

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
Florence H. Evans



**Board of Supervisors**  
Phil Serna – District 1  
Patrick Kennedy – District 2  
Susan Peters – District 3  
Sue Frost – District 4  
Don Nottoli – District 5

**County of Sacramento**

---

September 24, 2020

The Honorable Russell Hom, Presiding Judge  
Sacramento county Superior Court  
720 Ninth Street, Department 47  
Sacramento CA 95814

Re: Sacramento County Grand Jury 2019-2020 Final Report

Dear Judge Hom:

The Board of Supervisors, at a regular meeting on September 22, 2020 approved the Sacramento County response to the 2020 recommendations contained in the 2019-2020 Grand Jury Final Report.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 874-8150.

Respectfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Florence Evans".

Florence Evans, Clerk  
Board of Supervisors

Cc: Becky Castaneda, Grand Jury Coordinator

Enclosure: Sacramento County Response to the Grand Jury 2019-20 Final Report

FE/gd

**COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA**

**APPROVED**  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

SEP 22 2020  
*Flora Ann*  
BY \_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Board

For the Agenda of:  
September 22, 2020  
Timed: 2:00 PM

To: Board of Supervisors

Through: Navdeep S. Gill, County Executive

From: Britt Ferguson, Chief Fiscal Officer,  
Office of Budget and Debt Management

Subject: Response To The 2019-2020 Sacramento County Grand  
Jury Final Report (Continued from September 1, 2020; Item  
No. 32)

District(s): All

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

1. Adopt the attached reports as Sacramento County's response (to the findings and recommendations) contained in the 2019-2020 Sacramento County Grand Jury Final Report.
2. Direct the Clerk of the Board to forward a copy of the Board letter and responses to the Presiding Judge of the Sacramento County Superior Court no later than September 25, 2020.

**BACKGROUND**

On September 1, 2020, the Board of Supervisors reviewed and considered responses to the reports, *Election Security in Sacramento County* and *California Senate Bill 1022: A Gift Too Good to Ignore*. The Board of Supervisors provided input on responses to the report, *California Senate Bill 1022: A Gift Too Good to Ignore*. Changes based on Board's input are shown in strikethrough in Attachment 1. A clean copy is included as Attachment 2. No changes were made to the report, *Election Security in Sacramento County* (Attachment 3).

Responses to the report, *Impact of Gentrification and Neighborhood Revitalization on the Displacement of Residents* is included as Attachment 4 for the Board's review and consideration. The Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency also provided a response to the Grand Jury, which is included as Attachment 5.

The Board can approve or revise the language drafted by staff in these reports. Any requested changes will be included in the County's response to the Grand Jury.

This is the final meeting before responses are due to the Presiding Judge to meet the Grand Jury's 90-day deadline.

The Grand Jury report can be found at the following link:  
<http://www.sacgrandjury.org/reports/reports.asp>.

### **FINANCIAL ANALYSIS**

Departments contributing to this report absorbed incurred costs within their respective budgets.

Attachment(s):

Attachment 1 - Response to California Senate Bill 1022: A Gift Too Good to Ignore (strikethrough)

Attachment 2 - Response to California Senate Bill 1022: A Gift Too Good to Ignore (clean)

Attachment 3 – Response to *Election Security in Sacramento County*

Attachment 4 - Response to *Impact of Gentrification and Neighborhood Revitalization on the Displacement of Residents*

Attachment 5 – SHRA Response to *Impact of Gentrification and Neighborhood Revitalization on the Displacement of Residents*

## **California Senate Bill 1022: A Gift Too Good to Ignore**

### **FINDINGS**

**F1. Due to realignment and the *Mays* Consent Decree the Sacramento County jails must provide additional educational and vocational training, medical and mental health services, and brings the facilities into compliance with ADA.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.

