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Foreword – Letter from Judge

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

DAVID DE ALBA
SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE
DEPARTMENT 30

720 9TH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
(916) 874-7861

June 2010

In my 30 years as an attorney and judge, I have learned about and worked with many different Grand Juries in this state not only in their capacity to hand down criminal indictments but, more importantly, in their role as watchdogs over local government. I am pleased to endorse this book and congratulate the California Grand Jurors’ Association for putting it together. The goal of this book is to help as many citizens of this state understand this important function of Grand Juries, whether they choose to volunteer for this service or just be better informed about this critical work.

Through the entire history of California as a state, Grand Juries have played an important role as the most independent of any body to provide unbiased review of local government operations seeking more efficient and effective means of utilizing the taxpayer dollar.

I had the honor and pleasure of being on a panel discussion at the Association’s annual conference in October 2009 where I learned a lot about the Association’s mission, part of which is to reach out to the entire state to educate all about Grand Juries. I believe this book will help accomplish this. I hope each reader will take away increased knowledge of one of the most important forms of volunteer service possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David De Alba
Judge
Sacramento Superior Court

California Grand Jurors’ Association
www.cgja.org
Chapter I Introduction

What does the average citizen of the United States conjure up when the term “Grand Jury” is heard? A group of citizens meeting in secrecy to hear evidence presented by a District Attorney to determine whether or not there is sufficient evidence for a person accused of a crime to be held over for a criminal trial. That image is accurate for all 50 states as well as in federal jurisdictions. In California it is only part of the picture, because, unlike almost every other state in the union, the grand jury has a much greater and far-reaching role guaranteed in the California State Constitution. That role is to review the operations of all local governments within the jury’s county to determine if those local governments are operating to the highest possible level of efficiency and service.

Unfortunately the investigative role of California’s regular grand juries is not well understood by most citizens of the state. The purpose of this book is to explain this role in sufficient detail so that the average citizen can understand and appreciate the service of these local groups, follow the work of their grand jury and be sufficiently motivated to seriously consider applying for grand jury service. We hope to answer a question posed by a reporter conducting an interview about grand juries, which was, “Why should the average Californian care about grand juries?”

What kinds of people serve as grand jurors? They should be able to take an unbiased look at the way government works and, when necessary, offer solutions or suggest more efficient management of operations. They also need to possess strong personal initiative and high energy to face
the workload. Above all, a good juror is curious about how his/her government works and how it can be improved. Grand jurors come from all lifestyles and bring their life experiences to the process.

This book should also be a valuable resource for those persons who have been chosen to serve to explain to their friends and relatives what they have gotten themselves into while serving their one-year commitment.

We will cover the history of grand juries, California law applicable to the selection, the authority and grand jury rules, how a grand jury operates, some examples of what grand juries have achieved, and information about the California Grand Jurors’ Association, a nonprofit, all volunteer organization of current and past grand jurors dedicated to the advancement of the California Grand Jury system.

The California Grand Jurors’ Association (CGJA) is an advocate for the regular grand jury in dealing with its duty to review “civil” matters; i.e., its authority to conduct investigations and issue reports about local government. CGJA does not deal with any issues regarding the criminal indictment functions of grand juries other than to acknowledge that in some counties, the regular grand jury is also called on to handle requests for criminal indictments usually brought to the jury by the District Attorney. In these cases, the District Attorney’s office will conduct the necessary indoctrination and training. However, we will explain the indictment process briefly to offer a complete picture of the role and the authority of grand juries in California.
Chapter II History of the Grand Jury

The Grand Jury system originated in England in the 12th century; it immigrated to the colonies; and later moved westward to California. Starting with what is now its indictment function – the criminal grand jury as we know it today slowly took on its civil, or “watchdog” responsibilities.

Why go back nearly a thousand years into early English history? Because what we are discussing has evolved from very basic principles that were codified then and that have matured over the centuries.

As early as 1066, a group of 12 “Leading Citizens” in each English community was formed to bring charges against anyone who had committed a crime. This very well may be the origin of today’s 12-person jury. The date itself is interesting – the Battle of Hastings, the ensuing Norman Conquest of England, and what is considered the end of the Dark Ages. It all seems to have come together at that time.

Figure 1. Could this have been an early grand jury?
By 1176, the concept of a Grand Inquest by a body of 24 knights selected by the sheriff of the county was used. This also when tenant rights were first established – rights of the common citizen. The grand jury is even mentioned in the Magna Carta.

The genesis of the grand jury’s watchdog function developed during the same period. While the primary role of the inquest in early England was as a means of apprehending and punishing criminals, records from the Grand Inquest state: “The inquest was required to present those whose duty was to keep in repair bridges, causeways and highways, for neglect of duty; to inquire into defects of gaols and the nature thereof, who ought to repair them and who was responsible for any escapes which had occurred…” That was 600 years ago, and today grand juries are still investigating agencies responsible for infrastructure and inquiring into jails.

By the 17th century, grand juries were independent of the crown, and the concept of secrecy – that we now embody as confidentiality – had evolved. This model of an independent “local” or county grand jury remains with us to this day.

As a side-note - England abolished its grand jury system in 1933.

In the United States, the Massachusetts Colony established the first formal grand jury in 1635. By 1683, grand juries in some form were in all the colonies, and they started to suggest public improvements.
While the original US Constitution contained no reference to the grand jury, the 5th Amendment provides that, “No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury…” Under the 14th Amendment, most provisions of the Bill of Rights were made applicable to the states. This, however, is not true of the guarantee of indictment by a grand jury.

The last study we are familiar with shows that four states require a grand jury indictment for all crimes; 14 states and the District of Columbia require grand jury indictments for all felonies; six states mandate grand jury indictment only for capital crimes; 25 states, including California, make grand jury indictments optional; and in a single state, Pennsylvania, the grand jury lacks the power to indict.

In some states, early grand juries also developed quasi-legislative functions. In New York, the grand jury assumed direct ordinance-making powers.
A Pennsylvania statute of the late 1890s provided that no public buildings and no bridges could be built within the county unless approved by two successive grand juries. Similar statutes of the period required Georgia grand juries to act as boards of revision of taxes and to fix tax rates. Mississippi grand juries were required to examine tax collectors’ accounts. Alabama and Tennessee grand juries were charged with investigating the sufficiency of the bonds of all county officers.

