farmworker Housing Needs Assessment not later than September 30, 2018. An updated assessment of farmworker housing needs should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An identification of actual and projected farmworker numbers • The number of women in the workforce • The number of male and female workers accompanied by families • The number of farmworkers choosing to reside in Napa County • Housing needs for southwest-County workers (e.g., Carneros) • Farmworker income 	Napa County Board of Supervisors	This recommendation will be implemented.
R2. The Napa County Board of Supervisors, together with the appropriate stakeholders, prepare and publish a detailed action plan to meet County farmworker housing needs not later than June 30, 2019. These recommendations should specifically address south-County housing requirements.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	This recommendation will be implemented in part.
R3. The Napa County Board of Supervisors amend the farmworker housing regulations to permit year-round operation of the Farmworker Housing Centers not later than June 30, 2019	Napa County Board of Supervisors	This recommendation will require further analysis.

REPORT: New Napa County Jail – Who’s Paying for All of This?

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
F1. The new jail and Re-entry Facility construction timelines and funding have been and continue to be confusing to the public.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors disagrees with the finding.

F2. Funding and financial instruments for the new jail are complicated; the taxpayers are not fully informed of funding sources and the effects of the options	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The Board of Supervisors disagrees with the finding.
F3. The Re-entry Facility will assist inmates transitioning back to the community.	Napa County Board of Supervisors, Director of Corrections	The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding. The Acting Director of Corrections agrees with the finding.

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
R1. Napa County Board of Supervisors direct appropriate staff to produce a dedicated, easily accessible timeline on the County website that informs Napa County residents of the progress and funding of the jail by October 1, 2018.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented by the recommended date of October 1, 2018, based on prior direction from the Board.
R2. The Board of Supervisors generate greater publicity for all proposed funding sources of financing, holding public hearings throughout the County to justify the need and rationale for the use of particular funding mechanisms by October 1, 2018.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.
R3. The Board of Supervisors evaluate the recruitment and retention pilot program after its conclusion on September 30, 2021.	Napa County Board of Supervisors	No response given.

REPORT: The Williamson Act - Subsidizing a Lifestyle

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY FOUND:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
F1. The Napa County Williamson-Act program does not provide any more protection from development than does existing zoning and the General Plan.	Napa County Director PBES, Napa County Assessor, Napa County BOS	The Director of Planning, Building and Environmental Services (PBES) respectfully disagrees with this Finding. The Assessor agrees with the Director. The Board of Supervisors agrees with the Director.
F2. The Board of Supervisors lacks adequate information about the workings of the Napa County Williamson-Act program, of BOS options under it, and of the total lost property tax revenue to all Napa County entities that share in the revenue.	Napa County Assessor, Napa County BOS	The BOS disagrees with this finding. The Assessor agrees with the Board of Supervisors.
F3. Williamson-Act contract enforcement is non-existent. Planning and Assessor staff have not informed the BOS of undersize parcels, parcels without agricultural income, and 17 parcels whose owners do not supply Assessor-requested information as required by contract and by law.	Napa County BOS, Napa County Director PBES	The Director of Planning, Building and Environmental Services (PBES) respectfully disagrees with this Finding. The Board of Supervisors agrees with the Director.
F4. The continued use of 1969 minimum-imputed-income values may result in Williamson-Act grazing parcels (Type-H) being systematically under assessed.	Napa County Director PBES, Napa County Assessor, Napa County BOS	The Director of PBES deferred to the Assessor. The Assessor disagreed with the Finding. The BOS agreed with the Assessor.

F5. The Board of Supervisors has not exercised effective supervision of the Williamson-Act program since at least 2008.	Napa County Director PBES, Napa County BOS	The BOS disagreed with the Finding. The Director of PBES agrees with the BOS.
F6. The Assessor lacks adequate conflict-of-interest procedures regarding his own properties with unqualified personnel assigned to "check" any work.	Napa County Assessor	The Assessor disagrees with this Finding.

THE 2017-2018 NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY RECOMMENDED:	REQUIRED/INVITED RESPONDENT	RESPONSES (for full responses go to: http://www.napacourt.com/grand-jury/reports-response%202017-2018)
R1. No later than November 30, 2018, the Board of Supervisors commission an independent cost-benefit analysis of the Williamson-Act program, with public input, in which the cost to all stakeholders (e.g. schools, cities, special districts) in property tax revenues is considered so that the BOS may make informed decisions regarding the County's continued participation in the Williamson-Act program.	Napa County BOS, Napa County Director PBES	The BOS responded: This Recommendation will not be implemented. The Director of PBES agreed with this response.
R2. No later than November 30, 2018, the Board of Supervisors commission an independent study of the County Williamson-Act program to determine whether the program comports with those programs in other counties and with best practices, and to recommend revisions to the program, including revisions to the minimum-imputed-income values in Type-H contracts.	Napa County BOS, Napa County Director PBES	The BOS responded: This Recommendation will not be implemented. The Director of PBES agreed with this response.
R3. No later than October 31, 2018, the Board of Supervisors commission an independent audit of the Napa County Williamson-Act program by the Auditor-Controller or outside agency to determine to what extent contract holders are in compliance with their contracts, the WA rules, and the law.	Napa County BOS, Napa County Director PBES	The BOS responded: This Recommendation will not be implemented. The Director of PBES agreed with this response.
R4. No later than October 31, 2018, the Assessor revise his internal conflict-of-interest procedures so that at least two assessment-qualified personnel perform all the work on employee-owned properties.	Napa County Assessor	The Assessor responded: This Recommendation will not be implemented.