**F2. The Grand Jury is aware, based on its interviews and research, that there are those who believe that acceptance of any funds would be an endorsement of a policy of increased incarceration. The Grand Jury believes proponents of the project should emphasize the importance of increased services and programs to ultimately reduce recidivism and improve the post incarceration lives of the inmates and their families.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees partially with the finding. It does appear that some believe that acceptance of any funds would be an endorsement of a policy of increased incarceration, and increased programs and services for jail inmates can help to reduce recidivism and improve the post incarceration lives of inmates and their families (though not all components of the SB1022 project are directly related to providing programs and services). We do not believe, however, that it is appropriate for us to advise either proponents or opponents of the project on what they should emphasize.

**F3. Accepting the SB 1022 funds will commit the County to spending between \$6-8 million each year for 30 years or until the bonds are repaid for staffing and operating costs.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors partially disagrees with this finding. At the time the issue was last presented to the Board, the annual operating cost estimate was between \$4 million and \$6 million. However, since then, operating costs estimates have been revised and now stand at \$2.4 million per year (not

adjusted for inflation). If the County accepts these ~~se~~ SB1022 funds, the County ~~will~~ would be required to pay this amount until the bonds issued by the State are fully paid off. The State has not indicated how long the bonds ~~will~~ would be issued for and, it is true, that that could be for up to 30 years. However, the State ~~has~~ recently indicated that their preference would be to issue shorter term bonds.

**F4. If the County does not accept the SB 1022 funds, the structural improvements identified by the Sheriff, DGS and the County Executive as essential to meet the housing, educational and medical and mental health service needs of long term inmates at RCCC will require county funds to be accomplished.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors partially disagrees with this finding. Most of the improvements included in the SB 1022 project ~~will~~ would be required whether or not the County accept~~ed~~s the SB 1022 funds. ~~If t~~The County ~~does~~ will not accept SB 1022 funds, therefore then the cost of the~~ese~~ improvements ~~would~~ will fall to the General Fund. However, one component of the identified structural improvements project (the additional program space) ~~would not be required if the County does not was a condition of~~ accepting the SB 1022 funds and will not need to be built.

**F5. Whether or not Sacramento County accepts the SB 1022 funds, the County will still be responsible to fund all the changes required by the Mays Consent Decree.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**R1. By December 31, 2020, the Board of Supervisors should accept the \$80 million made available to Sacramento County through SB1022.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The recommendation requires further analysis, including a review of capital cost revisions and options. This analysis will be completed and the County will make a decision by no later than October 30, 2020 will not be implemented



because it is not warranted. The Board of Supervisors will not accept the \$80 million in SB 1022 funding.

**R2. By June 1, 2021, the Sheriff's Department should develop and begin implementation of the most cost-effective plan to achieve the objectives of the RCCC expansion and infrastructure improvement project.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The recommendation requires further analysis. We agree that it will be necessary to develop and implement a plan to achieve most of the objectives of the RCCC expansion project, but there are a number of issues that will need to be analyzed – capital, operational and fiscal –before that can happen and it is not clear a plan can be achieved by June 1, 2021. But the analysis will be completed by December 31, 2020.

**R3. By June 20, 2021, the Board of Supervisors in co-operation with the Sheriff's Department should include in implementation plans the flexibility to reduce operating expenditures to the extent required by reductions in jail population.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The recommendation requires further analysis. We agree that plans designed to achieve the objectives of the SB 1022 project should include the flexibility to reduce operating expenditures to the extent required by reductions in jail population. However, it is not clear that that can be completed by December 31, 2020. County staff is currently analyzing the various issues related to achieving this goal and that analysis should be completed by December 31, 2020.

## **California Senate Bill 1022: A Gift Too Good to Ignore**

### **FINDINGS**

**F1. Due to realignment and the *Mays* Consent Decree the Sacramento County jails must provide additional educational and vocational training, medical and mental health services, and brings the facilities into compliance with ADA.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.