After World War II, things changed drastically. To the best of our knowledge only seven states now have grand juries with any type of watchdog function at all, and it has been difficult to obtain definitive information about them. In Nevada a grand jury is convened (usually for a specific purpose) a minimum of three times a decade and only when the judge decides one is needed. As far as we know, California has the last remaining comprehensive grand jury watchdog function.

Grand juries have existed in California since the original constitution of 1849-50. There was a gradual evolution of the process during the following 30 years that defined its basic concepts and authority. Although certain aspects have been refined over the years, they all derive from those original principles.

The codification of grand jury law in California came about in 1872 with the adoption of the Penal Code, where most all grand jury law resides. This code referred to inquiring into local prisons, auditing county books, and examining matters of community interest.

In 1880, the grand jury was “authorized to investigate county governments, required to be impaneled annually to
function specifically as watchdogs over county governments.” This is where the actual term “watchdogs” first enters the story.

Figure 3. An early California Grand Jury. Note all middle-aged white men. Since there are more than 19, must include either court personnel or alternates.

Demonstrating the importance our state government places on the work of grand juries, in 2008, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger declared February of each year as Grand Jury Awareness Month. Many counties duplicate this declaration by issuing their own proclamations of support.

Over the years, there have been numerous changes to the Penal Code leading to today’s law, which we will explain in the next chapter.
PROCLAMATION

California's grand jury system is a unique component of our state's government. Present in each of our fifty-eight counties, these juries consist of citizens recommended by the Superior Court. Our grand juries exist through the dedication of the people, and they help to ensure that the accused are treated fairly and that our local governments are maintaining the highest legal standards.

Grand juries promote justice in our Golden State. Used at the beginning of the legal investigation process, these juries have three important functions: to decide whether a criminal act occurred and if there is enough evidence to charge a person with a crime, to use civil jurisdiction to oversee local governments and to reserve the power to accuse public officials of impropriety.

The hard work done by our grand juries has a great impact throughout our communities, and they have helped to make California a better place. These accomplishments can only be made through the outstanding dedication of those who volunteer to become grand jurors, and I thank them for their fantastic efforts. This month, I encourage all Californians to learn more about this terrific part of our judiciary system and applaud those who have made it so successful.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor of the State of California, do hereby proclaim February 2009, as "California Grand Jury Awareness Month."

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this 18th day of February 2009.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
Governor of California

ATTEST:

DEBRA BOWEN
Secretary of State

Figure 4. Governor's Proclamation of Grand Jury Awareness Month
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Chapter III Grand Jury Law

California Grand Jury Law is found almost exclusively in the Penal Code, beginning with section 888, which states, in part:

*A grand jury is a body of ... citizens of the county ... to inquire of public offenses committed or triable within the county ... One grand jury in each county shall be charged and sworn to investigate matters of civil concern.*

This section succinctly sets forth the two functions (criminal and civil) of grand juries in California. The California grand jury’s dual authority has been upheld by both case law and Attorney General Opinions.

An important court decision states:

“In our system of government a grand jury is the only agency free from possible political or official bias that has an opportunity to see the operation of the government on any broad basis. It performs a valuable public purpose in presenting its conclusions drawn from that overview. The public may, of course, ultimately conclude that the jury's fears were exaggerated or that its proposed solutions are unwise. But the debate which reports, such as the one before us, would provoke could lead only to a better understanding of public governmental problems. They should be encouraged and not prohibited.” [Monroe v Garrett (1971), 17 Cal App 3d 280] This statement gives a clear indication of both the independence and the authority of the grand jury in California.
Following are some of the key sections of California’s Grand Jury law.¹

**Criminal Indictments**

As mentioned in Chapter I, CGJA does not train or otherwise deal in the criminal indictment function, but we will explain it briefly here.

*Penal Code §889 states: An indictment is an accusation in writing, presented by the grand jury to a competent court, charging a person with a public offense.*

A criminal indictment results in an accused being bound over for trial. It is similar to a preliminary hearing, but there are significant differences between these procedures. In both, the process is initiated by the District Attorney, who presents the prosecutor’s evidence, and the standard of proof is “probable cause” supported by the preponderance of evidence as opposed to the “beyond a reasonable doubt” standard in a criminal trial.

But a grand jury indictment proceeding is conducted in complete secrecy. The only persons present other than the grand jury are District Attorney representatives, a court reporter, who is sworn to secrecy, and witnesses, who testify one at a time. The witnesses are not allowed to have an attorney present, but may consult with an attorney outside the hearing room when the witness deems it necessary to seek legal advice. Since there are no attorneys present other than the prosecutor, there is no cross examination. All testimony is taken under oath.

¹ The exact penal code language has been truncated for ease of reading
The jury foreperson presides and one of the jurors takes the role of a court clerk by calling witnesses, keeping track of evidence and performing other similar duties.

Jurors may ask questions, but they are written and submitted to the prosecutor conducting the hearing to determine that they meet the rules of evidence. The prosecutor is required to introduce exculpatory evidence, which is evidence that might mitigate the likelihood of an indictment; in other words, evidence in favor of the accused.

An indictment, endorsed as a “true bill,” may be submitted to the court only if at least a “supermajority” of grand jurors concurs. (PC §940). We’ll explain “supermajority” later in this book

By contrast, a preliminary hearing is conducted in open court, presided over by a judge. Witnesses are entitled to attorneys, and cross-examination is allowed. The judge decides whether or not to hold the defendant over for trial.

Some people feel that the grand jury process is one-sided in favor of the District Attorney. Those in favor of this method like it because of the secrecy, allowing the case to be made without revealing the complete case to be presented at trial. It also allows witnesses to be more open with their responses to questions.

It is important to note that either process results only in an accused to be bound over for trial where the defendant is entitled to a jury of peers and to all other rights guaranteed in the Constitution.
In California, in 2012, all but 15 counties convened a special grand jury from the normal juror pool for criminal indictment procedures. In those 15 counties, the regular grand jury is used for the criminal indictment function in addition to civil grand jury activities.

