


LOS ANGELES COUNTY

GRAND JURY



*Final
Report*

1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE

	Page
Preface	3
Letter to Presiding Judge	5
Jurors and Nominating Judges	7
Officers and Committees	9
Letter to Board of Supervisors	11
Letter to District Attorney	13
Letter to Sheriff	15
Letter to Chief of Police	17
An Acknowledgment	19
Foreman's Summary of Major Recommendations	21

PART TWO

Committee Reports

Administrative	25
Audit	27
Criminal Complaints	41
Jails	53
Juvenile	55
Schools	57
Smog	69
Social Services	71
Insurance (Special Committee)	77

PART THREE

Reference Index to Recommendations	81
--	----

PREFACE

The meat and substance of any report are its recommendations.

Many previous Grand Juries have left a special message for the succeeding Grand Jury as to studies they felt should be pursued or areas covered in some fashion.

Rather, we have incorporated all recommendations with the report of the Committee in which they originated. In this way it can be seen more clearly how they came into being and in what way they carried out suggestions of the 1962 Grand Jury. They indicate as well any unfinished business for the 1964 Grand Jury. In some instances a complete statement, recommendation or resolution is appended.

Part Three of this report consists of an index of these recommendations for easy reference.

HARRY L. HARRIS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MYRON J. CARR, JR.
FOREMAN

MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
SECRETARY

MRS. RICHARD C. BARRETT
MYRON J. CARR, JR.
CHESTER G. HANSON
HARRY L. HARRIS
MRS. BRIAN HARVEY
TARO KANOW
JOSEPH R. KNAPP
LOUIS KORNHANDLER
CHARLES HENRY MACDONALD
MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1963 GRAND JURY

548 HALL OF JUSTICE

LOS ANGELES 12

MA 9-2451

ABNER PARKER
MRS. GIFFORD PHILLIPS
MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
DR. HELEN G. SMITH
MRS. RAYMOND G. STANBURY
ELMER H. STRUEBING
WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
MRS. ISABELLE H. WADSWORTH
MRS. ALVIN WILSON

December 11, 1963

The Honorable Donald R. Wright
Presiding Judge, Criminal Division
Superior Court
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Judge Wright:

On behalf of the Los Angeles County Grand Jury I deem it an honor to submit to you our final report.

It is with great respect and appreciation that I address you in our closing days of service. This year will be remembered by all of us with great pride, and the humble hope that we have been able to contribute in some degree to the betterment and success of our great County. I know I speak the sentiments of each Grand Juror who has been privileged to serve under your guidance.

Our work averaged at least four days per week. The cases heard ranged in time of hearing from one hour to three weeks, the majority consuming a length of three or four days. A total of 1108 witnesses were heard, in all cases. To this end goes my entire appreciation and thanks to the Jurors for their untiring devotion to their duty to Los Angeles County.

Your wise counsel, whenever sought, was always given willingly and without hesitation. As Foreman, it was my duty to call upon you from time to time regarding various important matters encountered in the course of our work. On numerous occasions I came to you for such advice and always found you to be extremely patient, courteous, and helpful.

I am deeply grateful for the confidence you reposed in me in your appointment of me as Foreman of this year's Grand Jury. My efforts to fulfill this responsibility have been sincere, and I trust I have in some measure lived up to your expectations and those of my nominating judges.

Most sincerely,

MYRON J. CARR, JR.
Foreman

The members of the 1963 Grand Jury of Los Angeles County and the names of the Superior Court judges who nominated them are listed below:

JUROR

JUDGE

MYRON J. CARR, Jr. (Foreman)

FREDERICK W. MAHL and

CHARLES R. THOMPSON

MRS. RICHARD C. BARRETT

LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND

CHESTER G. HANSON

FREDERICK F. HOUSER

HARRY L. HARRIS

CLARENCE L. KINCAID

MRS. BRIAN HARVEY

RALPH H. NUTTER

TARO KANOW

JOHN F. AISO

JOSEPH R. KNAPP

V. P. LUCAS

LOUIS KORNHANDLER

ALFRED GITELSON

CHARLES HENRY MacDONALD

A. A. SCOTT

MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY

THOMAS C. YAGER

ABNER PARKER

BEN KOENIG

MRS. GIFFORD PHILLIPS

MACKLIN FLEMING

MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS

OTTO J. EMME

DR. HELEN G. SMITH

BERNARD S. JEFFERSON

MRS. RAYMOND G. STANBURY

BENJAMIN LANDIS

ELMER H. STRUEBING

BAYARD RHONE

WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN

EUGENE P. FAY

MRS. ISABELLE H. WADSWORTH

WALTER C. ALLEN

MRS. ALVIN WILSON

GEORGE FRANCIS

OFFICERS

Myron J. Carr, Jr., Foreman
Harry L. Harris, Foreman Pro Tem
Mrs. Jessie R. Roberts, Secretary
Louis Kornhandler, Sergeant-at-Arms

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administrative

Harry L. Harris, Chairman
Mrs. Gladys M. Molony, Secretary
Myron J. Carr, Jr.
Chester G. Hanson
Mrs. Brian Harvey
Joseph R. Knapp
Charles Henry MacDonald
Abner Parker
Mrs. Jessie R. Roberts
William D. Sullivan

Audit

Joseph R. Knapp, Chairman
Mrs. Alvin Wilson, Secretary
Harry L. Harris
Mrs. Gladys M. Molony
Abner Parker
Mrs. Gifford Phillips
William D. Sullivan

Criminal Complaints

Chester G. Hanson, Chairman
Taro Kanow, Secretary
Harry L. Harris
Joseph R. Knapp
Charles Henry MacDonald
Mrs. Raymond G. Stanbury
Mrs. Isabelle H. Wadsworth
Mrs. Alvin Wilson

Jails

Charles Henry MacDonald, Chairman
Mrs. Isabelle H. Wadsworth, Secretary
Harry L. Harris
Taro Kanow
Louis Kornhandler
Dr. Helen G. Smith
Mrs. Raymond G. Stanbury

Juvenile

Abner Parker, Chairman
Mrs. Gifford Phillips, Secretary
Mrs. Richard C. Barrett
Mrs. Brian Harvey
Mrs. Jessie R. Roberts
Dr. Helen G. Smith
Elmer H. Struebing
Mrs. Isabelle H. Wadsworth

Schools

Mrs. Brian Harvey, Chairmar
Dr. Helen G. Smith, Secretary
Chester G. Hanson
Abner Parker
Mrs. Gifford Phillips
Mrs. Jessie R. Roberts
Elmer H. Struebing

Smog

William D. Sullivan, Chairman
Mrs. Alvin Wilson, Secretary
Mrs. Richard C. Barrett
Taro Kanow
Charles Henry MacDonald
Mrs. Gladys M. Molony
Elmer H. Struebing

Social Services

Mrs. Gladys M. Molony, Chairman
Mrs. Richard C. Barrett, Secretary
Chester G. Hanson
Mrs. Brian Harvey
Louis Kornhandler
Mrs. Jessie R. Roberts
Mrs. Raymond G. Stanbury
Mrs. Alvin Wilson

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Dinner

Mrs. Isabelle H. Wadsworth, Chairman
Mrs. Gladys M. Molony, Secretary
Myron J. Carr, Jr.
Harry L. Harris

Final Report

Myron J. Carr, Jr., Chairman
Mrs. Isabelle H. Wadsworth, Secretary
Mrs. Alvin Wilson

Insurance

William D. Sullivan, Chairman
Mrs. Alvin Wilson, Secretary
Taro Kanow
Elmer H. Struebing

HARRY L. HARRIS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MYRON J. CARR, JR.
FOREMAN

MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
SECRETARY

MRS. RICHARD C. BARRETT
MYRON J. CARR, JR.
CHESTER G. HANSON
HARRY L. HARRIS
MRS. BRIAN HARVEY
TARO KANOW
JOSEPH R. KNAPP
LOUIS KORNHANDLER
CHARLES HENRY MACDONALD
MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
1963 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES 12
MA 9-2451

ABNER PARKER
MRS. GIFFORD PHILLIPS
MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
DR. HELEN G. SMITH
MRS. RAYMOND G. STANBURY
ELMER H. STRUEBING
WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
MRS. ISABELLE H. WADSWORTH
MRS. ALVIN WILSON

December 11, 1963

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attention: Supervisor Warren M. Dorn, Chairman

Gentlemen:

To the members of your Honorable Board, as the official directors of all departments of our County government, the 1963 Grand Jury wishes to express its appreciation of the cooperation and assistance it has received in pursuance of its duties.

We hope that our surveys and audits have met with your approval and that the work we have done will prove to be of assistance to you and the citizens of Los Angeles County in the future.

We will place in your hands, and in the hands of interested department heads, copies of our annual report, in which you will note special recommendations to your Honorable Board.

Respectfully yours,

MYRON J. CARR, Jr.
Foreman

MJC:jsf

HARRY L. HARRIS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MYRON J. CARR, JR.
FOREMAN

MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
SECRETARY

MRS. RICHARD C. BARRETT
MYRON J. CARR, JR.
CHESTER G. HANSON
HARRY L. HARRIS
MRS. BRIAN HARVEY
TARO KANOW
JOSEPH R. KNAPP
LOUIS KORNHANDLER
CHARLES HENRY MACDONALD
MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
1963 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES 12
MA 9-2451

ABNER PARKER
MRS. GIFFORD PHILLIPS
MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
DR. HELEN G. SMITH
MRS. RAYMOND G. STANBURY
ELMER H. STRUEBING
WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
MRS. ISABELLE H. WADSWORTH
MRS. ALVIN WILSON

December 11, 1963

Honorable William B. McKesson
District Attorney for Los Angeles County
Hall of Justice
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Judge McKesson:

As the 1963 Grand Jury approaches the conclusion of its session, its members have requested me to express our appreciation for the fine cooperation we have received from you and all members of your department, especially the extremely competent deputies who have worked with us. We have valued very highly the counsel received from Fred Henderson, our legal advisor, and the able assistance of our Grand Jury staff.