**F2. The Grand Jury is aware, based on its interviews and research, that there are those who believe that acceptance of any funds would be an endorsement of a policy of increased incarceration. The Grand Jury believes proponents of the project should emphasize the importance of increased services and programs to ultimately reduce recidivism and improve the post incarceration lives of the inmates and their families.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees partially with the finding. It does appear that some believe that acceptance of any funds would be an endorsement of a policy of increased incarceration, and increased programs and services for jail inmates can help to reduce recidivism and improve the post incarceration lives of inmates and their families (though not all components of the SB1022 project are directly related to providing programs and services). We do not believe, however, that it is appropriate for us to advise either proponents or opponents of the project on what they should emphasize.

**F3. Accepting the SB 1022 funds will commit the County to spending between \$6-8 million each year for 30 years or until the bonds are repaid for staffing and operating costs.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors partially disagrees with this finding. At the time the issue was last presented to the Board, the annual operating cost estimate was between \$4 million and \$6 million. However, since then, operating costs estimates have been revised and now stand at \$2.4 million per year (not

adjusted for inflation). If the County accepts these funds, the County would be required to pay this amount until the bonds issued by the State are fully paid off. The State has not indicated how long the bond would be issued for and, it is true, that that could be for up to 30 years. However, the State recently indicated that their preference would be to issue shorter term bonds.

**F4. If the County does not accept the SB 1022 funds, the structural improvements identified by the Sheriff, DGS and the County Executive as essential to meet the housing, educational and medical and mental health service needs of long term inmates at RCCC will require county funds to be accomplished.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors partially disagrees with this finding. Most of the improvements included in the SB 1022 project would be required whether or not the County accepted the SB 1022 funds. The County will not accept SB 1022 funds, therefore the cost of these improvements would fall to the General Fund. However, one component of the identified structural improvements (the additional program space) was a condition of accepting the SB 1022 funds and will not need to be built.

**F5. Whether or not Sacramento County accepts the SB 1022 funds, the County will still be responsible to fund all the changes required by the Mays Consent Decree.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**R1. By December 31, 2020, the Board of Supervisors should accept the \$80 million made available to Sacramento County through SB1022.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The Board of Supervisors will not accept the \$80 million in SB 1022 funding.

**R2. By June 1, 2021, the Sheriff's Department should develop and begin implementation of the most cost-effective plan to achieve the**



**objectives of the RCCC expansion and infrastructure improvement project.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The recommendation requires further analysis. We agree that it will be necessary to develop and implement a plan to achieve most of the objectives of the RCCC expansion project, but there are a number of issues that will need to be analyzed – capital, operational and fiscal –before that can happen and it is not clear a plan can be achieved by June 1, 2021. But the analysis will be completed by December 31, 2020.

**R3. By June 20, 2021, the Board of Supervisors in co-operation with the Sheriff's Department should include in implementation plans the flexibility to reduce operating expenditures to the extent required by reductions in jail population.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The recommendation requires further analysis. We agree that plans designed to achieve the objectives of the SB 1022 project should include the flexibility to reduce operating expenditures to the extent required by reductions in jail population. However, it is not clear that that can be completed by December 31, 2020. County staff is currently analyzing the various issues related to achieving this goal and that analysis should be completed by December 31, 2020.

## **Election Security in Sacramento County**

### **FINDINGS**

**F1. Sacramento County Department of Technology (DTech) is not currently practicing regular, consistent vulnerability scans and penetration testing. Vulnerability scanning and penetration testing are often confused. The two security procedures are quite different and are used for different purposes. At the most basic level, vulnerability scanning aims to identify any systems that are subject to known vulnerabilities while a penetration test aims to identify weaknesses in specific system configurations and organizational processes and practices that can be exploited to compromise security.**

#### **Chief Information Officer Response:**

The respondent disagrees partially with the finding. The County of Sacramento is currently performing consistent vulnerability scanning. However, while the County does conduct penetration testing, we agree that this testing is not regular and consistent. DTech is working to establish a contract vehicle to perform regular semi-annual penetration testing.

#### **Registrar of Voters Response:**

The Registrar of voters agrees with the Chief Information Officer.