Civil “Watchdog” Oversight

Penal Code §916 is the source of the grand jury's authority to decide for itself what, of the things it is empowered to do, it wants to do, how to do it, and how much energy to spend doing it. It provides, in part:

Each grand jury shall choose its officers, except the foreman, and shall determine its rules of proceeding. Adoption of its rules of procedure and all public actions of the grand jury, whether concerning criminal or civil matters, unless otherwise prescribed in law, including adoption of final reports, shall be only with the concurrence of that number of grand jurors necessary to find an indictment pursuant to Section 940. [This means 12 of 19 jurors in most counties, 14 of 23 in Los Angeles County, and 8 of 11 in some of the smaller counties – frequently referred to as a “supermajority”.] Rules of procedure shall include guidelines for that grand jury to ensure that all findings included in its final reports are supported by documented evidence, including ... official records, or interviews attended by no fewer than two grand jurors and that all problems identified in a final report are accompanied by suggested means for their resolution, ...

Although the grand jury has very broad discretion as to what it will investigate, as described further below, it is required by law to investigate some aspect of county government. Penal Code §925 provides, in part:
The grand jury shall investigate and report on the operations, accounts, and records of the officers, departments, or functions of the county including those operations, accounts, and records of any special legislative district or other district in the county …. The investigations may be conducted on some selective basis each year, ...

Figure 5. Grand jury members interviewing government official.

In addition, grand juries are required to “inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the county” and into the “willful or corrupt misconduct” of public officers. (PC §919)

The grand jury has broad discretion to investigate and report on other local governments such as cities or joint powers agencies (PC §925a); special districts, including school districts, and the local agency formation commission (PC §933.5); and housing authorities (PC §933.1).

Until they were abolished in 2011, the grand jury was also authorized to investigate county or city redevelopment agencies. Now, they may investigate the successor agency (the county or city) that is charged with winding down the redevelopment agency.

Grand juries may investigate the operations of local school
districts. The authority for investigating school districts is Penal Code §933.5, which states, in part:

A grand jury may at any time examine the books and records of any special-purpose assessment or taxing district located wholly or partly in the county or the local agency formation commission in the county, ... and in addition to any other investigatory powers granted by this chapter, may investigate and report upon the method or system of performing the duties of such district...

California case law explains why, even though school districts are not mentioned in the Penal Code itself, they may be investigated. In Board of Trustees v Leach (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 281, the court held that since assessed property within a school district is subject to a special tax for maintenance of schools in the area, a school district is a “special purpose assessing or taxing district” and is therefore within the grand jury’s jurisdiction.

The court went on to say that §933.5 limits the grand jury’s investigation to the financial affairs of the district. After this case was decided, §933.5 was amended to allow for the investigation of “the method or system of performing the duties” of the district.

So the authority of a grand jury with respect to school districts appears to be limited to administrative and non-policy operational matters and not matters such as personnel issues or curriculum.

Within its jurisdiction, the grand jury has great independence. If the grand jury familiarizes itself with the statutes, especially the Penal Code, it will have the legal basis and authority to decide for itself how to operate and properly exercise its independence.

There are no significant statutory prohibitions on what a grand jury may investigate and very few court-imposed
"prohibitions" so long as the grand jury is acting within its authorized jurisdiction to investigate and report on local government.

The grand jury's civil oversight jurisdiction is almost exclusively limited to local governments such as counties, cities, special districts, and school districts. It does not extend to state or federal activities or to purely private organizations and people not acting in a governmental capacity. The courts are state, not county, operations; they therefore cannot be investigated.

![Figure 6. Grand Jury Working Session.](image)

However, one of the very few things that a grand jury is *required* to do seems to involve the state function.

Penal Code §919(b) states:

*The grand jury shall inquire into the condition and management of the public prisons within the county.*

Unlike the general authorizing statutes that give grand juries investigative powers over only local government, Penal Code §919(b) seems to apply to *state* prisons.
Accusation

As noted earlier, Penal Code §919(c) requires the grand jury to inquire into the willful or corrupt misconduct in office of public officers of every description within the county.

If that investigation leads the grand jury to conclude that a public officer has engaged in willful or corrupt misconduct in office, the grand jury may initiate an Accusation proceeding in the superior court to remove the officer from office. This process is authorized by the Government Code, beginning with §3060, which states:

An accusation in writing against any officer of a district, county, or city, including any member of the governing board or personnel commission of a school district or any humane officer, for willful or corrupt misconduct in office, may be presented by the grand jury of the county for or in which the officer accused is elected or appointed. An accusation may not be presented without the concurrence of at least 12 grand jurors, or at least eight grand jurors in a county in which the required number of members of the grand jury is 11.

The Accusation is a powerful tool with respect to the civil oversight of local public officials. It reaches intentional misconduct or intentional failure to act that violates a law, rule or duty of office. It is tricky to use, but is a potent weapon specially reserved to the grand jury.

The grand jury issues the Accusation, a list of charges, by presenting it to the District Attorney who must file it and start the removal proceeding. The District Attorney may, however, thereafter object to the Accusation and seek its dismissal, but the decision whether or not it is valid lies with the Court.
Reports
Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05 defines the requirements for issuing reports, which are the sole authority of a grand jury, and the requirements for agencies to respond to reports as follows:

933. (a) Each grand jury shall submit to the presiding judge of the superior court a final report of its findings and recommendations that pertain to county government matters during the fiscal or calendar year. Final reports on any appropriate subject may be submitted to the presiding judge of the superior court at any time during the term of service of a grand jury. A final report may be submitted for comment to responsible officers, agencies, or departments, including the county board of supervisors, when applicable, upon finding of the presiding judge that the report is in compliance with this title. For 45 days after the end of the term, the foreperson and his or her designees shall, upon reasonable notice, be available to clarify the recommendations of the report.

(b) ...

(c) No later than 90 days after the grand jury submits a final report on the operations of any public agency ..., 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 ... 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. In any city and county, the mayor shall also comment on the findings and recommendations. ...
(d) As used in this section "agency" includes a department.

933.05. (a) ..., as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:

(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 of the reasons therefore.

(b) ..., 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 therefore.

The following provisions prescribe procedures regarding the final review and release of each grand jury report.
(d) A grand jury may request a subject person or entity to come before the grand jury for the purpose of reading and discussing the findings of the grand jury report that relates to that person or entity in order to verify the accuracy of the findings prior to their release.

(e) During an investigation, the grand jury shall meet with the subject of that investigation regarding the investigation, unless the court, either on its own determination or upon request of the foreperson of the grand jury, determines that such a meeting would be detrimental.

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

Summary
Here is a quick summary of grand jury law:

- A grand jury must adopt its own rules of procedures, including its organizational structure. This must be approved, along with other “public actions,” by the super-majority vote.