The experience has been most rewarding to us, and has provided an understanding of County government and of the problems confronting public officials which could not be gained in any other way.

As we close this year we are aware that you are coming to the end of your own public career. We trust that you have found great satisfaction in the fine public service you have rendered.

Yours very truly,

MYRON J. CARR, Jr,
Foreman

MJC:jsf

HARRY L. HARRIS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MYRON J. CARR, JR.
FOREMAN

MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
SECRETARY

MRS. RICHARD C. BARRETT
MYRON J. CARR, JR.
CHESTER G. HANSON
HARRY L. HARRIS
MRS. BRIAN HARVEY
TARO KANDW
JOSEPH R. KNAPP
LOUIS KORNHANDLER
CHARLES HENRY MACDONALD
MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1963 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES 12
MA 9-2451

ABNER PARKER
MRS. GIFFORD PHILLIPS
MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
DR. HELEN G. SMITH
MRS. RAYMOND G. STANBURY
ELMER H. STRUEDING
WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
MRS. ISABELLE H. WADSWORTH
MRS. ALVIN WILSON

December 11, 1963

Honorable Peter J. Pitchess
Sheriff, Los Angeles County
Hall of Justice
211 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Sheriff:

As the 1963 Grand Jury approaches the conclusion of its session the members have requested me to express our appreciation for the splendid cooperation received from your office.

We have learned with pride of the high caliber of deputies in your department. We recognize that this is the result of the great care taken in their screening and the excellence of your training program.

As members of the Jails Committee of the Grand Jury have gone about their duties, they have been impressed with the fine quality of management in your department. We feel that the majority of your employees are genuinely interested in their work and are giving a day's work for a day's pay. This reflects credit on your leadership and that of your official family.

Sincerely yours,

MYRON J. CARR, Jr.
Foreman

MJC:jst

HARRY L. HARRIS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MRS. RICHARD C. BARRETT
MYRON J. CARR, JR.
CHESTER G. HANSON
HARRY L. HARRIS
MRS. BRIAN HARVEY
TARO KANOW
JOSEPH R. KNAPP
LOUIS KORNHANDLER
CHARLES HENRY MACDONALD
MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY

MYRON J. CARR, JR.
FOREMAN

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1963 GRAND JURY

548 HALL OF JUSTICE

LOS ANGELES 12

MA 9-2451

MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
SECRETARY

ABNER PARKER
MRS. GIFFORD PHILLIPS
MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
DR. HELEN G. SMITH
MRS. RAYMOND G. STANBURY
ELMER H. STRUEBING
WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
MRS. ISABELLE H. WADSWORTH
MRS. ALVIN WILSON

December 11, 1963

Honorable William H. Parker
Chief of Police
Los Angeles Police Department
150 North Los Angeles Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Chief:

As the 1963 Grand Jury approaches the conclusion of its session the members have requested me to express our appreciation for the cooperation received from your office.

As the Jails Committee of the Grand Jury has inspected city jails and other facilities, we have noted the generally excellent quality of management in your department. We are aware of the dedication required in a department such as yours to meet the grave responsibilities with which you are confronted every day in the year.

May we further commend your new officers, as they come out of school and go into undercover work with the narcotics detail, for the fine way they are helping to stem the flow of narcotics in our city.

Very truly yours,

MYRON J. CARR, Jr.
Foreman

MJC:jsf

AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT

No newly impaneled Grand Jury can begin to function without the able assistance of an experienced staff. The 1963 Grand Jury was especially blessed in this regard.

Our staff of fine people, who have become our fast friends, knew exactly how to assist us with tact, patience and understanding. They could be relied upon to provide the information we needed when we needed it and where we needed it. They never counted hours or considered personal convenience, and their special knowledge in their respective fields was invaluable throughout the year.

We take this opportunity to offer our profound thanks to these people:

Fred M. Henderson, Deputy District Attorney, our legal advisor

Joseph A. Gebhart, Investigator

Lila S. Boyd, Secretary

Johanna Friederich, Secretary

Ronald V. Olds, Court Reporter

FOREMAN'S REPORT ON MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE GRAND JURY TO OFFICIAL BODIES

In order to give the people of Los Angeles County a brief picture of the formal recommendations made by the Jury during the course of its year's work, the Foreman makes the following report.

On two occasions the Grand Jury made recommendations calling for action at the State level:

1. The Grand Jury recommended that the so-called Brown Act, which requires that meetings of public bodies be open to the public, should be strengthened by amendment to make its enforcement more effective. This is described in detail in the Criminal Complaints Committee report.
2. The Grand Jury recommended to Governor Edmund G. Brown that the subject of conviction of teachers on charges of sex deviation be included in any call for a special session of the 1964 Legislature.

The Grand Jury also made recommendations to the County Board of Supervisors, as follows:

1. A recommendation that action be taken to expand the responsibilities of County Building Inspectors with respect to any observed violations of the State Industrial Safety Code. This grew out of the indictment of two persons on a charge of Manslaughter, due to alleged negligence in protecting workmen on the Playboy construction project in Hollywood. The details of this recommendation are given in the Criminal Complaints Committee's report.
2. A recommendation was made that additional personnel be provided for the Sheriff's Department due to a critical shortage. This was caused by dividing jurisdiction of the California Highway Patrol and placing the burden of patrolling the highways within the County upon the Sheriff and police of the cities within the County. With fine cooperation the Sheriff and police of the cities have accepted this duty, but it has resulted in a serious shortage of the manpower needed to discharge properly other functions of the Sheriff's Department. It is to relieve this situation that the Jury recommends providing for additional personnel.
3. A recommendation that a Citizens Committee be established to study and report to the Board on the operations and administration of the criminal

laws of the State as they affect law enforcement in Los Angeles County. This was probably the most important recommendation made by the Grand Jury.

4. A recommendation that more effective controls be established to prevent substantial losses in supplies in the County General Hospital and the Harbor General Hospital. Such losses had been disclosed to the Grand Jury by its Contract Auditor.

5. A recommendation that the Board employ a private consulting organization, skilled in making studies and reports on the operations of government departments and agencies, to survey operations in the County Department of Charities, as administered under State laws, rules and regulations, as well as under County ordinances.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

Areas which we believe deserve special attention of the Board of Supervisors are as follows:

1. Long range capital project planning.
2. Present and future plans for building and space utilization by the County.
3. Rapid transit in the County.
4. Cooperation, consolidation and financing of like functions in the County and the cities within its boundaries.

MYRON J. CARR
Foreman

PART TWO

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

This Committee was composed of the Foreman, the Secretary, Foreman pro tem, and the chairman of each of the following committees:

Audit
Criminal Complaints
Jails
Juvenile
Schools
Smog
Social Services

The purpose of the Administrative Committee was to establish general working rules for the Jury and to coordinate all Jury Committees. Certain regular meeting days each month were assigned to each.

A most valuable help to all Jurors in planning their work was the use of the south blackboard as a calendar. The secretary of the Administrative Committee kept it up to date and at least three weeks were shown in advance at all times.

Three special committees were appointed by the Foreman at Administrative meetings. They were:

1. A committee to make arrangements for the dinner honoring the judges.
2. A committee to determine the format of final reports.
3. A committee to look into the matter of excessive cost of workmen's compensation insurance rates for County employees.

The final business of the Administrative Committee was to assign certain days for each Committee to meet and consider its final report.

HARRY L. HARRIS
Chairman

AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT

At the outset of its activities the Audit Committee, with the approval of the full Jury and Judge Donald R. Wright, made two major decisions: The first decision was to appoint a new Contract Auditor; the second was to use one firm for all the examination work, instead of using several firms under a subcontract pattern which had prevailed for a number of years.

We have never since had a moment of doubt as to the soundness of those decisions. Not only the members of the Audit Committee but those of the entire Jury feel that our Contract Auditor, Walter H. Lohman, and his associates in Arthur Young & Company, have done an outstanding job in pinpointing and drawing out some of the County's basic problems and weaknesses. He has guided and led us, and in more than one instance has kept us on track and on target when we might otherwise have misdirected our attention and effort. His interest, and that of his associates in working with us, was not only professional, but personal and sincere.

Our Contract Auditor has not focused attention just on problems, but has pointed the way to solutions. The veins which run through the reports which have been submitted to us and to County officials point toward cost reductions, eliminations of duplications, rejection of unnecessary procedures and records, and an over-all practical, business-like approach to the County's operating problems.

The reports which have been prepared point the way to present annual cost reductions and recoverable costs in excess of \$1,600,000, aside from one item of \$3,500,000 spent but not recovered in fiscal 1963 for fire protection service provided in areas of State-wide interest.

The Contract Auditor's reports are co-ordinated, easily understandable, action rather than discussion-type documents. We commend them to study and action by each member of the Board of Supervisors and by every County officer and administrator who is charged with conserving funds, eliminating nonessentials and holding the line against tax increases.

As our assignments and reviews were completed during the year, our Contract Auditor reviewed his findings and suggestions with the personnel responsible for the areas examined. In some instances, informal meetings were held of the Audit Committee, department heads and their assistants, and the Contract Auditor. In both the Contract Auditor's meetings and those held by the Audit Committee with department heads, many problem areas and the related or resultant recommendations were resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee.

It would be impractical to list here the numerous findings and 200 recommendations contained in the Contract Auditor's reports. (A full report may be found on file in the office of the Grand Jury.) Many of them have been accepted and agreed upon by the administrative personnel concerned, some are still under study, some are to be subjected to pilot test programs, and a relative few have met with resistance. For the convenience of the 1964 Audit Committee members and County personnel, the Contract Auditor's final report includes a complete summary of recommendations which should be followed-up in 1964. We have asked the Chief Administrative Officer to respond to certain of those recommendations as well as to the contents of this report, when he prepares comments for the Board of Supervisors, as required by Section 933 of the Penal Code.