**F2. Voter Registration and Elections Department (VRE) considers election security a major concern and has given it a very high priority. The Sacramento County Registrar of Voters (SCRV) and her staff were very cooperative and began almost immediately to implement changes and corrective measures for identified shortcomings.**

#### **Registrar of Voters Response:**

The respondent agrees with this finding.

#### **Chief Information Officer Response:**

The Chief Information Officer agrees with the Registrar of Voters.

**F3. Media policy is currently under review to address the management of account passwords and the enforcement of the County of Sacramento supported multi-factor authentication methods. The estimated completion date is June 30, 2020. Social Media Accounts are managed by the Communication and Media Office (CMO) and adhere to the County of Sacramento Social Media Policy.**

**Due to the limitations and diversity of Social Media account authentications, a review of Social Media Management software will be conducted by the Sacramento County Department of Technology (DTech). The estimated completion date is January 15, 2021.**

**Registrar of Voters Response:**

The respondent agrees with this finding.

**Chief Information Officer Response:**

The Chief Information Officer agrees with the Registrar of Voters.

**F4. Sacramento County Department of Technology (DTech) has begun a 16-month county-wide initiative to implement multi-factor authentication. Multi-factor authentication is one of the best deterrents to keep unauthorized users from hacking into computer networks. Voter Registration and Elections Department (VRE) will be one of the first departments to deploy this methodology.**

**Chief Information Officer Response:**

The respondent agrees with this finding.

**Registrar of Voters Response:**

The Registrar of voters agrees with the Chief Information Officer.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**R1. Sacramento County Grand Jury (SCGJ) recommends the Sacramento County Department of Technology (DTech) institute frequent penetration testing performed by a third party twice per year at a minimum. SCGJ further recommends DTech perform vulnerability scans each time the following occurs within the IT ecosystem.**

- **Security patches are applied,**
- **Significant changes are made to the infrastructure or network,**
- **New infrastructure or web applications are added,**
- **An office location changes, or an office is added to the network.**

**Chief Information Officer Response:**

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The County of Sacramento is currently performing consistent vulnerability scanning and will create a contract vehicle to conduct semi-

annual penetration testing. The time frame for implementation is projected to be June, 2021.

**Registrar of Voters Response:**

The Registrar of voters agrees with the Chief Information Officer.

**R2. Sacramento County Grand Jury (SCGJ) recommends the Communication and Media Office (CMO) adjust its election security policy to include security of the Voter Registration and Elections Department (VRE) website, communication, registration, voting and results from tabulation by June 30, 2020 in preparation for the November 2020 general election.**

**Registrar of Voters Response:**

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The Sacramento County Voter Registration & Elections Security and Action Plan will be updated with security policies for the VRE website ([www.elections.saccounty.net](http://www.elections.saccounty.net)), communication and media, voter registration, voting security, and tabulation.

The revised security policies will be completed by September 25, 2020. No confidential voter information on security system information is ever shared with the media, elected officials, community members, or advocates.

**Chief Information Officer Response:**

The Chief Information Officer agrees with the Registrar of Voters.

**R3. Sacramento County Grand Jury (SCGJ) recommends that the Sacramento County Department of Technology (DTech) and Voter Registration and Elections Department (VRE) need to implement multi-factor authentication procedures before the November 2020 general election.**

**Chief Information Officer Response:**

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. VRE technical staff have been using multi-factor authentication. VRE non-technical staff have been postponed to June 2021 due to operational conflicts, with the November 2020 election.

**Registrar of Voters Response:**

The Registrar of voters agrees with the Chief Information Officer.

**R4. Sacramento County Grand Jury (SCGJ) requests that the Sacramento County Department of Technology (DTech) report back to the SCGJ the results of the CyberDefenses, Inc. review and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) audit of the election security by September 30, 2020.**

**Registrar of Voters Response:**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable to make this report public. Publishing a highly technical information security report will expose the County cyber defenses strategies, creating a significant vulnerability.