- A grand jury, with few exceptions, is free to decide what investigations it will undertake. Investigations are limited to local government activity within the county, including the county itself, cities, special districts, joint powers authorities and, within limits, school districts and certain nonprofit corporations.

- Grand juries operate under strict rules of confidentiality. Their published reports, however,
are a matter of public record along with the government responses.

- Grand juries must issue at least one report on a county activity, but otherwise have broad discretion on other investigative matters.
- All interviews must be conducted by at least two jurors.
- Final reports must include findings and recommendations (suggested means for resolution of problems identified in the findings). Findings may (and, in our view, should) be reviewed with the agency prior to release of the report. The “subject of the investigation” (the department head or other official or board in charge of the function under investigation) must be interviewed during the investigation.
- Agencies must respond to the Findings and Recommendations within prescribed time limits and prescribed responses.
- Grand juries may bring accusations against public officials. The simplest explanation of an accusation is its analogy to impeachment at the federal and state level. The only result is removal from office. An accusation brings charges, but does not determine guilt.

The next two chapters will explain how the law is applied to grand jury operations
Figure 7. Grand Jurors on a site inspection
Chapter IV Selection and Training of Grand Juries

Each of California’s 58 counties impanels a new grand jury annually, as required since 1880. All operate on a July-June fiscal year.

The size of the jury depends on a county’s population: if the population is less than 20,000, there can be 11 members if approved by the board of supervisors; otherwise, it will have 19. In any county of over four million, it is 23 jurors (only Los Angeles County has a population that large). All others consist of 19 members. Well over 150,000 California citizens have served their counties as grand jurors.

Although the grand jury is known as an “arm of the superior court,” each jury’s funding comes directly from the county’s budget – not from the court’s budget. Budgets vary widely, not only in absolute amount but in dollars per citizen. There has been some concern that this bifurcation of fiscal responsibility could cause problems as a county board of supervisors might cut a grand jury budget to reduce the number or quality of investigations into its own operations.

The Penal Code specifies three basic and two additional legal advisors to the jury. There is the presiding or supervising judge, the county counsel, and the district attorney. In addition, a jury may request legal assistance from the California Attorney General. And in some special circumstances, the court may agree to a jury’s request for outside counsel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population 2010</th>
<th>10-11 Grand Jury Budget ($)</th>
<th>Per Capita Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>1,330,271</td>
<td>810,810</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alino</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>6,010</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amador</td>
<td>38,361</td>
<td>69,999</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>64,656</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>40,078</td>
<td>85,167</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>53,483</td>
<td>16,731</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>1,040,428</td>
<td>768,564</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>28,010</td>
<td>61,064</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>231,028</td>
<td>260,018</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>336,456</td>
<td>46,958</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>28,722</td>
<td>47,222</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>44,275</td>
<td>45,218</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>174,528</td>
<td>96,656</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>10,466</td>
<td>15,763</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>329,012</td>
<td>400,450</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>337,466</td>
<td>173,724</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>64,465</td>
<td>63,185</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3,905,065</td>
<td>1,407,827</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modera</td>
<td>250,064</td>
<td>54,647</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>227,400</td>
<td>325,412</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>8,251</td>
<td>71,435</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>87,844</td>
<td>146,925</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>25,073</td>
<td>226,972</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>6,896</td>
<td>13,356</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>14,668</td>
<td>23,245</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>425,021</td>
<td>291,531</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>109,484</td>
<td>56,852</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada*</td>
<td>123,654</td>
<td>144,950</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>1,418,788</td>
<td>250,676</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>55,264</td>
<td>15,771</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>709,210</td>
<td>536,509</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>3,985,218</td>
<td>500,152</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco*</td>
<td>809,429</td>
<td>52,268</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>753,500</td>
<td>173,505</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>499,567</td>
<td>325,417</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>718,457</td>
<td>572,333</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>271,809</td>
<td>275,727</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>1,751,962</td>
<td>155,900</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>261,162</td>
<td>16,877</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>277,223</td>
<td>76,313</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>13,241</td>
<td>12,094</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>44,401</td>
<td>31,917</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>353,446</td>
<td>123,720</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>88,676</td>
<td>91,406</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>53,463</td>
<td>22,434</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>94,748</td>
<td>23,457</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>38,465</td>
<td>11,994</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>15,798</td>
<td>20,127</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>244,771</td>
<td>257,242</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>255,663</td>
<td>28,753</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>873,318</td>
<td>346,225</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>100,246</td>
<td>24,556</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>72,256</td>
<td>23,566</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,286,635</td>
<td>4,052,802</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Grand Jury budgets and per capita cost for FY 2010-11.
The qualifications for serving as a grand juror are simple: A citizen of the United States 18 years or older; a resident of the county for one year immediately prior to being selected; in possession of their natural faculties; of ordinary intelligence, sound judgment, and fair character; and possessed of sufficient knowledge of the English language. These subjective criteria are dealt with during the vetting and interview process.

A grand juror may not be serving as a trial juror in any state court, may not have been discharged as a grand juror within one year, cannot have been convicted of malfeasance in office or any felony or other high crime and cannot be serving as an elected public officer.

How are the grand jurors selected? Some courts send summons or notices from the petit jury rolls; some rely on suggestions by the judges; some conduct extensive outreach; many times there’s a combination approach. It is entirely up to each superior court jurisdiction.

There is information and an application form on most county websites. Once received, the applications are vetted. Some courts use their staffs; others use a committee of judges; many use former grand jurors or current jurors to participate in the preliminary vetting and interview process. The pool is usually reduced to 30 qualified citizens, and the names of the jurors to serve are drawn randomly. If the judge has selected any “holdovers” from the previous jury, they constitute the first of the jurors selected. The court may hold over up to 10 jurors for one additional year.

Usually, additional names are selected as alternates to fill those spots that may become vacated by sitting jurors during the year. The reasons for a juror leaving range from “too much work,” health, moving out of the county, etc.
There are instances where the judge has removed a sitting juror for cause. Unlike in a trial jury, an alternate grand juror has no role until selected and sworn in to replace a juror who has left.

The success of various recruiting efforts varies widely. Many routinely have more than enough volunteers to fill their pool, while others have such significant difficulty that they resort to random selection from the trial jury pool. Several counties have produced high-quality recruitment videos that are posted on the county website and available in DVD format for use in local community settings. CGJA chapters assist in this effort, as well. CGJA also has a generic video available on its website.