Our comments are intentionally not a lengthy, detailed recital of all findings and recommendations. Rather, they are a partial summary of our reviews, an expression of some of our concerns, and a few basic over-all suggestions for County administrators.

Examinations and Reviews directed by the Audit Committee

Matters of County-wide significance or involving a number of departments

- Review and Evaluation of the Data Processing Unit of the Office of Chief Administrative Officer, and the County's Existing and Near-term plans for Data Processing Installations
- Review of Payroll and Personnel Records maintained for Employees
- Review of Property Records
- Review and Evaluation of Budget Processes and Controls
- Review of Administration and Execution of the Superior Court's Rule 28 Program
- Real Estate Management
- Examination of Provisions for Contingencies Fund

Departmental Examinations and Reviews

- Air Pollution Control District
- Auditor-Controller
 - General Claims, Special Claims and Accounting Divisions
 - Audit Division
 - Frequency of Audits Performed
 - Audit Procedures and General Effectiveness
 - Claims and Collections Section
- Department of Charities
 - Bureau of Public Assistance
 - Old Age Security Program
 - Medical Assistance for the Aged and Medical Services to Public

Assistance Recipients programs

General Hospital

Harbor General Hospital — Linen and Laundry Division

Long Beach General Hospital — Linen Controls

Olive View Hospital

Rancho Los Amigos Hospital — Capital Projects Expenditures

County Engineer

Flood Control District — Accounts Receivable

Forester and Fire Warden

Mechanical Department

Parks and Recreation Department

Purchasing and Stores Department

Road Department

Treasurer — Count and Reconciliation of Cash and Securities

Review of Recommendations included in Audit Reports submitted to Grand Juries in the years 1956 through 1962

Review of Action Completed and Progress Made in the Public Administrator-Public Guardian's Department since mid-1962

Data Processing Installations

Decisions which are made in the near future with respect to the courses the County will follow in acquiring and using sophisticated data processing equipment will affect for many years to come the costs (now \$4,500,000 annually) to which the County will be committed and the effectiveness of the use it will derive from data processing equipment. We urge that diligent consideration be given to the Contract Auditor's recommendations,

"We believe that development and adoption of an over-all, co-ordinated long-range plan — spearheaded and directed by the Data Processing Unit — is vitally necessary to adequately provide for the growing needs of the County, within reasonable cost limits. We strongly recommend movement in that direction, and with it, serious consideration of the data processing centers concept which we have outlined."

Payroll and Property Records

The reviews which have been made of payroll records maintained for employees, and of property records for the quarter-million pieces of equipment owned by the County, both point the way to substantial annual cost reductions (\$155,000 to \$214,000) through elimination of duplicate procedures and reports, and the accompanying inevitable duplication of personnel.

Budget Processes

The County's 1963-64 budget provides approximately \$325,000,000 (about 38% of the total) for salaries, wages and employees' benefits. It appears to us

that the most significant area in which the Board of Supervisors can obtain cost reductions, while still maintaining adequate levels of service, lies in the application of industry-proved management cost control techniques in the determination of personnel budgets. We believe the potential cost reductions are huge, not only for 1963-64 but for all future years.

Rule 28 Program

Administration of the Superior Court's mushrooming Rule 28 case load has been — and is — a massive internal processing problem, as well as a problem with social overtones and involving County public relations. We agree with and endorse the conclusions of the Contract Auditor's study in which he suggests, (1) physical consolidation of the Court Trustee and the District Attorney's Reciprocal Support Division, and (2) transfer of the Court Trustee function from the Probation Department to the Executive Officer of the Superior Court — the body basically responsible for Rule 28 cases.

Real Estate Management

We are concerned over the still-unsatisfactory aspects of the leasing of property to provide facilities for County operations. We urge that publicity and competitive bidding replace the practice of negotiation for major sites and facilities.

We are equally concerned at the Board of Supervisors' pursuit of a policy of leasing facilities from outsiders for long terms, at substantial rentals, without making rainy-day provisions for acquisitions of those facilities (or replacement facilities) upon expiration of the leases.

Auditor-Controller

We believe the Auditor-Controller is making reasonable efforts to increase the frequency with which he audits County departments. While we are advised that adequate internal controls do exist within the controlling divisions of the Auditor-Controller's office, we are doubtful that the Auditor alone — without assistance and support from the Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrative Officer — can cover enough ground with his present staff and the multiplicity of non-audit demands which are constantly made upon him, to adequately and independently review the financial and business operations of all County departments.

Our interest in the problem stems, in part, from the following few examples in departments which have not been recently audited by the Auditor-Controller:

- 1) General Hospital has not been audited by the Auditor-Controller in any of the years during the period since 1949-50. Among many other unsatisfactory conditions reported, our Contract Auditor pinpointed an unaccounted-for

shortage of \$187,000 in 17 of the Hospital's 130 linen items during the 19-month period from August 29, 1961 to April 2, 1963.

2) The County Engineer's Department has not been audited by the Auditor since fiscal 1957-58. Our Contract Auditor pointed up cost reductions and duplications with a price tag of approximately \$50,000 per year.

3) The Auditor-Controller's most recent audit of Long Beach General Hospital covered the fiscal year 1957-58, and at Harbor General Hospital the year 1958-59.

Reviews for the Audit Committee disclosed that Long Beach General has no verifiable controls over linen supplies, and Harbor General's linen losses during the last four years have averaged approximately 25% of linen costs, or about \$25,000 annually.

Both hospitals manufacture the major portion of the linen which they use but neither has ever made a conclusive "make or buy" analysis, to determine whether they should be manufacturing or whether they can purchase linen in the commercial market at prices lower than manufacture costs.

4) The Air Pollution Control District is recovering only about 18% of its costs of issuing permits. At least \$550,000 annually is not recovered because permit fees are not charged to the extent allowed by law.

These are the kinds of situations which we believe the Auditor-Controller should be pursuing, in frequent audits of all County departments. Instead, he is in the position of having to scatter the Audit Division's available time over a wide range of services and assistance to departments, at the expense of the audit function.

The age of the Auditor-Controller's most recent audits of the following sizable departments is:

Rancho Los Amigos Hospital	1956-57
County Clerk	1956-57
Marshal, Municipal Courts	1958-59
Road Department	1951-52
Recorder	1956-57

Los Angeles County is a giant business enterprise. Internal review of its operations and business practices cannot be left to the day when time and staff become available from other tasks. Continuous and imaginative review is necessary to unearth information which can be used to eliminate the nonessential, consolidate the duplication, and reduce total cost.

The Audit Committee has not explored in depth the ramifications of a division and segregation between the Auditor-Controller's present dual role as accountant-controller on the one hand and as auditor on the other. We believe that question should be carefully studied by the 1964 Audit Committee unless,

in its judgment, there is a marked acceleration in adequate auditing of County departments.

Bureau of Public Assistance

The Bureau is making an effort to comply with all the recommendations resulting from examinations of the Old Age Security, Medical Assistance for the Aged, and Medical Services to Public Assistance Recipients programs. State Department of Social Welfare approval is necessary in some cases, and has been requested.

General Hospital

Of all the County units examined, General Hospital is unenviably the outstanding example of the need for imagination, for objective consideration of what is necessary in business areas, and for action to correct deficiencies and eliminate waste effort. Our Contract Auditor's report states,

"In our opinion, as illustrated in our comments and suggestions, there are many areas in which the Hospital business operations and methods can be modernized, tightened and streamlined, with accompanying increases in revenue and decreases in expenditures."

The examination at General Hospital disclosed substantial loss of aid program reimbursements due to a classification of wards, disclosed the unaccounted-for \$187,000 current linen shortage mentioned earlier, pointed out that similar shortages have averaged approximately 25% of total inventory for each of the past eleven years (roughly \$100,000 per year), and pointed to numerous direct cost reductions accomplishable through the application of practical business methods instead of time-honored procedures.

Example: General Hospital's linen manufacturing department employs a crew of 31 people who sew and assemble in excess of 400,000 pieces of linen each year. The production consists of approximately 120 different items. Manufacturing has gone on without any "make or buy" comparisons of the difference between the costs of manufacturing and the costs of purchasing from outside vendors. A test comparison of only nine of the 40 principal manufactured items indicated that seven of the items could be obtained through the County's Purchasing and Stores Department for substantially less than the cost at which they were manufactured by the Hospital. The Hospital is now conducting a "make or buy" study.

The point to be made is that Hospital personnel either had not thought of making such comparisons or had not taken the initiative to make them.

Example: The Hospital was spending approximately two months of tabulating equipment time, machine rental and operating costs, to produce annual employees' attendance reports. The reports were usually completed six

or seven months late, and duplicated monthly reports containing the same information. As recommended by our Contract Auditor, the annual report has been dropped.

Similar other examples have been noted.

County Engineer

The major problem pointed up in the examination of the Engineer's Department is that relating to the County's role in the ownership and operation of airports.

The County presently has two airports, Brackett Field near LaVerne, in the Pomona area, and General William J. Fox Airfield, near Lancaster in Antelope Valley. For the two fiscal years ended June 30, 1963, before provision for depreciation, the two airports show a combined net loss in excess of \$600,000. If depreciation expense were added to the loss, and if consideration were given to tax revenue which would be generated if the facilities were privately owned, the loss would approximate \$500,000 per year for the two airports.

We have met with the County Engineer and the County's Aviation Advisory Commission to probe into and evaluate what the County's posture should be, not only in the operation of Brackett and Fox but in current considerations relating to the acquisition of an additional field in the Compton area.

The two existing airports are not supported financially primarily by the immediate areas and small groups which they serve, but are supported by taxes levied on taxpayers throughout the County.

We have requested that the Board of Supervisors, the Aviation Advisory Commission and the County Engineer make careful and objective review of —

- 1) The over-all role of the County in providing airport facilities
- 2) Whether the need for airport facilities — to whatever extent realistically necessary — is a proper function and responsibility of the County or the function and responsibility of individual cities which are primarily served by and benefit from the facilities
- 3) The present status and stated goals of the master plan for airports in the County.

On September 12, 1963, with the approval of the full Jury, we recommended to the Board of Supervisors that acquisition of an airport or airport site in the Compton area or any other area be deferred, at least until such a review has been made and publicly reported, and until such time as Stanford Research Institute completes its current nine-county regional survey.

In the course of our discussions with the County Engineer and members of the Aviation Advisory Commission, we were told that Brackett and Fox fields are not actually operating at losses inasmuch as the County-owned underlying land is appreciating in value in amounts sufficient to match or exceed the operating losses. It is obvious that appreciation of land, if any, can be realized only if and when that land is sold. We reject such dippy doodle bookkeeping.

Forester and Fire Warden

In the examination of the Forester and Fire Warden's Department, our Contract Auditor has pointed out a major drain on County funds in the existing arrangement under which the County provides fire protection in areas in which the California State Board of Forestry has determined that the State has a State-wide interest and primary financial responsibility.

Since 1956 the State has not provided sufficient financing to come even close to the amounts necessary to reimburse the County for its costs and expenses under the arrangement. During the eight years ended June 30, 1963, the excess of total County costs over reimbursements from the State totals almost \$19,000,000.

Since at least 1957 County officials have been carrying on discussions and negotiations, attempting to obtain equitable treatment and reimbursement under the agreements with the Board of Forestry.

The results to date are extremely disappointing.

Purchasing and Stores Department

At least 15 County departments, in addition to the central Purchasing and Stores Department, maintain inventories of materials and supplies. We are told that some of these inventories are maintained because of the length of time required to receive delivery from the Purchasing and Stores Department.

To assist the Purchasing and Stores Department to reduce its order-filling and delivery time, the Contract Auditor has suggested a system of night deliveries and basic physical changes in packaging, wrapping and shipping methods.

Public Administrator-Public Guardian

A survey of this Department, recommended by the 1962 Grand Jury, has been completed. A second survey was commenced early in November, following a series of recurring operational problems and differing opinions of the Public Administrator and the Chief Administrative Officer as to the number of personnel required in the Department.

The current survey, by a management consultant, is expected to be completed by March 1, 1964. The situation should be reviewed by the 1964 Audit Committee at an early date.

Records and Reports

Members of the Audit Committee and other committees have been dismayed at the endless flow of reports which have come into the Grand Jury from County Departments. Our Contract Auditor has commented in the same vein, with examples in his reports on General Hospital, Budget Processes and Controls, Purchasing and Stores Department, and Payroll and Personnel Records.

Reports are generated from records. We concur in the recommendation that an across-the-board hard look be taken at all records maintained and reports produced by all County units, and that the following objective yardsticks be applied:

To the records

For what purpose are they maintained?

Why are they needed?

Who uses them? Why?

Is the information in them available elsewhere?

Are they required by law?
If so, is the law a reasonable one?

What is the cost of keeping them —
— in numbers of people?
— in equipment?
— in total dollars?

To the reports

What need generated the first such report? Is that need now present?

To what use are they put?

Are they issued to people who have responsibility for costs and authority to make decisions?

Are they copies of records, or have they been translated into management-use data?

Is the information in them —
— absolutely necessary?
— helpful?
— nice to know?
— meaningless?

What is the total preparation cost?

With answers to those questions, objective evaluations can be made of the need-cost relationship of all records maintained and reports produced.

Workmen's Compensation Insurance Costs

We are aware of steady increases in the annual costs of workmen's com-

pensation insurance, climaxed with a jump from \$3,700,000 in fiscal 1962-63 to in excess of \$6,000,000 for fiscal 1964.

In August the Chief Administrative Officer laid groundwork for comprehensive changes in the County's safety program, to stop the mounting premium costs. This is an area which should be reviewed and followed by the 1964 Audit Committee.

Summary

We are concerned at what appears to us to be a growing, stronger trend toward departmental autonomy, away from co-operative services and operations. The reviews by the Audit Committee indicate that department heads are leaning increasingly toward departmental self-sufficiency in such areas as data processing equipment, inventories, record keeping, and reproduction equipment. In discussing with County personnel his suggestions relating to simplification of payroll records, the Contract Auditor relates the feeling of the County personnel that,

"The process of educating personnel in individual departments to discontinue their present methods and rely instead upon the Special Claims Division will be lengthy and difficult, **and may never be completely accomplished.**"

In his report on data processing installations the Contract Auditor notes,

"We do not underestimate the magnitude of the task of selling and indoctrinating the County's departmental administrators on the merits of over-all co-operative, shared efforts such as those which we are recommending. Historically and presently, to some extent as a direct result of their stated individual statutory responsibilities, County department and division leaders think of and largely conduct their respective units in a manner as self-sufficiently and autonomously as the law and their budgets permit.

"An over-all, co-ordinated plan such as we are suggesting will not be accepted and cannot become effective unless it has the understanding, blessing and sponsorship of the Board of Supervisors. To that must be added the leadership which the Data Processing Unit can provide, to produce a co-operative working arrangement in which the mutual goals of everyone involved can be realized."

We have come out of our term on the Audit Committee with an uneasy feeling, after our meetings with various department heads and their assistants, that there is little sense of urgency, and that problems which are recognized at administrative levels are not always handled with dispatch. In his report on examination of General Hospital, our Contract Auditor comments,

"General Hospital's special problems would seem to deserve special attention by Hospital personnel. However, it is our impression that Hospital personnel have abandoned any hope of eliminating the unaccounted-for short-

ages which have appeared consistently over a period of years. We don't believe the case for controlling losses is hopeless."

Other examples lie in the Flood Control District's problems in collecting its accounts receivable, in the failure of the Road Department to check the correctness of the County's \$29,000,000 share of gas tax money apportioned by the State Controller, and in the failure of County officials to make significant headway on recovery of fire protection costs expended for the State of California.

We have been exposed to a number of examples of opportunities for cost reduction through elimination or combination of functions and records, which in turn set the stage for reductions in payroll costs. Examples are in the County's payroll records, the records of its equipment, its expenditure accounting, and within individual departments such as a series cited to us in the report on the Engineer's Department.

Some of the examinations have disclosed disproportionate costs expended to maintain and control nominal quantities of inventories. The Air Pollution Control District, County Engineer, Forester and Fire Warden and the Department of Parks and Recreation are examples.

On the whole, it appears to us that a greater measure of administrative initiative is needed, not only to attack and solve problems which are evident, but to critically and constantly look for operations which may not be justifiable when viewed in their need-cost relationship.

It is clear to us that, so long as the population and business community increase in Los Angeles County continues on its present pattern, there will be no abatements in the levels of essential services which the County must provide for public protection, health and sanitation, medical care and education. It is similarly clear that the crux of controlling the County's budget and the tax rates which support it lies — not in new sources of revenue — but in searches for cost reduction and in exploration of methods to assure that the County gets maximum productivity and service for every dollar it expends in functions and activities which — unlike the basic essential services — fall into the categories of administration, supervision, clerical support, record keeping and report production, promotion, exploitation, and marginal community services.

The quest for the cost reduction and for holding the line on taxes must be dynamic, imaginative and relentless. In carrying on their daily operations and activities, a question which County administrators and operating heads must keep before them is, "Would the **public need** be adequately served if I

don't buy it, don't build it, don't commit for it, don't record it, don't copy it, don't generate a report from it?" We believe that objective, realistic answers to these questions can result in significant reductions in total County expenditures.

JOSEPH R. KNAPP
Chairman

RESOLUTION TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING SECURITY
MEASURES AT COUNTY HOSPITALS

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Grand Jury, through their Contract Auditors, have uncovered substantial losses in the linen supply for the County General Hospital over the last 19 months, in the amount of more than \$186,000.00, and at the Harbor General Hospital for a period covering 10 months of over \$29,000.00;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Los Angeles County Grand Jury urge the Board of Supervisors to initiate security measures at all County hospitals to prevent the loss of supplies. We urge security controls as follows:

That all hospital employee personnel check in and out through established security gates.

That all hospital employee personnel lockers be maintained outside the security gates.

In addition we are submitting for your consideration the attached recommendations for security measures in this matter, along with a map of the grounds showing ingress and egress locations. This material was sent to us by the Sheriff's Department when the Grand Jury requested security recommendations from the Sheriff.

After months of secret investigation, following disclosure by our Contract Auditor of these losses, the Grand Jury feels this recommendation is in order.

Approved December 6, 1963

CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE REPORT

In reviewing the work of the Criminal Complaints Committee of the 1963 Los Angeles County Grand Jury, the Committee feels that the two most important projects, from the standpoint of possible far-reaching effects, were those that resulted in two recommendations by the full Jury — the one to the California State Legislature, and the other to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

The first project involved an investigation and study by the Committee of the so-called Brown Act, the law that seeks to require public officials and public bodies to conduct public business in open public meetings.

The second project involved a Committee study and investigation into safety inspections by County inspectors for the protection of workmen on building construction projects in County territory.

These two projects were undertaken apart from the regular Committee schedule of receiving and holding hearings on complaints of alleged criminal conduct brought in by the District Attorney, or by way of letters from persons seeking redress of many types in the field of criminal law.

The investigation and study of the Brown Act resulted from a number of complaints brought in by individuals or groups, alleging that public officials or public agencies were guilty of conducting public business behind closed doors, or were making secret agreements as to the conduct of public business.

In that study and investigation, the Committee was benefitted greatly by the investigation and research work of its legal counsel, Deputy District Attorney Fred M. Henderson. The Committee had also the benefit of an analytical study and opinion on the Brown Act by County Counsel Harold W. Kennedy, given last year to the Board of Supervisors for guidance, at their request.

It was the opinion of our legal counsel that a conviction under the Brown Act, as it is now written, would be next to impossible to secure. The Grand Jury, after studying the Committee recommendation and report, sent a recommendation to the State Legislature urging that the Brown Act be amended so as to make it more realistic for public prosecutors to proceed with a reasonable prospect of securing a conviction, against public officials charged with violating the terms of the act.

The Grand Jury has received no acknowledgment from the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the Assembly, or from State Senator Tom Rees, to whom the recommendations were addressed, due probably to the fact that the Legislature was in the closing weeks of the session when the communications were sent.

As to the safety of workmen on building construction projects, this project grew out of the indictment by the Grand Jury of persons charged with criminal negligence in a Hollywood building construction job where a workman was killed by a cave-in.

Following the indictment, the Criminal Complaints Committee conducted hearings as to the probable need to expand the duties and responsibilities of inspectors in the Department of the County Engineer (Building & Safety Division) so as to encompass the safety of workmen on projects within County territory. In the course of the hearings the Committee enjoyed full cooperation from representatives of the building construction industry, including contractors, State, County, and City officials, and representatives of the building construction labor unions.

As a result of these hearings and the Committee recommendations, the full Jury recommended to the Board of Supervisors that the Board consider taking necessary action expanding the duties and responsibilities of County inspectors as recommended.

The Committee made its recommendation along this line, and the full Jury adopted the recommendation, despite the fact that at the hearings opposition to the proposal was expressed. The Jury felt that the safety of the workmen on the jobs should be of paramount consideration. The Grand Jury has been advised that a motion by Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli, of the Board of Supervisors, has referred the recommendation of the Grand Jury to the Chief Administrative Officer, the County Counsel, and the County Engineer for a review and report back to the Board. The public may expect, apparently, some action by the Board on this matter.

The Criminal Complaints Committee carried a very heavy work-load, probably the heaviest of any committee, due to the very nature of its assignment — the consideration, study, and hearings on complaints coming to the Grand Jury from all sources. This Committee is the only Committee that was required to meet each Tuesday morning to do its work. Upon occasion the Committee has had to meet more than once a week to keep ahead of the work at hand.

The work of the Committee involved the consideration of 220 letters received from citizens and organizations. In several instances these lead to lengthy investigation and Committee discussion, even though, finally, there was insufficient ground to warrant hearings by the full Grand Jury. The Committee found that a great deal of time had to be spent considering complaints from individuals who really had no substantial case to present, or whose remedy was not a criminal action, but rather a suit in the civil courts.

The District Attorney's offices presented to the Criminal Complaints Committee 31 felony cases, requesting hearings before the Grand Jury, looking

toward indictments. The committee recommended such hearings, after hearing the cases outlined by Deputy District Attorneys. The Jury voted indictments in all but two of the cases.

The more important cases considered and recommended to the Grand Jury, and upon which indictments were returned, included: the bribery cases involving inspectors of the State Alcoholic Beverage Control administration in the Long Beach area; the auto-referral sales racket, in which six auto agencies and more than a score of individuals were indicted; and a great number of narcotics sales cases brought in by the Narcotics Division of the Los Angeles Police Department. In one of these series of cases the County Sheriff's Department made arrests in a round-up with the Los Angeles Police Department. Other indictments included the indictment of two important officials of the State Department of Motor Vehicles and a civilian having business with the Department. These cases involved alleged bribery and misconduct.

The following number and types of cases were considered by the committee and recommended to the Grand Jury for hearings:

SUMMARY OF CASES

<u>Number of Complaints</u>	<u>Type of Case</u>
3	Bribery
15	Grand Theft
2	Bookmaking (1 case with 4 parts)
4	Narcotics—LAPD (280 separate cases)
1	Manslaughter
2	Robbery and Murder
1	Attempted Grand Theft
2	Forgery
1	Murder
1	Defrauding Insurance Company

Especial thanks is given Mr. Henderson for his legal counselling and guidance of the Committee in its work. And to Joseph A. Gebhart a hearty thank-you for his able assistance as the Committee investigator. Both of these men attended all of our meetings.

CHESTER G. HANSON
Chairman

STATEMENT BY THE GRAND JURY ON THE BROWN ACT

The following statement on the Brown Act is appended to this annual report of the Criminal Complaints Committee in order to give the readers some background as to what the Committee did before making recommendations on the Brown Act to the State Legislature.

The Brown Act is a law adopted by the legislature in recent years, seeking to prevent the conduct of public business by public bodies in secret meetings.

The fundamental concept and intent of the legislature in enacting the Brown Act (which received its name from its principal author, former Assemblyman and now Appellate Court Justice, Ralph M. Brown of Modesto) is set forth in the following language in the Act:

“Sec. 54950. Declaration, intent; sovereignty.

“In enacting this chapter, the Legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and the other public agencies in this State exist to aid in the conduct of the people’s business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.

“The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.”

Deputy District Attorney Fred Henderson, the Grand Jury’s legal advisor, points out that although a violation of the Brown Act is a misdemeanor rather than the more serious charge of felony, the Grand Jury has the legal right to return what is known as an accusation for willful or corrupt misconduct in office and seeking removal from office of a public official for committing such misdemeanor in the course of his official duties.

Counsel points out, however, that before the Grand Jury could return an accusation against a public official or officials accused of violating the Brown Act as to secret meetings, it must have evidence to show that when the alleged violation took place the person or persons accused knew they were violating the law and acted with the intent to violate the law. This, as any lawyer would tell you, is extremely difficult to accomplish.

Mr. Henderson, at the request of the committee, has made an extensive study of the law and the opinions and interpretations of the law's provisions which have been given by legal authorities, including State Attorney General Stanley Mosk, Los Angeles County Counsel Harold W. Kennedy, and Los Angeles City Attorney Roger Arnebergh.

Mr. Kennedy, in a report to the County Board of Supervisors in May of 1962, summed up the basic requirements of the Brown Act, as amended in 1961, as follows:

“(1) All formal meetings of legislative bodies, as defined, must be open and public, except when considering matters of personnel or national security.

“(2) All informal gatherings of a majority or more of the legislative body, at which a collective commitment, promise or decision is made, must be open and public.

“(3) Although violation of the Act does not invalidate action taken, violation is made a misdemeanor, and the Act is enforceable through mandamus or injunction.”

Mr. Kennedy concluded that report with the following observations, which carried a statement in the nature of an admonition to the Board of Supervisors. In the opinion of the Grand Jury, all members of public legislative bodies, boards, and commissions could well read and keep this counsel in mind in the conduct of their business, viz.:

“Mere discussion or fact-gathering sessions are not covered by the Act. There is always the danger, however, that if such sessions are closed, collective commitments, promises or decisions may be inadvertently made, and such action would constitute a violation of the Act.

“It is strongly recommended, therefore, that unless some cogent reason requires otherwise, all meetings or informal gatherings of your Honorable Board or any other legislative body as defined in the Act, at which some discussion of public business will take place, be open and readily accessible to the public.”

This Grand Jury was requested to take action in a case, for example, wherein it was alleged that a city council concluded deliberations and action on a portion of the agenda for a given meeting then retired to another room. Those citizens and taxpayers who were attending the meeting left the council chamber or hearing room assuming, erroneously or not, that the meeting was over. The council subsequently returned to the chamber and resumed its session and took action dealing with a tax matter and calling for a plan to protect the city's interest in Sacramento.

When members of this council appeared before the Criminal Complaints Committee by invitation to respond to citizens' complaints, alleging a violation of the Brown Act, it was explained to the Committee that when the council retired to the other room on this occasion it was to hear advice from the City Attorney in reference to the tax matter. It was said that no agreement or decision was made at the closed meeting.

When questioned about this episode by our Committee the City Attorney said that they had the advice and opinion from the County Counsel that conferences by a legislative body with its legal advisor may be held at closed meetings, under the general provision that a private conference held by the Board of Supervisors and its legal officer to consider pending or proposed legislation to obtain legal advice is permissible under the Brown Act.

This was an instance, in the opinion of the Grand Jury, where criticism, dissatisfaction and apprehension on the part of the citizens and taxpayers could easily have been avoided by discussing the matter in the open meeting. It is the feeling of the Jury that the persons attending a city council meeting, for the most part, may be presumed to be citizens and taxpayers of the city and that they are in fact the real clients of the city attorney, regardless of any legal technicality.

In the opinion of the Jury, there was no violation of the Brown Act, according to the opinion of the County Counsel, as set forth in his report to the Board of Supervisors in reference to conferences by public officials with their legal advisor. Nevertheless, if the council had noted Mr. Kennedy's admonition to the Supervisors to be extremely careful about holding conferences behind closed doors, the citizens in this instance would not have felt outraged and as though they should appeal to the Grand Jury for relief.

It must be recognized, of course, that circumstances do arise wherein an executive session of a public agency, such as a City Council, may be desirable in the public interest, such as a discussion of a proposal to acquire a piece of property or to discuss proposed or pending litigation involving the city.

An extensive article in the Harvard Law Review (Vol. 75:1199) devoted to the subject of open meeting statutes in the several states, observed:

"Executive sessions are also commonly authorized where premature publicity would be detrimental to the interest of the community, as by revealing information to individuals who might profit at public expense."

It is the intent of the Grand Jury to urge the Legislature to amend the Brown Act by removing the language requiring the prosecution to show that accused knew he was violating the law and so intended when he committed the alleged violation. Such amendment would give the people a real opportunity to do what the Act declares in its preamble: "... retain control over the instruments they have created."

RESOLUTION BY THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY
RECOMMENDING THAT ACTION BE TAKEN TO EXPAND
RESPONSIBILITIES OF COUNTY BUILDING INSPECTORS

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Grand Jury, in the course of its hearing of the case of the so-called Playboy construction project in Hollywood, was impressed by the fact that inspectors from the County Division of Building and Safety of the County Engineer's office are not empowered and directed to make, in addition to their present inspection duties, inspections looking to the safety of workmen on construction projects, and

WHEREAS, from the testimony in this case it developed that if County building inspectors had the authority and responsibility to inspect and to act in behalf of the safety of the workmen and inspectors on the job it would be in the public interest,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the 1963 County Grand Jury recommends to the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County:

1. That the Board of Supervisors enact or adopt an appropriate ordinance, resolution or order authorizing and directing the building inspectors employed by the Division of Building and Safety, in addition to their present inspection duties, to make inspections of construction projects pertaining to the safety of the workmen on the projects as provided in the State Building and Safety Code, which is administered by the State Division of Industrial Safety.

2. It is further recommended that such ordinance or order provide that such County building inspectors, upon noting such hazardous conditions, dangerous to the safety of the workmen, as provided in the State Code, shall immediately notify the contractor and/or the contractor's superintendent on the job to remedy the conditions; and he shall also immediately notify the inspector or inspectors of the State Division of Industrial Safety, if they are present on the job.

If such State inspector is not on the project, the ordinance shall require that the County inspector noting the unsafe conditions shall immediately call the local office of the State Division of Industrial Safety and notify a qualified employee therein of the violation of the State Safety Code he has noted and request the State office to take steps necessary to correct such violation. The County inspector shall also, on the same day, write or cause to be writ-

ten a letter to the State Division of Industrial Safety, setting forth violations he noted on the project in question and and stating in such letter the fact he has given notice to the State Division, as aforesaid, and giving the name of the person to whom he made his report and the hour at which he made such telephonic call.

It is the opinion of the Grand Jury that the ordinance provide that if the condition or conditions on the job he is inspecting be of such hazardous nature to the workmen as to present imminent danger to the safety of the workmen on the job, such inspector shall have authority to order the workmen off the job until the hazardous condition or conditions are remedied or removed to the satisfaction of the County inspector.

In the event of a difference of opinion between the State and County inspectors as to alleged hazardous conditions complained of, then the judgment of the State inspector or inspectors shall prevail, in which event the responsibility of the County and its inspectors on the job shall cease — as to the controversial hazardous condition or any accident or injury resulting therefrom. On the basis of facts developed during our hearing and subsequent investigation, it is the opinion of the Jury that the additional requirements upon County building inspectors to inspect as to safety conditions, as recommended herein, should not require the employment of additional County building inspectors. Such safety inspection would be in conjunction with building code inspections.

Approved September 25, 1963

RESOLUTION TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RECOMMENDING THE CREATION OF A CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO STUDY STATE CRIMINAL LAWS AS THEY AFFECT COUNTY ENFORCEMENT

WHEREAS, according to statistics on national crime, compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, California is listed as having 16.7% of the crimes committed throughout the nation, despite the fact it has only 9.1% of the population of the United States, thereby exceeding all other states in total crimes, with New York being the second state in total number of crimes, but with only 58.5% of the number of crimes committed in California, and

WHEREAS, California has the highest crime rate in the nation (exceeded only by that of the State of Nevada), our state exceeds the national rate of 1102 crimes per 100,000 population by 82%, and

WHEREAS, in the period from 1955 to 1962, according to reports from the California State Bureau of Criminal Statistics, crime increased in Los Angeles County four times as fast as the population increased, and it increased in Los Angeles City six times as fast as the population increased;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Los Angeles County Grand Jury urge the County Board of Supervisors to appoint a citizens' committee to study and report to the Board as to the operation and administration of criminal laws as they affect the work of law enforcement agencies at the State and local levels within the County, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Jury is mindful that many and repeated studies and reports have been made in our State on the causes of crimes and juvenile delinquency, but seemingly little has been done seeking to aid the law enforcement agencies in their efforts to protect society by detecting, apprehending and bringing to the bar of justice those legitimately suspected of criminal activities, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Grand Jury express to the Board of Supervisors its concern over observations made by J. Edgar Hoover in a speech before the Catholic Youth Conference in New York recently, to the effect that Americans are developing a too indulgent attitude toward crime and corruption. Mr. Hoover also stated, it was reported, that a Federal Judge in Washington in 1957, had assailed an alarming trend in judicial decisions, "which strain and stretch to give the guilty, not the same, but vastly more, protection than is given the law abiding citizen." Mr. Hoover said: "There has been no reversal in this alarming trend."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in making this recommendation to the Board of Supervisors it is not the intent of the Grand Jury to urge the creation of a so-called crime commission to ferret out crime and prosecution. It is, rather, that the proposed commission should be composed of laymen, none of whom shall be members of the judiciary, nor of the bar, nor should they be criminologists. It is the intent of this Jury, however, that the commission shall have the benefit of the opinions of heads of law enforcement agencies and their staffs, as well as the opinion of members of the bench and bar for the guidance of the commission. They shall be men and women with an interest in this subject, who can devote the necessary time and contribute the stern thinking necessary to carry out this study and report. We have in mind such persons as many members of past Grand Juries, both County and Federal. Such commission should be non-partisan in its composition.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the commission should be assigned County headquarters in which to meet and conduct its business. It should be provided with necessary clerical help and an experienced investigator. The members of the commission should be appointed and be subject to removal by the Board of Supervisors. The commission should be composed of no more than 11 to 15 members and the commission should exist for no more than two years. The members should receive the same per diem and mileage as granted members of the County Grand Jury. It is contemplated that the commission will make interim reports to the Board of Supervisors prior to their final report.

Approved December 3, 1963

Jurors dissenting:

Mrs. Richard C. Barrett
Mrs. Brian Harvey
Abner Parker
Mrs. Gifford Phillips
Dr. Helen G. Smith

JAILS COMMITTEE REPORT

The Jails Committee submits the following report of its activities:

The Committee was appointed in February in compliance with the terms of section 923 of the California Penal Code. With approval of the Committee we were divided into three units for the purpose of inspections.

- Unit 1 Dr. Helen Smith and Louis Kornhandler
Unit 2 Mrs. Isabelle Wadsworth, Harry Harris and Mrs. Raymond G. Stanbury
Unit 3 Taro Kanow and Charles H. MacDonald

The following jails were inspected by the three units:

Firestone Park	Pomona	Lynwood
Compton	Monterey Park	Santa Monica
Bell	East Los Angeles	Culver City
Lennox	South Pasadena	El Segundo
Torrance	Pasadena	Palos Verdes
Long Beach	Temple	Redondo Beach
Lakewood	Huntington Park	Glendale
Signal Hill	Vernon	Harbor Division
Maywood	South Gate	San Fernando
San Dimas	Norwalk	Hollywood
Beverly Hills	Wilshire	Lincoln Heights
Purdue Station	Malibu	Gardena
Van Nuys	Avalon	Inglewood
		Hawthorne

There are reports on file of these jails visited.

The Committee wishes to praise the Sheriff's Department for the wonderful work being done at the Wayside Honor Farm.

The entire Grand Jury made the following inspections:

Central Jail	Wayside Honor Farm
County Jail	New Men's Central Jail

The people of the cities and County of Los Angeles are fortunate to have high caliber law enforcement officers.

CHARLES H. MacDONALD
Chairman

JUVENILE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Committee has interviewed juvenile authorities, inspected juvenile facilities in the County of Los Angeles and investigated all complaints and suggestions brought to its attention.

Judge Eugene Breitenbach, Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court, reported to the Committee on the functions and achievements of his court. (Judge Breitenbach's report and other records of the Committee are on file at the office of the Grand Jury.)

The representatives of the juvenile divisions of the Police and Sheriff's Departments presented their programs regarding juvenile arrests.

Karl Holton spoke to a joint meeting of the Juvenile and Schools Committees on the newly founded Youth Opportunities Board of Greater Los Angeles. The Committee hopes that Congress will make funds available to carry on this program, which is planned to deal with the serious social problems of school drop-outs and the attendant lack of employment opportunities for youth.

Following upon suggestions of previous Grand Juries, the Committee found that many of the complaints concerning inadequate facilities at Juvenile Hall will be answered when Sylmar Hall, the new juvenile installation, is opened early in 1965. In the interim further improvements should be made at the school rooms of Juvenile Hall, and the Committee recommends that the Board of Supervisors make funds available for this purpose.

In reference to specific recommendations made by the 1962 Grand Jury, the Committee found the Juvenile Court and the Probation Department have formed a Detention Control Committee to deal with the problem of lengthy stays of children at juvenile facilities. This plan has been successful in reducing the population at Juvenile Hall and the average length of detention there.

The Committee inquired into the El Monte project of the Probation Department and found that the results of this study were being used as a basis in Department staffing and in reducing juvenile case loads assigned to probation officers. However, because of budgetary limitations it is not being used throughout the entire Department. This study was conducted from 1957 to 1960 to demonstrate the benefits to be derived from smaller juvenile case loads and to formulate new standards for juvenile staffing.

The small number of complaints regarding treatment of juveniles at coun-

ty facilities, brought by citizens to the Committee, were investigated thoroughly. Though these complaints were found to be unsubstantiated, a few minor recommendations were made to appropriate department heads.

Recommendations of the 1963 Governor's Conference on Delinquency Prevention, covering "New Methods and Techniques," were reviewed by the Committee and many of the suggestions were deemed to be worthy of continued study by the 1964 Jury.

Juvenile Hall, MacLaren Hall, Georgia Street, Lathrop Hall, Camp Gonzales, Camp Kilpatrick, Camp Afflerbaugh, Camp Paige and allied detention facilities, probation camps, and special schools were visited. The Committee was greatly impressed with the high caliber and dedication of the men and women administrating the juvenile facilities of the County, and with their constant goal of developing and improving youth programs. The Committee recommends that these programs, actual and experimental, be continued and that whenever possible emphasis be placed on a preventive approach in dealing with juvenile problems.

ABNER PARKER
Chairman

SCHOOLS COMMITTEE REPORT

The Schools Committee of the 1963 Grand Jury visited several of the Los Angeles County Special Schools, examined the only complaint presented to it during the year, and considered some of the problems facing County School Districts.

Acting on the suggestion of the 1962 Schools Committee, we first considered the drop-out problem. The Committee had the benefit of hearing members of Dr. Trillingham's staff, and the benefit of reports of studies on drop-outs. We are encouraged to find that many County School Districts already have in effect programs to help solve this problem. We recommend that steps outlined below, all suggested by school people, continue to be encouraged by the County Superintendent of Schools:

1. Use additional counseling to identify and work with the potential drop-out, to identify the college-capable students, and to provide increased vocational counseling. Counsel with parents, whenever possible, to help them understand the advantages of their children staying in school.
2. Increase flexibility in local school programing to provide a diversified curriculum to meet the many levels of student ability and interest. Expand vocational and other non-academic courses.
3. Provide remedial instruction in reading and language skills.
4. Provide experimental programs such as keeping the school library open, under supervision, after the school day to provide children with a place to study.
5. Expand job placement services and establish school-work programs.
6. Provide in-service training for teachers so that they may work more effectively with culturally deprived students.

We realize that the community as a whole is becoming aware of the drop-outs and the problems that they pose. We feel that this awareness is healthy, and that only by combined efforts of the community and the schools can this problem be solved.

In our study of the drop-outs, we learned of the Youth Opportunities Board of Greater Los Angeles. Karl Holton, Executive Director, spoke to a joint Schools-Juvenile Committee meeting, and we received and read reports

from the Board. We recognize the Youth Opportunities Board as an attempt by representatives of the schools and the community to work together to solve mutual problems. We commend this effort, and feel that it is a positive step toward solution of the problem of the drop-out and his lack of employment.

* * * * *

De facto segregation in the public schools is one of the problems that face most County School Districts at this time. It is also an area of concern to a majority of this Committee, and so we invited informed officials to talk to us on the subject, and we obtained a report on equal educational opportunities. As a result, we recommend to the County Superintendent of Schools that he continue doing everything consistent with his powers to encourage school boards and their staffs to exercise their legal and moral responsibilities in the use of their resources to provide facilities, personnel and conditions which will insure the best possible educational opportunities for all youth—regardless of their race, religion, national origin, or economic status. This calls for qualified personnel, adequate physical facilities and sound educational offerings in all schools.

To accomplish this, we recommend to the County Superintendent of Schools that he continue to encourage school districts to:

1. Eliminate, whenever and wherever possible, double sessions.
2. Determine school boundaries, whenever and wherever possible, to avoid ethnic segregation in the establishment of school attendance areas. Further, exercise creative leadership in experimenting with new solutions to help solve this problem.
3. Employ, assign, transfer and promote personnel strictly on a merit basis to insure justice and fair play to the employee, and the best development of the school system.
4. Use programs which include textbooks and other instructional aids which accurately portray the contribution of the racial groups that make up our diverse society.
5. Establish workshops for building sound human relations, and strongly encourage school staffs to take advantage of them.
6. Expand programs of compensatory education, broaden vocational preparation, and use counselling practices to encourage young peo-

ple to prepare for those occupations commensurate with their interests, needs, and capacities.

* * * * *

As an outgrowth of a complaint referred to the Schools Committee, we recommended to the full Jury that it ask Governor Brown for legislative action to insure that in future cases, before their disposition, teachers who are charged with sex offenses and plead guilty to lesser offenses be identified to the Court as teachers.

* * * * *

The Committee became aware of the possibility of the establishment of a non-profit, non-commercial, educational TV channel in the Los Angeles area. Having heard discussions by competent authorities, including school officials, we recommended to the full Jury that it send letters to the Federal Communications Commission and to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, asking favorable action on petitions to make possible the establishment of the channel. The jury accepted this recommendation and letters were sent.

* * * * *

We visited a number of the Los Angeles County Special Schools. Each of these schools must meet the needs of all types of students, all of whom are wards of the Court. A single classroom may have an achievement range of five grade levels. Students come to special schools from over one hundred school districts, and in most cases attend these special schools for relatively short periods of time. In spite of these problems, we observed classroom situations of a near-normal school atmosphere, and we were impressed.

As a result of our visit to the school facilities at Juvenile Hall we recommend to the County Board of Supervisors that:

1. They determine whether or not an inspection has ever been made of the existing school building for boys to ascertain if it meets the requirements of the Field Act.
2. They determine whether proper fire regulation inspection has been made of the existing school building for boys.
3. An inspection be made of the annex, which houses classrooms for younger boys, to determine whether it meets minimum requirements for classrooms.

* * * * *

The Schools Committee has received full cooperation from the County

Superintendent of Schools and from all members of his staff whom we have contacted during the year, and we are grateful. We have met with men and women who seem highly competent and dedicated, and we feel fortunate that they are associated with the public schools.

MRS. BRIAN HARVEY
Chairman

Jurors dissenting:

Chester G. Hanson
Harry L. Harris
Taro Kanow
Elmer H. Struebing

HARRY L. HARRIS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MYRON J. CARR, JR.
FOREMAN

MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
SECRETARY

MRS. RICHARD C. BARRETT
MYRON J. CARR, JR.
CHESTER G. HANSON
HARRY L. HARRIS
MRS. BRIAN HARVEY
TARO KANOW
JOSEPH R. KNAPP
LOUIS KORNHANDLER
CHARLES HENRY MACDONALD
MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1963 GRAND JURY

548 HALL OF JUSTICE

LOS ANGELES 12

MA 9-2451

ABNER PARKER
MRS. GIFFORD PHILLIPS
MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
DR. HELEN G. SMITH
MRS. RAYMOND G. STANBURY
ELMER H. STRUEBING
WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
MRS. ISABELLE H. WADSWORTH
MRS. ALVIN WILSON

December 5, 1963

The Honorable E. William Henry
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Mr. Henry:

The 1963 Los Angeles County Grand Jury
urges favorable action on the application filed by
Community Television of Southern California to
make possible the establishment of Channel 28.

Very truly yours,

MYRON J. CARR, Jr.
Foreman

MJC:jf
cc: Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare

HARRY L. HARRIS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MYRON J. CARR, JR.
FOREMAN

MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
SECRETARY

MRS. RICHARD C. BARRETT
MYRON J. CARR, JR.
CHESTER G. HANSON
HARRY L. HARRIS
MRS. BRIAN HARVEY
TARO KANOW
JOSEPH R. KNAPP
LOUIS KORNHANDLER
CHARLES HENRY MACDONALD
MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
1963 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES 12
MA 9-2451

ABNER PARKER
MRS. GIFFORD PHILLIPS
MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
DR. HELEN G. SMITH
MRS. RAYMOND G. STANBURY
ELMER H. STRUEBING
WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
MRS. ISABELLE H. WADSWORTH
MRS. ALVIN WILSON

December 5, 1963

The Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze
Secretary
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Celebrezze:

The 1963 Grand Jury of Los Angeles County
urges favorable action on the petition for a Federal
Assistance Grant in connection with the establish-
ment of Channel 28, an educational television
channel for the Los Angeles area.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent by the
Grand Jury to the Federal Communications Commis-
sion in regard to granting a license to Channel 28.

Sincerely,

MYRON J. CARR, Jr.
Foreman

MJC:jsf
encl.

HARRY L. HARRIS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MYRON J. CARR, JR.
FOREMAN

MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
SECRETARY

MRS. RICHARD C. BARRETT
MYRON J. CARR, JR.
CHESTER G. HANSON
HARRY L. HARRIS
MRS. BRIAN HARVEY
TARO KANOW
JOSEPH R. KNAPP
LOUIS KORNHANDLER
CHARLES HENRY MACDONALD
MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
1963 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES 12
MA 9-2451

ABNER PARKER
MRS. GIFFORD PHILLIPS
MRS. JESSIE R. ROBERTS
DR. HELEN G. SMITH
MRS. RAYMOND G. STANBURY
ELMER H. STRUEBING
WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
MRS. ISABELLE H. WADSWORTH
MRS. ALVIN WILSON

November 6, 1963

His Excellency, Edmund G. Brown
Governor of the State of California
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Governor:

Attached is a recommendation unanimously adopted by the 1963 Los Angeles County Grand Jury, which we believe should warrant and merit your support.

We know that there are certain laws now on the books of California that fairly well cover the basic law regarding such offenders. However, this, if adopted, will make it mandatory that the Court be notified at the time of trial, where it is proposed that the defendant be allowed to plead guilty to a lesser offense, that the defendant is a teacher in our public schools.

It is the feeling of the Los Angeles County Grand Jury that in cases where teachers are charged with sex offenses, as defined by Section 12912 of the Education Code, if the defendant teacher offers to plead guilty to a lesser offense, the Court should know that the defendant is a teacher before he disposes of the plea to the lesser offense.

It is also the feeling of the jury that the welfare of children placed in contact with such teachers is of greater importance to society than the desire of the teacher to be permitted to teach children.

It is the intent of the jury in making this recommendation to you

that the Courts of this state be fully informed of all the circumstances in disposing of serious sex charges against teachers.

Very truly yours,

LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY

MYRON J. CARR, JR., FOREMAN

MJC-b
encl.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY
CONCERNING TEACHERS CHARGED WITH SEX OFFENSES

A motion was passed that the Grand Jury request Governor Brown, at any special session of the Legislature called in the year 1964, to recommend to the Legislature an amendment to the Penal Code that in cases wherein a teacher is charged with a sex offense, as defined in Section 12912 of the Education Code, it shall be the duty of the prosecutor to advise the judge before the judge accepts a plea to a lesser and included offense, that the defendant holds a credential as a school teacher under the California Code.

Approved Nov. 6, 1963

SMOG COMMITTEE REPORT

Residents of Los Angeles County are acutely aware of the discomfort caused by air pollution, commonly called smog, especially those who suffer from any form of chronic pulmonary disorder. Air pollutants can be broadly classified as aerosols and gases. Of the gases, ozone has become most commonly known because as it is affected by sunlight it becomes noxious and irritating to the eyes.

The highest level of smog occurs on Inversion days. As air normally rises, it becomes 4% cooler with every 1000 feet, but on Inversion Days the opposite is true. As it rises, it enters a thick layer of air that is warmer than the air at ground level. This is the Inversion Lid. It keeps cooler air from rising and keeps pollutants from escaping upward, and upward is the only way they can escape when there is not enough wind velocity to disperse them horizontally.

The Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District, which operates nine air monitoring stations, including two for the U. S. Public Health Service, has control over all emissions from stationary sources. The California Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board has control over emissions from moving sources.

Early in the year the Smog Control Committee visited the Air Pollution Control Building and inspected the facilities, meeting with Mr. Louis Fuller, the Chief Deputy, and his various assistants and officials of the District personnel. After discussing the smog problem with them, their condensed findings indicated that gasoline additives had no real effect on air pollution, that discontinuing the use of street cars and trolley buses was inadvisable, and that 25% of air pollution comes from crankcase emission.

Mr. Fuller stated that the Air Pollution Control District has gone as far as possible on stationary sources and that from here on control efforts must be directed toward emissions from motor vehicles.

During the year the Committee, and at times the full Jury, heard speakers familiar with the smog problem. They represented industry, medicine, science, the State Pollution Control Board, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Metropolitan Transit Authority. Also pictures were shown and statistics given regarding construction of both subway and monorail systems. The Committee was impressed with the flexibility, speed of construction and low cost, compared to subway, of the monorail system. The Committee concluded that solving the rapid transportation problem would contribute most toward solving the smog problem.

The Board of Supervisors held a public hearing on Senate Bill 325, which the Committee attended. This bill would make it mandatory for the motorist to install air pollution control devices and to have them inspected at authorized stations.

The Smog Committee is of the opinion that everything that will tend to reduce air pollution should be utilized, that the time for debate on the causes is over and remedial action should be taken.

WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
Chairman

SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT

The 1963 Social Services Committee devoted its time to the inspection of hospitals, camps, and other areas.

The Committee was greatly impressed by the amount of money necessary annually for the County of Los Angeles to carry on the welfare program. In the year 1962-1963 there were 601,958 persons being cared for by the Department of Charities through its institutions, bureaus, and camps. The Department's budget was \$392,587,513.00 for the fiscal year 1963-1964. The County will be reimbursed by some Federal and State money. Also, some money is collected from persons who can pay for part of their care.

However, for this fiscal year the Department of Charities will spend 45.5% of the entire County budget.

We visited the Los Angeles County General Hospital. The Communicable Diseases Building is comparatively new. Medical research is done here and in the other units of the hospital. We noted that several wards in the main building were crowded.

On its 75th anniversary in October of this year, Rancho Los Amigos could trace its transformation from a county poor farm into a world-renowned chronic diseases hospital with 2,000 beds. Located in Downey, it has established an extensive rehabilitation program. This program, as well as the large brace shop, constitutes a vital part in the polio patient's partial or complete recovery.

The Committee was advised, while visiting Olive View Hospital, that it could be equipped as a general hospital, but that the people of the community in which it is located did not favor such a transformation. So the hospital with its 700 patients devotes its care to 65% tuberculosis victims, and the balance of persons cared for are general medical, surgical chest, heart (open heart surgery is performed), and mental health. Physical and occupational therapy is given patients.

The geriatric rehabilitation program for the County is centered at Long Beach General Hospital. Here the County for about three years has been pioneering in this special field of medicine. The Committee was pleased to note that the patients were encouraged, wherever possible, to help themselves. Under a step-by-step program patients were given an opportunity to live in a building apart from the others, to test their ability to live alone and eventually to be released from the hospital.

The Committee was impressed with the administration of Acton Rehabilitation Center and Warm Springs Camp when we visited their facilities. Both camps, located near Castaic, are supported by the General Relief program which provides board and care for chronic and convalescent single adult male patients. Acton houses 400 male patients between ages 24 and 86. In 1964, mental health services will be expanded to provide more psychiatric care while retaining work therapy for those able to work around the camp.

At Warm Springs Camp there are 320 patients. Daily patient cost in 1962-1963 was \$1.78. Some patients are able to pay part of their care. At both places their canteen funds help them to subscribe to newspapers and magazines, and to purchase television sets. The Committee felt that the camp programs were good and should be maintained because they involved self-help on the part of the men.

The Committee recommends that the 1964 Social Services Committee refer early to the 1963 Audit Committee reports on the Institutions and Bureau of Public Assistance for suggested areas to be considered by the Committee.

The six training centers of the Bureau of Public Assistance for the In-Service Training and Field Supervision for graduate and under-graduate students were visited by the Committee, which divided up into groups. The operations of the centers and seminar-type classes were observed by our members. The Committee regrets that it undertook this study too late to evaluate the program and make a complete report. We recommend that the 1964 Social Services Committee study in detail the training manual and its application to the In-Service Training. This is the indoctrinational course for case workers. Here they are exposed to the basic philosophy and knowledge in administering the County welfare programs.

The Psychiatric Department of the Superior Court is assigned all matters relating to civil commitments of the mentally disordered persons, as well as narcotic addicts. The judge presiding in the Psychiatric Court is Judge William A. Munnell. The Committee visited the court while it was in session and observed from the procedure followed that the patient was duly advised of his rights and was given a complete opportunity for a full hearing. This was reassuring.

The Committee learned that the court has removed several sanitariums licensed by the State from the list of such homes to which the court assigns its wards. The Committee understands this action was taken because these sanitariums were not up to required State standards.

In view of this action by the court the Committee feels that the State De-

partment of Mental Hygiene, which licenses such sanitariums, should look into this situation and bring those institutions withdrawn from the court's approval up to the Department's required standards. The court is using more than a score of other State-licensed sanitariums.

Further, the Committee was advised the court feels more efficient work could be done with the addition of two mental health counselors. The Committee feels that the Board of Supervisors would be doing the County a service by considering this suggestion.

In its consideration of the Department of Charities the Committee benefited greatly from a visit and a talk by Mr. William A. Barr, head of the Department, who explained to us the structure and the functions of the various institutions, bureaus and camps included under its jurisdiction. He also explained the various types of aids and how they are financed.

The Committee also invited as a speaker Superior Judge Roger A. Pfaff, who presides over the Consolidated Domestic Relations and Conciliation Court. The Committee was interested in Judge Pfaff's observations in drawing comparison between the payments established by the courts by which fathers in divorce cases are required to contribute to the support of their minor children, and the amount granted children under the Aid to Needy Children program, which is administered under State law by the Department of Charities. In his talk Judge Pfaff referred to statewide complaints, including Los Angeles County, of the abuses in the allocation of Aid to Needy Children awards. Under State law these tax-free awards are alleged in some instances to exceed by \$100.00 or more per month the amount many fathers earned gross while supporting their families when they lived at home.

The Committee, as a result of these talks, recommended that the Grand Jury ask the Board of Supervisors to have an independent survey made of this and other problems of the Department of Charities. The Jury approved this recommendation, which was forwarded to the Board, and a copy of which follows this report.

MRS. GLADYS M. MOLONY
Chairman

RECOMMENDATION BY SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE TO THE
GRAND JURY IN REGARD TO STUDY OF DEPARTMENT
OF CHARITIES, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

The Grand Jury recommends to the County Board of Supervisors that the Board employ the services of a private organization, skilled in making studies and reports on the operations of government departments and agencies, to make a study of the County Department of Charities, as administered under State law and State rules and regulations, as well as under the County ordinances.

This survey should determine, among other things, whether interpretations of the laws and practices by the Department are in the best interests of the taxpayers and recipients of these benefits. The survey may also indicate the need for changes in the State laws and County ordinances.

It is the position of the Grand Jury that from such study and report great benefit would accrue to the taxpayers of Los Angeles County, to the Board of Supervisors, and to the Department of Charities itself.

Approved November 22, 1963

INSURANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

This special committee was appointed by the Foreman in the hope of ferreting out the causes and suggesting some remedies for a 53% increase next year in County Workmen's Compensation premiums. This cost has been constant and spiralling over recent years.

Our recommendations follow:

1. The report of a study made for the County should be analyzed by the present Chief Administrative Officer. This report was made by an insurance counselor and analyst at the request of Arthur Will, previous Chief Administrative Officer.
2. A close check should be kept on the open claims.
3. When the experience modification is published in May, the payrolls by classification used in the computation should be verified. The losses also should be verified, at least to be sure that all claims used in the calculation belong to the County.
4. Establish a qualified manager with complete responsibility under the Chief Administrative Officer.
5. Employ experienced and qualified personnel to set up and administer a Workmen's Compensation Department.
6. Clear all employee accident reports, investigations, and follow-ups through the Workmen's Compensation Department.

WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN
Chairman

PART THREE

INDEX TO RECOMMENDATIONS

	Page
Contract Auditor's General Recommendations	
Reference to (Auditor's Complete Report of Recommendations on File in Office of Grand Jury)	28
Security Measures at County Hospitals	32
Evaluation of County's Role in the Ownership and Operation of Airports	33
Brown Act	
Background	41
Jury Statement on	45
Safety of Workmen on Construction Projects	
Background	42
Resolution Recommending Action	49
Creation of Citizens Committee to Study Law Enforcement	
	51
School Committee's General Recommendations	57
	58
Establishment of Educational TV Channel	
Background	59
Letter to FCC	61
Letter to Dept. of HEW	63
Teachers Charged with Sex Offenses	
Background	59
Letter to Governor Brown	65
Recommendation	67

School Facilities at Juvenile Hall

Juvenile Committee Recommendation	.	.	55
Schools Committee Recommendation	.	.	59

Study of Department of Charities

Background	73
Recommendation	75

Workmen's Compensation Insurance	77
---	---	---	---	---	----