**Chief Information Officer Response:**

The Chief Information Officer agrees with the Registrar of Voters.

**IMPACT OF GENTRIFICATION AND NEIGHBORHOOD  
REVITALIZATION ON THE  
DISPLACEMENT OF RESIDENTS**

**FINDINGS**

**F1. Clear lines of responsibility regarding relocation of Single Room Occupancy (SRO) clients have been difficult to determine. Opinions from interviewees indicate the agencies were not always working collaboratively, sharing information and consistently messaging.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors neither agrees nor disagrees with this finding. The finding relates to Single Room Occupancy Units located in the City of Sacramento and governed by the City's Ordinance. The Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency is responsible for reporting and tracking of units and maintaining compliance with the City's Ordinance. Therefore, the County defers to the City's response as the Agency with primary responsibility.

**F2. The Grand Jury found no evidence that a study of best practices from other cities has been performed or communicated.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding as it relates to the Sacramento Homeless Policy Council (SHPC). It is unclear if the study of best practices is referring to SRO's, which are under the jurisdiction of the City, or to the objectives identified in the Grand Jury Report for SHCP which were to include "providing a public forum for sharing information and best practices for addressing homelessness in Sacramento." The SHPC has not yet been convened.

**F3. The Grand Jury found that the conversions of The Berry, The Capitol Park and the Shasta facilities appear to have been well-planned and meet the intent of the law and the needs of the community.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors neither agrees nor disagrees with this finding. The finding relates to Single Room Occupancy Units located in the City of Sacramento and governed by the City's Ordinance. The Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency is responsible for reporting and tracking of units



and maintaining compliance with the City's Ordinance. Therefore, the County defers to the City's response as the Agency with primary responsibility.

**F4. Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) did not provide the Grand Jury information on reporting or tracking individual residents of SROs who were displaced. Therefore, it could not be determined whether those occupants who may have been compensated have relocated, whether the relocation was successful or, worst case, if the resident spent the money and may now be homeless.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding. SHRA staff in their response to the Grand Jury agrees they did not provide Grand Jury information about the tracing of individual residents of SROs who were displaced.

**F5. The Grand Jury Report for 2018-2019 recommended seeking assistance to look at the actions and coordination of the stakeholders. As a result of those recommendations, The Sacramento Homeless Policy Council (SHPC) was formed which will impact future relocated tenants.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

We partially disagree with this finding because additional coordination of stakeholders was contemplated prior to the 2018-19 Grand Jury report. When the Sacramento Steps Forward nonprofit was created in 2011, there was the intention to create a formal structure to include elected leadership across jurisdictions. Additionally, the 2018 County Homeless Plan included specific strategies and activities to support improved coordination and leadership on homelessness. In November 2019, the Board of Supervisors endorsed the proposed Sacramento Homeless Policy Council to provide an informal structure that would potentially be more flexible; however, the Council has not yet been convened.

**F6. Kaiser Permanente is funding support to help SHPC develop oversight, stronger collaboration and a coordinated plan.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding.

**F7. While SHRA has the legal mandate for housing individuals displaced by gentrification, several initiatives and/or agencies including Sacramento Steps Forward (SSF), Volunteers of America, and Continuum of Care are involved in various aspects. It is not clear**

**which entity makes the final decision, which initiates policy and which manages implementation regarding development of plans and re-housing those impacted by gentrification.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors partially disagrees with this finding because SHRA does not have the legal mandate for housing individuals displaced by gentrification. The County neither agrees nor disagrees with the finding regarding clarity of development plan decisions, policies, and implementation, because these comments appear directed to issues surrounding the conversion of Single Room Occupancy Units located in the City of Sacramento and governed by the City's Ordinance. Therefore, the County defers to the City's response as the Agency with primary responsibility.