Many courts try to seat as diverse a grand jury as possible. For counties where many grand juror hours per week are expected, the selection gravitates to retired people, which biases the jury toward senior citizens. And since English fluency is a requirement, citizens with little or no capacity to understand English are automatically excluded. Geographical diversity within a county is sometimes assured by selecting six from each supervisorial district for the pool of 30. The courts are now required to collect and report demographic data, which supports the concept that diversity should be sought. The recruiting methods mentioned above are used to attract as diverse a group of volunteers as possible.

As mentioned earlier, about 15 of California’s 58 regular grand juries consider indictments together with their civil watchdog responsibilities. In the other counties, a special criminal grand jury is impaneled when required by the district attorney. The Penal Code allows for a second grand jury to be convened, but only two may be serving at any
given time. One exception to this is Los Angeles County, which, because of its large population, is allowed a third grand jury if deemed necessary. Another exception (that has never been invoked) is that San Bernardino County may convene a second “civil” grand jury.

CGJA’s grand juror training seminar covers the essentials, including: history, organization, and concepts such as independence, collegiality, confidentiality, and continuity; local government as to structure, transparency, and ethics; grand jury law; investigations; interviewing; and report writing. We also have presentations from state corrections officials on jail and prison inspections.

Figure 9. Question and Answer Panel Discussion at CGJA Regional Training Seminar
Chapter V How a Grand Jury Does its Job

Getting Organized

Once a new grand jury is sworn in, usually on or about the first of July every year, it has the responsibility to carry out the mandate of the law as well as the charge by the judge who has sworn them in. This chapter will explain how this is done with the notation that we may not cover every possibility, as one thing CGJA has learned through dealing with grand juries is that there are about 58 ways to do just about everything.

![Diagram of Grand Jury Year]

Figure 10. Typical timetable for a grand jury’s term.

Once the grand jury has been selected and sworn in, the sole input of the court into a jury’s organization is the presiding or supervising judge’s selection of the foreperson. The foreperson is the official spokesperson of the jury and must remain available for 45 days following the jury’s
dismissal to explain to the successor jury some details of that jury’s reports. Other than those two code-specified tasks, the foreperson has no more rights than are conferred by each jury’s own Rules of Procedure. The foreperson votes with all other jurors and is not a “tie-breaker.” Usually, the foreperson does not sit on an investigative committee, but will operate as a coordinator and assume the usual duties of a chairperson.

All other officers – foreperson pro tem, secretary, sergeant-at-arms, parliamentarian – whatever a particular jury decides - are selected by the jurors. This is usually done within the first few weeks after impanelment. The other, nearly simultaneous, task necessary for the jury to function is the adoption of its Rules of Procedure.

Figure 11. Typical Grand Jury Organization. Each jury must adopt its own Rules of Procedure and organization structure.
Most juries inherit a set of Rules of Procedure from the previous grand jury. However, PC §916 specifically requires each individual jury to adopt its own Rules of Procedure. As a practical matter, it may be the Rules that were used by a previous jury. However, the grand jury may decide to make some changes or even proceed with an entire rewrite. The court has no input into these Rules. The Rules will specify the officers and their duties, which committees may be formed, how committee chairs are selected, general rules of conduct (*Robert’s Rules of Order, Revised* is usually the fallback for non-specified matters), how grand jury mail is to be handled, the authority of the Editorial Committee, and everything else that is involved with a functioning body.

There is a tremendous difference in grand juries as to their budget, facilities, and hours of work – nearly everything can and does vary within the 58 counties.

A few grand juries have their own building – and there are others that have difficulty finding a place to meet. Some juries have individual desks with computers for each member, an office for the foreperson and for the secretary, and one to three interview rooms. Others constantly seek space.

Some juries meet five days a week with regular office hours; others meet twice a month, and the committees meet whenever they have a need.

Jurors receive a per diem stipend anywhere from $15 to $60 (most at the low end); some are limited to one or two per diems per week; others have no limit. In addition, they are entitled to the mileage reimbursement applicable to
county employees when the jurors are engaged in most grand jury activities. (PC §890)

The law does not set forth what the general working relationship should be between the grand jury and the court. Each superior court interacts differently with its grand jury. Most superior courts are actively involved in the outreach and recruitment process, and most use the same personnel who process the petit jury to do so with the grand jury selection. Some assign personnel time to assist the jury in arranging speakers, interviews, and site visits; to provide administrative services; and to support final report publication and distribution. In some counties, these services are provided by the county instead of the court.

The day-to-day work of a grand jury – investigations and report writing – is performed by its committees, so let’s look at how they are created, organized, and operate.

The jury has its judge-appointed foreperson; it adopts its Rules of Procedure; elects its officers; and agrees on its committees. These are usually somewhat generic: public safety – police and fire; education and libraries; health and human services; environment and transportation; infrastructure; cities; special districts – however each jury agrees to divide its work.

In addition to these investigative committees, there are additional tasks to be undertaken by administrative committees such as editorial, perhaps speakers and site visits, and maybe a social committee, as well.

The next step is assigning jurors to the committees. Usually the foreperson or secretary polls the jurors as to their preferences and allocates committee slots accordingly.
Most jurors will serve on at least two investigative committees. The committee chairs are chosen according to the agreed upon procedure – foreperson assigns or committee votes are the usual variations. Each committee then brainstorms as to possible areas of investigation within their given purview.

Jurors must be careful to avoid conflicts of interest and must recuse themselves from participating in any investigation where there may be an actual or even a perceived conflict of interest. A recent law requires jurors to disclose to the court and foreperson any employment within the prior three years by an agency the grand jury may investigate. The juror must be recused from any part of an investigation of that agency. (PC §916.2)

**Selecting and Conducting Investigations**

As a truly independent body, each jury – by a supermajority – is free to choose its investigative subjects. Absolutely no one – not the court or any outside person or entity – can direct the jury to conduct an investigation. The grand jury is probably the most independent of all government bodies.

Topics for investigation usually come to the jury by three basic avenues – a citizen’s complaint or request for investigation form, topics suggested through the committee process, or occasionally a reference from the immediate preceding jury. Two or more juries may come together and conduct a joint investigation of a multi-county entity. However, each must publish its own individual Final Report.

There are also what we term “non-entity” investigations – those not referencing a particular agency or official. These are county- and or city-wide subjects such as county-owned
vehicles, travel or credit card charges, information technology, Americans with Disabilities Act compliance, and use of Homeland Security funds, information technology, and many others.

While the grand jury is independent, it does have the responsibility to use its resources wisely and conduct meaningful investigations, yielding reports that will make a difference in local government. For example, a jury should not engage in a “fishing expedition” based on some sensational news story. The grand jury has an obligation to prepare responsible, documented and verified reports. It must observe the balance between independence and responsibility.

There is a complaint form on most county websites that may be filled out and submitted to the jury. How each jury deals with such requests is determined by its own Rules of Procedure (e.g., how to handle anonymous complaints). The jury is in no way obligated to investigate any complaint or request for investigation. As a rule, juries will reply with a form letter stating that the matter has been received and taken under advisement. Some juries designate a member as a complaint coordinator to oversee this process.

While grand juries have no legal obligation to act on any complaint, they are well-advised to consider every complaint as a serious matter and give it full attention before deciding whether or not to investigate.

However a subject for investigation is identified – usually by a committee – it requires a vote by the mandated supermajority to actually begin the investigation. The same vote is required to approve a report, as well.
There are four exceptions to the jury’s independence in selecting topics:

First, each grand jury is required to investigate and report on some aspect of a county government function or operation.

Second, if a county board of supervisors asks the grand jury to investigate and report on the needs for increase or decrease of the salaries of the county’s elected officials, it must do so.

Third, each grand jury is required to inquire into the “willful or corrupt misconduct” of public officers.

Fourth, each jury is required to inquire into the condition and management of the public prisons within the county – back to the days of the Grand Inquest. In brief, the term “prison,” that came into the California code about 1872, is usually interpreted as including jails, holding facilities, juvenile detention facilities, etc. It also, however, does include any state prison within the county – an exception to the jurisdictional rule. If there is a state prison in the county, the grand jury has an obligation to inquire into it.

Note the term “inquire.” Although existing for 700 years, does not appear anywhere else in legal codes, and is open to interpretation. Most jurisdictions, at the lowest level, consider an inquiry to be a “walk-through-look-see,” during which jurors ask questions of staff. However, more intensive examinations can be and frequently are done.

Although the Penal Code does not require the jury to write a report following an inquiry, many juries do.
Research, observation and interviews are the three basic methods whereby a jury conducts its investigation.

Juries normally research all of the pertinent information available regarding their subject prior to any interviews or site visits – e.g., codes and regulations under which the entity functions, audits from previous years, procedure and training manuals, even hints that may have appeared in the media. Much of this information is now available electronically which speeds up the process.

The law requires that a minimum of two jurors participate jointly in any phase of an investigation. Thus, all interviews, site visits – everything that pertains to the investigative process – must be attended by two or more jurors. No individual juror is permitted to investigate alone.

At some point in its process, the jury is required to meet with the subject of the investigation – the office holder or head of the department.

Grand juries operate under a code of confidentiality, and are forbidden from divulging interviewees’ identities and source material. No information is ever revealed to an interviewee, and names are never published in reports.

The jury has the right to subpoena a person to testify. This is usually arranged by a request to the judge or through the legal advisor. As a general rule, informing the subject that a subpoena may be issued is sufficient to obtain compliance with the request.

Interviewing may be done at the jury’s offices, at the entity’s place of business, or at any agreed upon location
that enables confidentiality. Grand juries are often approached by “whistle-blowers,” who are obviously wary of being identified. They cannot be interviewed at work and may be reluctant to be seen walking into a building where the jury has its office or even be seen talking to a juror.

In order to ensure accuracy, interviews may be recorded if the subject agrees.

Juries are encouraged to obtain their information from a variety of sources and to be extremely diligent in their efforts to establish factual truths.

Verified facts must support a grand jury’s findings, upon which its recommendations will rest. All findings must be directly supported by factual material, and all recommendations must flow from one or more findings.

Penal Code §916 requires that “all problems identified in a final report are accompanied by suggested means for their resolution, including financial, when applicable.” Thus, the jury is encouraged to be practical in its approach so that its work may be of real benefit to its county. There would be no benefit in telling a financially challenged agency that it should appropriate millions of dollars next year – even on a great program. It could be of benefit if the recommendation showed that the program could be achieved incrementally, or if it could be accomplished in conjunction with other adjacent counties.

**Writing and Issuing Reports**

The only real authority of a grand jury is to conduct an investigation and then issue a report that includes findings and recommendations. The jury has no authority to enforce any recommendation. However, the reports can have
additional impact through the power of the press and the public to pressure the agencies to respond and take action.

Accordingly, preparing and issuing a report becomes a critical step. Most juries use an editorial committee to edit the draft prepared by the investigative committee so that the report is a readable document that can be understood by the agencies to which it is addressed as well as the press and the public. The final document requires approval of the supermajority of the grand jury.

Final reports on individual investigations may be issued at any time during the jury’s one-year term. Juries are encouraged to issue reports throughout the year to get greater public attention. Juries also issue a consolidated report at the end of the term that will include all reports issued during the entire term as well as those not released until this final date.

Typically, there are about 900 reports issued each year by California’s 58 grand juries.

**Confidentiality**

One of the hallmarks of the grand jury going back to its beginnings in England is confidentiality, and it remains one of the most important principles in grand jury work.

Members of the grand jury are sworn to secrecy. All grand jury proceedings are secret. This secrecy guards the public interest and protects the confidentiality of sources. This means that each grand juror must keep secret all evidence adduced before the grand jury, anything said within the grand jury, and the manner in which any grand juror may have voted on a matter (PC §924.1).
An important aspect of confidentiality is that it provides assurance to government officials and employees that anything they say to a grand jury will remain confidential, particularly with respect to the source. Obviously “whistle-blowers” fall into this category.

The minutes and records of grand jury meetings, including email and computer files, cannot be subpoenaed or inspected by anyone. Matters before the grand jury should never be discussed outside the grand jury, even with closest relatives or associates.

The most important aspect of confidentiality is embedded in the oath taken wherein each grand juror swears to maintain complete confidentiality of all work, except information released in a final report. The grand juror’s promise or oath of secrecy is binding for life. By law, it is a misdemeanor to violate the secrecy of the grand jury room. Successful performance of grand jury duties depends upon the secrecy of all proceedings.

Any final report is, of course, a matter of public record, as are all agency responses. But any material developed in the investigation that is not in the final report remains confidential. A grand jury must not divulge any evidence concerning the testimony of witnesses or comments made by other grand jurors. “Leaks” concerning grand jury proceedings inevitably impair or even destroy the effectiveness of the entire grand jury and might be evidence in a libel suit against the grand juror and possibly the entire grand jury. The confidentiality of interviewees and complainants is critical and required by law. Reports should be written so that an interviewee cannot be identified. Interviewees probably will not volunteer
sensitive information if they have fears about being identified.

While conducting interviews or making field trips, grand jurors must not discuss or reveal any information regarding grand jury business, plans, or investigations.

To preserve privacy and confidentiality, the grand jury room should be locked at all times when it is not in use for meetings. Sensitive, unwanted documents and computer files should be destroyed per the grand jury’s Rules of Procedure.

Confidentiality is also an aspect of collegiality (see next page), since jurors can be confident that anything they say or write in the jury room will not be repeated outside the grand jury environment.

Many juries read to witnesses a confidentiality statement, known as an “admonishment,” to preserve the confidential nature of the investigation. Compliance with confidentiality by witnesses is largely unenforceable, although a breach could lead to a contempt of court citation. Grand jurors must always keep their oath of confidentiality.

Witnesses may also be administered an oath to tell the truth, which is different than the admonishment. A recent provision in the Penal Code provides that when a witness is put under oath in the course of a civil investigation, the witness may have an attorney present to give advice to the witness. The attorney has very limited authority and cannot speak to the jurors or object to questions. (PC §939.22)
The Grand Jury is a Collegial Body

Penal Code §916 provides that the grand jury, as a body, has the authority to make all decisions regarding its rules of proceeding and public actions. The grand jury, therefore, by definition, is a collegial rather than a hierarchical body. “Collegial,” however, does not mean “unstructured.” Rather, it means: “characterized by or having power or authority vested equally in each of a number of colleagues; equal sharing of authority.” (Webster Revised Unabridged Dictionary)

A grand jury is a meeting of equals. This can be a tough concept for some jurors whose life and work have been hierarchical. Jurors come from all walks of life; some may have been members of the military or governing bodies, licensed professionals or corporate executive officers. Others come from more modest walks of life, perhaps blue collar or office workers. Again, all are equal; no one outranks anyone else. Usually, an individual’s talent for the assorted tasks close-at-hand will become evident to all as collegiality is developed.

An important element of a collegial body is "jurorship," the recognition that each juror brings a unique set of perspectives and should not hesitate to speak up, question authority, question the answers, be tenacious, agree, and disagree, as appropriate. Jurorship also includes being reasonable, polite, and collegial; listening carefully to other jurors; and speaking as clearly and succinctly as possible.

Having a say is important. Jurors in the minority on a vote should not feel left out if they have been afforded the opportunity to share their views, voice their concerns, and make their case. That their own personal view has not been adopted is less important than having been given fair and
equal consideration. Likewise, jurors who keep their views to themselves and fail to comment when there is something to offer are not fulfilling their duty as grand jurors.

Each juror has a responsibility to speak up and to be candid and direct. One of the major benefits of collegial brainstorming is that clashing thoughts often give birth to wholly novel ideas that could not have been generated without the conflict. The free flow of all views during jury deliberations, including expressions of honest and respectful disagreement, is essential to an effectively functioning, collegial democratic process.

**Continuity**

Continuity is a subject not explicitly addressed in the Penal Code sections that define the duties and authority of the grand jury. However, we can derive a definition of continuity from the law and past practices. There are elements of continuity required by the law and elements not required but allowed.

Grand juries tend to work in isolation from their predecessors and successors for various reasons. First, grand juries are allowed, even required, to conduct only those investigations they deem fit to do and must adopt their own rules and procedures.

Second, grand juries are restricted in how they may use the work of their predecessors by adhering to the requirement that any report must be based on its own investigation (PC §939.9).

Finally, grand juries may not be interested in the prior jury’s work as they wish to concentrate on their own work. Grand juries have every legal right to do this, but most
grand juries pay attention to the work of prior juries. That is largely what continuity is all about.

The principle element of continuity is for a grand jury to review the responses to the prior grand jury’s reports in order to: let the community know that someone is watching; publicize the responses, giving credit where credit is due or admonishing an agency that has been non-responsive; and generally keep the public informed about the continuous nature of grand jury work. The media can be an important ally in this effort.

We can therefore conclude that while a grand jury is free to do as it wishes in this regard, should it decide to follow up on prior work, the law provides the tools to do so.

**Benefits to Grand Jurors**

So far we have seen that much good can come from grand jury reports, and more evidence will be presented in the next chapter.

But there is another aspect of grand jury work almost as important: the benefit to the jurors themselves. Many jurors describe the immense satisfaction of serving on a grand jury that includes a feeling of contribution to improving local government, a sense of giving back to the community, feelings of camaraderie, and the making of lifelong friends.

These benefits usually compensate for the full year of service to which all grand jurors commit.
Chapter VI Grand Jury Achievements

Many citizens who are familiar with the watchdog role of California’s grand juries will ask, “What good have they done?” What can a group of average citizens with no particular expertise in government affairs accomplish in a year? The best answer comes from a well-known quote by famed anthropologist, Margaret Mead, “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful people could change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.”

One way to demonstrate this point is to document the impact of grand jury reports over the years and throughout the state. CGJA has initiated an effort to collect such data and has produced a report titled Grand Jury Achievements. Following are selected examples. These examples range from some seemingly very minor improvements to major taxpayer financial savings. But even what to some seem minor may be very important to that particular community.

- An order to prohibit county employees from receiving mileage reimbursement for travelling to and from work was rescinded as not being legal.

- A potential for a chlorine gas disaster was called to the public agency’s attention.

- City council members removed themselves from the housing authority board to eliminate any perception of a conflict of interest.

- County officials eliminated a loophole that allowed county employees to avoid the civil service system.
Because of concern with special education needs, an entire school board was voted out of office and the superintendent of schools resigned.

The process of selecting and voting for special district boards was improved to comply with the law.

A public guardian was removed from office and criminally charged for violating the trust of those whose funds were under supervision.

The dangers of steroid use in high schools are now being taught in high schools along with other health warnings.

Improved care of jail inmates and reduced risk to the general population has been achieved.

Notable strides were made in standardizing and strengthening the control of pharmacy distribution of medication throughout the county medical facilities, resulting in reduced medical errors.

Recommendation to grade restaurants was implemented after ten years of grand jury reporting.

Additional funding was secured to implement a series of recommendations to improve operations of the county coroner’s office.

Unpaid fines were computerized; payment-due notices were reinstituted; and collection procedures were centralized – resulting in increased county revenue.
• Franchise fees now being collected in a timely manner.

• Juvenile inmates are no longer being housed in the men’s central jail.

• A city and a county water district came to agreement on dividing responsibility for upgrading the district’s water system.

• A potential of $8 million of property tax refunds were in the process of being made to property owners.

• County agencies were notified of their ability to take advantage of a commodity procurement system to save money. The enrollment fee for this program was waived.

• A senior center was determined to have a history demonstrating abuse of employees, a disrespectful demeanor towards the seniors, a neglected facility, deteriorating programs, and an excessive compensation package for the executive director. The director resigned and the new director immediately implemented changes and improvements. This particular case was an example where local media coverage amplified the grand jury’s report and helped bring about change.

• A report reviewed governmental deficiencies in a farm worker housing facility causing costs to overrun contracted expenditures by $1.75 million - nearly doubling the original projected outlay. The
report labeled the absence of control by those responsible for the projects “a failure in governmental stewardship.” The recommendations also included implementation of a leadership training program.

- A county auditor was deemed unfit for office and was forced to resign.

- A county library system was deemed poorly managed with fraudulent official behavior. Officials resigned and some convicted of fraud.

One aspect of determining the impact of grand jury reports is that often the agreement to a recommendation and the implementation make take years – years to agree after several grand juries will make the recommendation and more years to implement the change. Thus, it takes persistence by grand jurors, both current and past, to record and publicize these achievements.

In addition to effective reports, there are a number of examples of successful use of the Accusation authority of the grand jury. In one city, the mayor was removed from office for harassing a property owner who would not sell the mayor a piece of property. In a county, the sheriff was removed from office for not reporting alleged sexual harassment offenses. Sometimes the mere threat of an accusation will create the desired result; i.e., resignation of an official.
Figure 12. A Sample of Grand Jury Final Report Covers
Figure 13. Additional Sample Covers
Chapter VII The California Grand Jurors’ Association

In 1982, a group of former grand jurors representing many of California’s 58 counties founded the California Grand Jurors’ Association to promote public awareness of and offer support to county grand juries. Today, CGJA members include both current and former grand jurors throughout California.

CGJA is organized as a tax-exempt California nonprofit public benefit corporation as specified in Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Association seeks to educate new grand jurors, public officials and the general public about the contribution grand juries make to improve the effectiveness of local government entities within their counties.

CGJA’s outreach emphasis is directed at supporting grand juries with adequate references and training to produce effectual final reports on government entities.

Since CGJA’s founding in 1982, its members have become

- Trainers for new grand jurors statewide
- Champions of grand jury preservation at the California Legislature
- Statewide resources for information on the California grand jury system
Training
Since the late 1990s, CGJA has sponsored regional training seminars and on-site training programs for new grand jurors throughout California. Currently, over 90 percent of all sitting grand jurors participate in our training programs each year.

Training Seminars and Workshops
CGJA conducts low-cost, two-day regional and on-site training seminars presented by experienced trainers with legal, investigative, writing, and educational backgrounds.

CGJA also conducts separate workshops for forepersons and pro tems that focus on leadership and organizational skills required to build a cohesive and competent panel of jurors.

CGJA conducts full day report writing workshops throughout the state in the fall of each year.

Research & Analysis
CGJA tracks legislative, judicial, and legal developments; conducts periodic surveys of grand jury practices; and provides tools for jurors to search for topics of interest through its website.

Outreach
CGJA conducts ongoing outreach through various media to educate both citizens and officials about what the state’s 58 regular grand juries are doing.
CGJA maintains a comprehensive website; distributes a bimonthly newsletter to members and impaneled grand juries; holds an annual conference where members meet face to face, exchange ideas, and learn from speakers on topics of interest to grand jurors; exchanges information and networks with all county grand juries; and responds to inquiries from grand jurors, the media, and public officials.

A list of publications with important references on grand juries, including a *Compendium of California Grand Jury Law*, is available to grand juries on request.

CGJA documents and publicizes effective grand jury reports that accomplish an improvement in local government operations. CGJA gives media and grand jury “Excellence in Reporting” awards for grand jury reports that result in improvements to local government

CGJA has produced educational videos and brochures informing the public of county grand juries and has distributed them to media and public interest groups.

*Figure 14. Panel Discussion at CGJA Annual Conference*
The CGJA Mission Statement
The CGJA mission is to promote, preserve, and support the grand jury system through training, education, and outreach.

Purpose Statement
1. To provide the general public with informational and educational materials and activities on the California Grand Jury system that will help increase public awareness of the valuable role the grand jury plays in our democratic system of government, and

2. To promote comprehensive training and orientation of all new grand jurors throughout the state, and

3. To promote adequate funding, office and meeting facilities, and other support as typically required by grand juries be provided to them in all counties throughout the state pursuant to fulfilling their lawful duties, and

4. To promote the preservation of all grand jury reports issued throughout the state during its history both in counties of origin and in a centralized state archival repository accessible to the public, historians, scholars, students and other researchers, and

5. To advocate publication of all grand jury reports and official responses to those reports in a public newspaper or other medium for community wide distribution to educate the public regarding the final grand jury investigative findings and recommendations and the official reactions to them, and
6. To advocate that social studies and history classes and texts in California secondary schools contain comprehensive information regarding the role of the grand jury in California, and

7. To publish a statewide informational newsletter to provide current information concerning issues, events and activities regarding the grand jury, and

8. To sponsor an annual statewide conference of grand jurors and others interested in matters pertaining to the preservation and enhancement of the California Grand Jury institution, and

9. To work toward the preservation and enhancement of the grand jury system by studying issues or legislation that specifically pertains to the grand jury and to make recommendations based on non-partisan analysis to the appropriate body or legislature, and

10. To undertake any other efforts consistent with the foregoing that will increase the public knowledge of the grand jury system and the contributions it has made, and continues to make, to California's citizenry and toward good government.
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