**F8. The Joint Powers Agency (JPA) members - Sacramento City, Sacramento County and SHRA - are making efforts to work more collaboratively along with Sacramento Steps Forward and the newly formed Sacramento Homeless Policy Council along with Community Solutions.**

**Board of Supervisors Response:**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with this finding. The County continues to be committed to working collaboratively across all entities working on homelessness. The Board of Supervisors agreed in May 2019 to participate in the Homeless Policy Council being convened by Sacramento Steps Forward; however, the council has not yet been convened. Collaboration among the entities has significantly deepened in the implementation of the COVID-19 Homelessness Response Plan that has opened approximately 600 new sheltering units, supported safety in congregate shelters, increased support to homeless encampments, and is now focused on transitioning approximately 500 households to permanent housing stability and creating new permanent housing opportunities. These activities are jointly funded and implemented across the separate entities: County, City of Sacramento, SSF/Continuum of Care and SHRA.

**F9. Sacramento City Code mandates a minimum of 712 SRO rooms must remain available at all times. As of July 3, 2019, the City had 762 rooms including those at the new complex at 7th & H which indicates**

**they are maintaining the mandated levels. The question remains whether that is an adequate number today.**

**Board of Supervisor's Response:**

The Board of Supervisors neither agrees nor disagrees with this finding. The finding relates to Single Room Occupancy Units located in the City of Sacramento and governed by the City's Ordinance. The Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency is responsible for reporting and tracking of units and maintaining compliance with the City's Ordinance. Therefore, the County defers to the City's response as the Agency with primary responsibility.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**R1. The Joint Powers Authority along with Sacramento Steps Forward and Sacramento Homeless Policy Council should collaboratively develop a single uniform plan relating to SRO displacement that would improve transparency, coordination, accountability and reduce duplication of efforts between the stakeholders by June 30, 2021.**

**Board of Supervisor's Response:**

This recommendation will not be implemented by the County because it relates to Single Room Occupancy Units located in the City of Sacramento and governed by the City's Ordinance. Therefore, the County defers to the City's response as the Agency with primary responsibility.

**R2. The Joint Powers Authority and Sacramento Steps Forward should develop a task force, utilizing the Sacramento Homeless Policy Council, to include representatives of all agencies involved in plans for gentrification throughout the County of Sacramento and especially Downtown Sacramento. This task force should research best practices of other jurisdictions to learn how they manage their efforts to protect residents of housing slated for gentrification and issue a report of findings by June 30, 2021.**

**Board of Supervisor's Response:**

This recommendation will not be implemented by the County because it appears to focus on Single Room Occupancy Units located in downtown Sacramento. Therefore, the County defers to the City's response as the Agency with primary responsibility.

**R3. The current mandate of maintaining 712 SRO units may not be an adequate number. SHPC should study the number of SRO units needed**

**in 2020 and beyond and provide a report of findings by March 31, 2021.**

**Board of Supervisor's Response:**

This recommendation will not be implemented by the County because it relates to Single Room Occupancy Units located in the City of Sacramento. Therefore, the County defers to the City's response as the Agency with primary responsibility.

**R4. Placements for residents of all SROs being repurposed or revitalized need to be monitored and publicly reported. To facilitate greater understanding and ensure improved transparency of the placement process, the SHRA website could be utilized to contain reports similar to the Capitol Park Hotel Resident Relocation Report for all SRO property renovations. SHRA should provide the elements and timeline of these reports by March 31, 2021.**

**Board of Supervisor's Response:**

This recommendation will not be implemented by the County because it relates to Single Room Occupancy Units located in the City of Sacramento. Therefore, the County defers to the City's response as the Agency with primary responsibility.



INVESTING IN COMMUNITIES

August 28, 2020

**A Joint Powers Agency**

**MEMBERS**

City of Sacramento

County of Sacramento

Housing Authority of the  
City of Sacramento

Housing Authority of the  
County of Sacramento

Hon. Russell Hom, Presiding Judge  
Sacramento Superior Court  
720 Ninth Street, Department 47  
Sacramento, Ca 95814

Dear Judge Hom,

I am submitting responses to the findings and recommendations to the Sacramento County Grand Jury Final Report 2019.

**Findings**

**F1. Agree.** SHRA has the sole responsibility for reporting on the status of the units and compliance of the Ordinance. While collaboration between agencies can always be improved, and the City's SRO Ordinance was limited to 10 downtown Single Room Occupancy (SROs) hotels, responsibility for ensuring the relocation of residents residing in the 10 SROs hotels belongs to Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA).

In 2006 the City Code Chapter 18.20 (Relocation Benefits Pertaining to Residential Hotel Unit Conversion or Demolition) and City Ordinance 2006-056 require that 712 residential hotel or comparable units located in 10 hotels be maintained within the City of Sacramento. Residents who meet the requirements for relocations are provided relocation benefits per the Ordinance.

Pursuant to the Ordinance, the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) is required to provide an annual report to the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Commission and City Council on the number of residential hotel units withdrawn, the number of new units expected based on approved replacement housing plans, and the number of units constructed in anticipation of conversions or withdrawals.

**F2. Agree.** There have been no recent studies of best practices. Studies may have occurred prior to passage of the 2006 City SRO Ordinance.

**F3. Agree.** The Berry, Capitol Park and the Shasta meet the needs of the community.

**F4. Agree.** SHRA did not provide Grand Jury information about the tracing of individual residents of SROs who were displaced. Displacement of residents has only occurred in two hotels, the Marshall and Capitol Park. Residents who meet the requirements for relocations are provided relocation benefits per the Ordinance.

SHRA has detailed records documenting the assistance provided to individual residents at both sites. While personal information such as names and addresses cannot be released, information regarding the number of residents who received benefits is available upon request.

**F5. Agree.** According to a report presented to the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Homeless Policy Council was formed in early 2020. It is our understanding that no meetings have been convened to date due to COVID-19.

**F6. Disagree.** SHRA has been informed that Kaiser Permanente has not provided funding support for SHPC.

**F7. Disagree.** While SHRA ensures relocation assistance is provided when units subject to the City's SRO Ordinance are withdrawn, SHRA does not have the legal mandate for housing individuals displaced by gentrification.

**F8. Agree.** SHRA works collaboratively with the City, County, and Sacramento Step Forward (SSF), we will also work with the Sacramento Homeless Policy Council members once it convenes meetings.

**F9. Partially Agree.** As of July 3, 2019 the total units subject to the City's SRO Ordinance's Regulated/Replacement Units was 764 (not 762 as stated).

### **Recommendations**

**R1. Non-concurrence.** SHRA has developed SRO displacement plans per the requirements of the City SRO Ordinance. SSF and the Sacramento Homeless Policy Council do not have SRO displacement plans. The development of a SRO displacement plan referred to as a (Withdrawal and Relocation Plan) is the sole responsibility of SHRA. SHRA will provide information and provide input as needed to support the development of a single uniform plan related to general displacement. The Sacramento Homeless Policy Council has not convened its first meeting and e to COVID 19 it is uncertain when the first meeting will be held. It is unclear if the June 30, 2021 date can be met.



**R2. Non-concurrence.** Sacramento is one of the few cities in the country with an SRO ordinance that references a specific number of units. The purpose of the ordinance is to ensure that despite market pressures, there will be a specified number of units available downtown. The Sacramento Homeless Policy Council has not convened its first meeting to address the issue of developing a task force and due to COVID 19 it is uncertain if this can be accomplished by June 30, 2021.

**R3. Non-concurrence.** The City of Sacramento is responsible for preparing a Housing Element as a part of their General Plan. The Housing Element determines the number and type of housing units needed to meet the demand based on income levels. It is the City of Sacramento's responsibility not SHPC to determine the housing needs.

**R4. Concur.** No other unit conversions or withdrawal are anticipated at this time, however, if additional withdraws/conversions of hotels subject to the SRO Ordinance occur, reports will be placed on SHRA's website. Residents who meet the requirements for relocations are provided relocation benefits per the Ordinance.

Sincerely,



La Shelle Dozier  
Executive Director  
Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency