


LOS ANGELES COUNTY

GRAND JURY



*Final
Report*

1964

PART ONE

P R E F A C E

Part One of this report consists of this Preface and letters.

Part Two sets forth the standing and special committee reports. These reports cover the activities for the year, as well as recommendations and such special messages for succeeding Grand Juries, as to actions they felt should be pursued or areas covered.

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

IN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Grant me the privilege, as Foreman, to here make mention of the public service shown by the members of this Grand Jury in the course of their work; a willingness to invest endless hours of investigation and inspection of county operations; their integrity in administering justice; their determination to find sensible answers to complex problems; and above all, their good humor in controversy have made this Foreman's task a truly pleasant and satisfying experience.

Also, thank you, William J. Goss, Foreman Pro Tem, for making the work load of this Foreman lighter throughout our year of service.

And the members of the Grand Jury wish me to here express their appreciation to our Secretary, Mrs. Lorraine Ljung, for her excellent performance of all secretarial duties.

J. T. BLALOCK
Foreman

The members of the 1964 Grand Jury of Los Angeles County and the names of the Superior Court judges who nominated them are listed below:

JUROR

J. T. BLALOCK (Foreman)
MRS. CLAIRE L. BASS
MAXWELL J. BRISTOL
CARL G. BUSCH
LOUIS V. CASSADAY
MERRILL J. CATE
MRS. FRANCES K. DOLL
S. H. EDMONDSON (Deceased 7-1-64)
FRANK W. FEE
H. J. GARRETSON
ALVA C. GARROTT
WILLIAM J. GOSS
HOWARD J. GREEN
CHAS. K. KAMAYATSU
OZRO D. LEAS
MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
THOMAS F. McCUE
WM. MIDDLETON
ARNOLD MUNZ
ELMER NIEMOELLER
MRS. CHARLES PALMER
SAM A. SARKISIAN
MRS. MARGARET M. TEGART

JUDGE

STEVENS FARGO
NEWCOMB CONDEE
V. P. LUCAS
FREDERICK F. HOUSER
MAURICE C. SPARLING
F. RAY BENNETT
WILLIAM B. NEELEY
WILLIAM E. FOX
CHARLES A. LORING
H. EUGENE BREITENBACH
DAVID W. WILLIAMS
AUBREY N. IRWIN
JOSEPH A. WAPNER
JOHN F. AISO
CLARKE E. STEPHENS
HERBERT V. WALKER
OTTO J. EMME
CHARLES R. THOMPSON
ALBERT E. WHEATCROFT
STEVENS FARGO
ROGER ALTON PFAFF
ARTHUR K. MARSHALL
WALTER H. ODEMAR

OFFICERS

J. T. BLALOCK, Foreman
WILLIAM J. GOSS, Foreman Pro Tem
MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR., Secretary
FRANK W. FEE, Sergeant-at-Arms

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administrative

J. T. Blalock, Chairman
Carl G. Busch
Louis V. Cassaday
Merrill J. Cate
Mrs. Frances K. Doll
William J. Goss
Howard J. Green
Mrs. Harry Erling Ljung, Sr., Sec.

Audit

Louis V. Cassaday, Chairman
M. J. Bristol
H. J. Garretson
Mrs. Harry Erling Ljung, Sr.
Thomas F. McCue, Secretary
Arnold Munz
Elmer Niemoeller
Sam A. Sarkisian

Criminal Complaints

Merrill J. Cate, Chairman
Carl G. Busch
S. H. Edmondson
Frank W. Fee
Alva C. Garrott
Chas. K. Kamayatsu
Mrs. Charles Palmer, Secretary

Jails

Carl G. Busch, Chairman
Merrill J. Cate
S. H. Edmondson
Frank W. Fee
Alva C. Garrott
Chas. K. Kamayatsu, Secretary
Mrs. Charles Palmer

Public Services

Howard J. Green, General Chairman
and Schools Committee Chairman
Mrs. Frances K. Doll
Juvenile Committee Chairman
William J. Goss
Social Services Committee Chairman
Mrs. Claire L. Bass, Secretary
Ozro D. Leas
Mrs. Harry Erling Ljung, Sr.
Wm. Middleton
Mrs. Margaret M. Tegart

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Arrangement Committees

William J. Goss, Chairman
Merrill J. Cate
Mrs. Frances K. Doll
Mrs. Harry Erling Ljung, Sr.

Insurance Committee

J. T. Blalock
Louis V. Cassaday
Merrill J. Cate
William J. Goss

WILLIAM J. GOSS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
SECRETARY

MRS. CLAIRE L. BASS
J. T. BLALOCK
M. J. BRISTOL
CARL G. BUSCH
LOUIS V. CASSADAY
MERRILL J. CATE
MRS. FRANCES K. DOLL
S. H. EDMONDSON
FRANK W. FEE
H. J. GARRETSON
ALVA C. GARROTT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
1964 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90012
629-2451

WILLIAM J. GOSS
HOWARD J. GREEN
CHAS. K. KAMAYATSU
OZRO D. LEAS
MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
THOMAS F. MCCUE
WM. MIDDLETON
ARNOLD MUNZ
ELMER NIEMOELLER
MRS. CHARLES PALMER
SAM A. SARKISIAN
MRS. MARGARET M. TEGART

December 11, 1964.

The Honorable Joseph A. Wapner
Master Calendar Judge
Superior Court
Los Angeles, California

Dear Judge Wapner:

The final report of the Los Angeles County Grand Jury is submitted herewith.

As Foreman I know that the members of this Grand Jury express appreciation to the Judges who nominated us for this important service to the people of the County of Los Angeles. It is a year which all of us will remember.

Also, we thank you for the clear and explicit introduction to our duties which you provided us on the date of our impanelment, and for your valuable advice and counsel in connection with many difficult problems arising during the year, which earned our continued appreciation.

Also I must tell you how grateful I am to you for appointing me Foreman -- and thus affording me the opportunity to serve the people of this community in so many matters of importance.

Most Sincerely,

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

JTB-1b

WILLIAM J. GOSS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MRS. CLAIRE L. BASS
J. T. BLALOCK
M. J. BRISTOL
CARL G. BUSCH
LOUIS V. CASSADAY
MERRILL J. CATE
MRS. FRANCES K. DOLL
S. H. EDMONDSON
FRANK W. FEE
H. J. GARRETSON
ALVA C. GARROTT

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1964 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90012
629-2451

MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
SECRETARY

WILLIAM J. GOSS
HOWARD J. GREEN
CHAS. K. KAMAYATSU
OZRO D. LEAS
MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
THOMAS F. MCCUE
WM. MIDDLETON
ARNOLD MUNZ
ELMER NIEMOELLER
MRS. CHARLES PALMER
SAM A. SARKISIAN
MRS. MARGARET M. TEGART

December 11, 1964

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

Attention Supervisor Warren M. Dorn, Chairman

Gentlemen:

The 1964 Grand Jury wishes to express its appreciation for the cooperation and assistance it has received in pursuance of its duties from the members of your Honorable Board, as the official directors of all departments of our county government.

We wish also to herewith express our appreciation to all those department officials of county facilities who did so much to assist us in our duties of inspections and audits. I can not omit mention of the high caliber of these officials and the devotion to public service shown by them.

We hope that our surveys, audits, and reports will be of assistance to you and beneficial to the citizens of Los Angeles County.

Respectfully submitted,

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

JTB-1b

WILLIAM J. GOSS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MRS. CLAIRE L. BASS
J. T. BLALOCK
M. J. BRISTOL
CARL G. BUSCH
LOUIS V. CASSADAY
MERRILL J. CATE
MRS. FRANCES K. DOLL
S. H. EDMONDSON
FRANK W. FEE
H. J. GARRETSON
ALVA C. GARROTT

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1964 GRAND JURY
348 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90012
629-2451

MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
SECRETARY

WILLIAM J. GOSS
HOWARD J. GREEN
CHAR. K. KAMAYATSU
OZRO D. LEAS
MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
THOMAS F. MCCUE
W. MIDDLETON
ARNOLD MUNZ
ELMER NIEMOLLER
MRS. CHARLES PALMER
SAM A. SARKISIAN
MRS. MARGARET M. TEGART

December 11, 1964

The Honorable William B. McKesson
District Attorney, Los Angeles County
600 Hall of Justice
Los Angeles, California

Dear Judge McKesson:

As the date of December 7, 1964 approaches, so also approaches the date when you terminate, by retirement, a long and illustrious career of distinguished public service to the people of Los Angeles County. We, the members of the 1964 Grand Jury, tender to you our sincere and heartfelt wish that your retirement will be filled with happiness and contentment and good health. We know that you will carry with you great personal satisfaction in the record of the fine public service you have rendered.

It is an especial privilege which the members of the 1964 Grand Jury granted to me as Foreman to express to you our appreciation for the fine cooperation we have received from you and all members of your department. The deputies who appeared before us were always cooperative, courteous, and extremely competent.

May I also take this opportunity to express to you our special appreciation for the highly valued counsel received from Mr. Fred Henderson, our legal advisor, and the able assistance of our Grand Jury staff.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

JTB-1b

WILLIAM J. GOSS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

MRS. CLAIRE L. BASS
J. T. BLALOCK
M. J. BRISTOL
CARL G. BUSCH
LOUIS V. CASSADAY
MERRILL J. CATE
MRS. FRANCES K. DOLL
S. H. EDMONDSON
FRANK W. FEE
H. J. GARRETSON
ALVA C. GARROTT

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1964 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90012
629-2451

MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
SECRETARY

WILLIAM J. GOSS
HOWARD J. GREEN
CHAS. K. KAMAYATSU
OZRO D. LEAS
MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
THOMAS F. MCCUE
WM. MIDDLETON
ARNOLD MUNZ
ELMER NIEMOELLER
MRS. CHARLES PALMER
SAM A. SARKISIAN
MRS. MARGARET M. TEGART

December 11, 1964

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

Dear Sheriff:

In a few days the 1964 Grand Jury will conclude its year of service. The members have granted to me the great privilege of expressing our appreciation for the splendid cooperation received from your office.

Our Jails Committee has inspected all jail facilities located in the County. The Grand Jury as a body has inspected the major jail facilities under your jurisdiction. These inspections included detention facilities for juveniles.

I wish to mention here the recognition by the Grand Jury of the caliber of those charged with the management. We recognize and commend their objective toward the rehabilitation of prisoners. We believe that this humane objective reflects greatly upon your leadership and that of your official family.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

JTB-1b

WILLIAM J GOSS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

J T BLALOCK
FOREMAN

MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG SR.
SECRETARY

MRS. CLAIRE L. BASS
J. T. BLALOCK
M. J. BRISTOL
CARL G. BUSCH
LOUIS V. CASSADAY
MERRILL J. CATE
MRS. FRANCES K. DOLL
S. H. EDMONDSON
FRANK W. FEE
H. J. GARRETSON
ALVA C. GARROTT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1964 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90012
629-2451

WILLIAM J GOSS
HOWARD J. GREEN
CHAS. K. KAMAYATSU
OZRO D. LEAS
MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
THOMAS F. MCCUE
WM. MIDDLETON
ARNOLD MUNZ
ELMER NIEMOELLER
MRS. CHARLES PALMER
SAM A. SARRISIAN
MRS. MARGARET M. TEGART

December 11, 1964

The Honorable William H. Parker
Chief of Police
Los Angeles, California

Dear Chief:

The members of the 1964 Grand Jury have requested me to express our appreciation for the cooperation received from your office.

We have in mind the prompt and forthright action which your department took in the investigation of, and the presentation of all evidence pertaining to certain vice squad department officers. Perhaps in no other city could a police department be trusted to investigate its own shortcomings. Your action reinforced anew public confidence in the integrity of the Los Angeles City Police Department.

We cannot omit commendation of your new officers, who upon graduation from your Police Academy go into undercover work with the narcotics detail, and thus help to stem the use of narcotics in our city.

We think that the Los Angeles City Police Department is the finest in the nation, and that this pinnacle has been attained by reason of the quality of your leadership and that of your official family.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

JTB/lb

IN APPRECIATION

It is proper and appropriate for the Grand Jury to express its appreciation to those who have contributed their guidance and assistance to us throughout the year, and we take this opportunity to tender our sincere "thank you" to the able and experienced staff assigned to the Grand Jury:

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

Joseph A. Gebhart, Investigator

Lila S. Boyd, Secretary

Johanna Friederich, Secretary

Jack Werther, Court Reporter

No Grand Jury could function efficiently without the patience, understanding, and tact constantly given to the Grand Jury throughout the year.

FOREMAN'S REPORT

Herewith follows a brief report of action taken and formal recommendations made by the 1964 Grand Jury

GAMBLING AND THE DOCTRINE OF "PRE-EMPTION"

The 1964 Grand Jury noted with alarm the controversy which developed between law enforcement agencies and professional gambling over the question of whether or not organized commercial gambling should be permitted in communities in this county. This Grand Jury was requested to conduct an inquiry into the effect upon the enforcement of local anti-gambling ordinances in light of the fact that the Court had applied the "doctrine of pre-emption." As a result of this inquiry the Grand Jury recommended that the members of the Legislature of the State of California consider the following action:

(1) Amend the appropriate state statutes which particularly relate to gambling, vice, and kindred areas, to clearly indicate that such statutes shall not pre-empt the enforcement of local ordinances.

(2) Initiate a constitutional amendment which shall accomplish these same objectives.

The complete resolution is set forth following the report of the Criminal Complaints Committee.

AMENDMENTS TO NARCOTICS ADDICTION LAWS

The Grand Jury also recommended to the Legislature the adoption of amendments to present narcotics laws to make it possible for a relative or friend to file a petition alleging that such person is addicted to narcotics; thus permitting, as an example, a mother, by such proceedings, to bring her addicted child under the custody of the courts for treatment for such addiction.

The resolution, as adopted, is set forth following the report of the Social Services Committee.

MORE STRINGENT ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES

Since about 50% of the total county budget is expended on various aid programs, the recommendation of the Audit Committee bears repeating here: "Reports of the contract auditor and our exposure to eligibility guidelines under aid programs clearly indicate to us that the primary application of

brakes on aid spending must be at the state and federal levels before any appreciable curtailments can be achieved in the county.

"We recommend that the Board of Supervisors consider the possibility of seeking from the state more stringent guidelines in keeping with the county's ability to pay for aid programs."

LONG RANGE CAPITAL PROJECTS FINANCING

Also recommendations contained in the Audit Committee's annual report on the subject of long range capital project financing bears emphasis here.

In commenting on the failure of the Juvenile Detention Facilities bond on last months' ballot, by a very slim margin, the committee made this observation.

"It is clear to us that budget and property tax pressures in future years very likely will make it virtually impossible for the county to fund any large, expensive capital project on a completely current basis. It is similarly clear to us that, on balance, the general obligation bond issue route is less expensive and it is preferable to lease-purchase arrangements for long-range capital project financing.

"We recommend, therefore, that our Board of Supervisors, the California Supervisors Association, and other interested bodies push for legislative revision pointed to accomplish a reduction from 66 2/3 % in the voter majority requirement for passage of general obligation bonds."

PSYCHIATRIC COURT PATIENTS

It is also recommended that the County Board of Supervisors institute a study of cost and feasibility of operation facilities, such as the Saugus Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center for Psychiatric Court patients. We recommend a pilot operation be instituted to carry out such study.

CENTRAL INVESTIGATION DEPARTMENT

A central investigation department to handle all departmental investigation, and responsible to the Board of Supervisors, and its Chief Administrative Officer, should be instituted. It is absurd and unbusiness like for such investigation to be conducted by and responsible to the department head.

FAMILY COURT BUILDING

We recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they consider the construction of a Family Courts Building, and that studies be initiated for the purpose of determining the nature, character, and scope of such a Family Courts Building and its efficient utilization.

RECOMMENDATION OF JAILS COMMITTEE

Space does not permit more than to call specific attention to the 13 recommendations contained in the Jails Committee Report. These recommendations were adopted and approved by the Grand Jury.

J. T. BLALOCK
Foreman

May I take this opportunity to thank the members of the 1964 County Grand Jury for the honor and confidence they showed be by their selection of me as their secretary.

It has indeed been a great pleasure to be associated with the Foreman, Mr. James T. Blalock, as well as the rest of the members of the jury.

The work I have been able to accomplish during the year would have been impossible if it had not been for the dedicated secretaries in the office, Mrs. Lila Boyd and Mrs. Johanna Friederich.

Most sincerely,

MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
SECRETARY

PART TWO

AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT

The Audit Committee allocated its attention during the year in three principal directions —

- 1) To studies of matters of County-wide significance.
- 2) To reviews and examinations of specific departments and programs.
- 3) To follow-ups of suggestions and recommendations pending from prior years.

With the approval of the full Jury and Judge Wapner, the Committee appointed Walter H. Lohman of Arthur Young & Company as its Contract Auditor, to carry out its examinations.

As he progressed with or completed the assignments to which we directed him, the Contract Auditor reviewed and discussed his findings and suggestions with the appropriate County personnel and then furnished his comments and recommendations to us in a series of interim reports. To enable County officials to consider audit report suggestions and commence responsive action at the earliest possible time, copies of the interim reports were also sent to —

Each Supervisor

The Chief Administrative Officer

The Auditor-Controller

The department heads involved and, in some cases, departmental division or bureau heads.

Following distribution of the interim reports, we invited comments and reactions from the County officials involved. In some instances the audit comments and recommendations were subsequently discussed in informal meetings of Audit Committee members, department heads and their assistants, and the Contract Auditor.

To augment the written reports and the meetings, and to gain maximum insight into the County's problems and pressures, members of the Committee personally visited and inspected the operations of the following departments:

Auditor-Controller

Regional Planning Commission

Small Craft Harbors, at Marina del Rey

Bureau of Public Assistance

In addition, we carefully inspected the Purchasing and Stores Department, although it was not on our audit list, and we sat in to listen to budget hearings of the Board of Supervisors.

Under date of November 6, the Contract Auditor completed an updated, composite report on the year's work. In accordance with our instructions, copies of that final report have been delivered to the following:

- Each Supervisor
- Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
- Chief Administrative Officer
- Chief of the Management Division of the Chief
Administrative Officer's office
- Auditor-Controller
- Chief of the Audit Division of the Office of Auditor-Controller
- Superintendent of Charities

In the paragraphs which follow we have not intended to duplicate the suggestions and action-inviting comments which have been set out in the Contract Auditor's reports. We have merely briefly highlighted some of our conclusions and opinions.

Examinations and Reviews Directed by the Audit Committee

MATTERS OF COUNTY-WIDE APPLICATION

- Accounts Receivable — in departments other than the
Department of Charities
- Charges to Cities for Contracted Services
- Identification and Disposal of Excess Real Property in the Flood Control
District and in the Department of Real Estate Management
- Expenditures and Future Commitments for Leased Real Property
Facilities
- Comparisons of Cost to the County for the Hall of Administration and
the County Courthouse, with comments on lease-purchases vs.
bond issues

DEPARTMENTAL EXAMINATIONS AND REVIEWS

- Department of Charities
 - Bureau of Resources and Collections
 - Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, including a review
of Reconciliation Controls and Duplicate Warrants
 - Indigent Aid Program

Municipal Courts — East Los Angeles and San Antonio, with comments
on all municipal courts
Regional Planning Commission
Department of Small Craft Harbors and Marina del Rey Revenue Bond
Fund
Treasurer — Review of Non-Working or Surplus Funds

REVIEWS AND FOLLOW-UPS OF RECOMMENDATIONS PENDING FROM PRIOR YEARS

* * * * *

CHARGES TO CITIES FOR CONTRACTED SERVICES

During the ten-year period since the adoption of the Lakewood Plan, the matter of County charges to cities and the underlying cost concepts and methods of determining those charges have been subjects of almost constant discussion and review by the many parties involved — the so-called “contract cities”, the so-called “home rule cities”, the Sheriff, the Auditor-Controller, the Chief Administrative Officer, the Board of Supervisors, Grand Juries, and assorted taxpayer groups.

With respect to charges for law enforcement services in particular, the Chief Administrative Officer, the Auditor-Controller and the Sheriff have found themselves in the middle of a continuous tug-of-war in which the determination of cost (rates) is not always a matter of pure arithmetic, but rather must be tempered by administrative practicalities and over-all relationships with all cities within the County.

The subject of rates for contract services to cities was reviewed by Grand Juries in 1958, 1959 and 1962. From its studies of Sheriff's charges the 1962 Grand Jury concluded that,

“... the contract city should pay for any costs incurred by the Sheriff, **over** and **above** those he would have to expend to maintain a **normal** staff in the area

“... this does not give a contract city any so-called ‘credit’ because its citizens are taxpayers of Los Angeles County. No such credit was contemplated by the jury, and none is to be construed.

“Instead, the jury is endeavoring to ascertain what price a contract city should pay for the **extra** service it causes the Sheriff to render, as opposed to the **normal** service he would render if the municipality elected to have its own police department.”

(In these quoted paragraphs, we have inserted bold type for current emphasis.)

Based on the foregoing cost recovery concept, the 1962 Jury recommended a rate which cities should be charged for law enforcement services. After exposure to and reported agreement of all interested parties, the rate was adopted effective January 1, 1963.

The 1962 Jury also recommended that the Auditor-Controller recompute the rate annually, for use in each ensuing fiscal year.

Working with our Contract Auditor, we reviewed the concepts and methods used to establish and update rates charged to cities by the County for services provided by the Sheriff, Registrar of Voters, Engineer, Parks and Recreation Department, Forester and Fire Warden and Road Department.

With respect to the services rendered by departments other than the Sheriff, our review disclosed that the amounts being charged are reasonably recovering the County's cost of providing the services — except for General County Overhead. All departments except Road are charging 50% of General County Overhead. Road's rates in the current fiscal year are recovering no General County Overhead.

With respect to the charges for law enforcement services provided by the Sheriff, it is our clear and definite conclusion that —

- 1) The subject has been more politically emotional than it deserves to be; its financial aspects have been distorted out of perspective.
- 2) The crux of the problem encountered in determining what the rates should be for contract law enforcement services revolves around the point that the Sheriff has over-all, County-wide responsibility for general law enforcement which, although reduced by a city's incorporation, is not eliminated. Because it is not possible to precisely define or specifically pinpoint the exact extent of the Sheriff's statutory responsibilities, it is similarly impossible to compute a single, true, indisputable cost for the law enforcement services which the Sheriff renders. No amount of conversation will change that existing fact.
- 3) The cost recovery concept and the methods of rate determination and updating which have been in use since 1962 are generally sound and reasonable, although the methods should be refined to provide for complete rate recomputations, not less than once every five years, to fully reflect all changes in the numbers of cars manned, in Sheriff's station staffing patterns, in the number of contracting cities, in the number of stations involved, and in other elements of the program, to provide a new base rate for application of interim years' increases geared to increases in salaries of deputy sheriffs. Such recomputations should include:

- a) Redetermination by the Sheriff of "What is normal";
- b) Analysis of the Sheriff's central administrative and support costs — not now included in rates — to determine to what extent, if any, they should be included; and
- c) Recognition of the cost of unfilled, vacant positions.

In addition, County Counsel should be asked to rule on the legality of the present practice of applying General County Overhead at 50% instead of 100% of full rates.

THE INTERNAL AUDIT FUNCTION

Despite the pre-audit processes and other accounting controls which we recognize exist within the various divisions of the Auditor-Controller's office, it appears to us that there are still far too many holes in the total review which the Audit Division is able to accomplish. For example, following is the dating of some of the most recent audits, together with the amounts of revenue, expenditures and capital projects currently budgeted —

<u>Department</u>	Most recent audit	<u>1964-65 Budgeted</u>	
		<u>Revenue</u>	<u>Expenditures and capital projects</u>
Building Services	1956-57	\$ 6,983	\$ 3,041,711
Communications	1955-56	179,625	6,380,328
Harbor General Hospital	1958-59	1,267,595	10,639,799
Health	1956-57	1,034,691	18,410,582
Public Library	1958-59	773,883	6,830,499
Sheriff	(Limited cash audit) 1952-53	4,947,184	28,997,752

(The Sheriff's Civil Division was audited for 1961-62, and the Jail Store was checked for 1956-57)

We believe that an expansion in the internal audit coverage should be accompanied by increased emphasis on the "eyes and ears" role which a well-trained, imaginative internal audit group can play. The following comments from The Wall Street Journal of October 26, 1964 could just as aptly have been made about the County:

"This broadening role of the auditor as the eyes and ears of top management is a relatively new one. It comes about largely because many U.S. companies have grown so complex and far-flung that the people who run them can

never be wholly certain that they know about important things that are happening at lower levels. These managers often find it highly useful to have a reasonably objective and independent branch to look into situations that other subordinates might be reluctant to report, or the significance of which they might not understand.

“Auditors can expand their role because office automation is freeing them from much of their traditional routine paperwork.”

The article goes on to mention a large West Coast company which has expanded its auditing staff from 14 in 1949 to 112 now:

“But only about 30% of the man-hours of the department today are expended on financial auditing. The rest are devoted to broader ‘operational’ auditing”

AID PROGRAMS

Reports of the Contract Auditor and our exposure to eligibility guidelines under aid programs clearly indicate to us that the primary application of brakes on aid spending must be at State and Federal levels before any appreciable curtailments can be achieved in the County.

We recommend that the Board of Supervisors consider the possibility of seeking from the State more stringent guidelines, in keeping with the County's ability to pay for aid programs.

REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT

We are aware of the unsettled questions and differences of opinion which have arisen during the last few years over personnel requirements, leasing procedures, excess real property disposals and business practices of the Department.

We are in agreement with the Chief Administrative Officer's recommendation and the Board of Supervisors' decision that a thorough management, operational and procedural review of the Department should be made by an outside, qualified consultant.

MANAGEMENT COST CONTROL TECHNIQUES

The County's 1964-65 budget for salaries, wages and related benefits calls for approximately \$362,000,000 for 47,000 employees. That is about 38% of the total budget.

As were our predecessors last year, Audit Committee members and others on the Jury became aware of and interested in what we believe to be huge po-

tential savings and cost reductions achievable in the personnel budget through the application of industry-proved cost control techniques.

Based on our recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, and with the support of the Chief Administrative Officer, the Board in October approved the undertaking of two pilot work measurement studies which, when completed, can be used as the basis for personnel budgeting.

It is expected that the two pilot projects will be completed in time to use the results in 1965-66 budget proposals.

BUSINESS PRACTICES

While the examinations which we assigned to our Contract Auditor this year were considerably less in number than the audits and reviews carried out in some prior years, the findings and suggestions which run through his reports point to continuing opportunities for improvements or revisions in business practices which, in turn, should produce increased revenue or reduced expenditures.

The types of things we are talking about are —

- Useless accounts receivable documents and records prepared and maintained. (Auditor-Controller and various individual departments)
- Uncontrolled cost overruns on fixed or maximum price contracts. (Engineer and Regional Planning Commission)
- Losses of interest income because of delays in reinvestment of funds. (Marina del Rey Revenue Bond Fund)
- Drags in the disposal of excess real property. (Real Estate Management)
- Paying appraisal fees to professional appraisers to make mathematical calculations. (Real Estate Management)
- Juror-calling methods which result in more jurors than are needed. (Various Municipal Courts)
- Debtor identification problems generated from illegible patient identification forms prepared by admitting clerical workers in General Hospital.

Loopholes, duplications and losses such as these can be held to a minimum only through continuing and constant vigilance and objective thoughtfulness by every County officer and employee who is responsible for generating paper or for collecting money or for spending it.

Supervisor Bonelli summed it aptly when he said, last July 14, "Most emphatically, the Board of Supervisors and the County Assessor are integral parts of a governmental corporation — the County of Los Angeles. Our employer is the County taxpayer, and we in County government are all eating out of a common trough. Whether we are elected or hired, the first and most sacred obligation is to run this County government corporation as any successful business would be run in the best interest of the stockholders — the people of our County."

LONG-RANGE CAPITAL PROJECT FINANCING

On this subject we have two comments, the first of which is a quote from our Contract Auditor's report to us on Comparisons of Cost to the County for the Hall of Administration and the Civic Center County Courthouse:

"It is not our function to attempt to decide for the Board of Supervisors or the community how the County should finance its present and long-range capital projects needs. However, one basic point is clear, and should be met head-on:

"The County's present 10-Year Capital Projects Program contemplates the addition of a total of about \$400,000,000 in facilities by 1973. Of that projected total, a portion — presently undetermined — will probably be financed through lease-purchase agreements with the Board of Retirement. As to both that portion, and more particularly to the remainder, it appears to us to be a basic, essential element of the total planning that the Board of Supervisors — at the same time that it plots out long-range capital projects growth — must also plot out and publicize the proposed financing means by which that capital growth is to be achieved.

"A long-range growth plan without a financial blueprint can be only a paper fantasy."

The failure of the juvenile detention facilities bonds on last month's ballot serves to emphasize the Contract Auditor's comment.

Our second observation relates to the very narrow margins by which the hospital bonds received but the juvenile bonds failed the 66 2/3 % vote required for passage:

It is clear to us that budget and property tax pressures in future years very likely will make it virtually impossible for the County to fund any large, expensive capital project on a completely current basis. It is similarly clear to us that, on balance, the general obligation bond issue route is less expensive and is preferable to lease-purchase arrangements for long-range capital project financing.

We recommend, therefore, that our Board of Supervisors, the California Supervisors Association and other interested bodies push for legislative revision pointed to accomplish a reduction from 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ % in the voter majority requirement for passage of general obligation bonds.

FOLLOW-UP OF RECOMMENDATIONS PENDING FROM PRIOR YEARS

Our Contract Auditor made a comprehensive review to determine what action had been completed, or was still in process, or had not been taken on audit matters which were "open" from prior years.

By and large, although both we and he have been sometimes frustrated by a pace of action which has made us impatient, the Contract Auditor's follow-up reports indicate a high degree of acceptance and a reasonable degree of implementation of suggestions made in prior years.

FOR 1965

To facilitate continuity, and for the convenience of 1965 Grand Jurors and County personnel, the Contract Auditor has set out in the concluding pages of his final report a listing of audit recommendations and related matters which should be followed in 1965.

In addition, we believe that the 1965 Audit Committee will be interested in following on —

- Progress made by the Department of Small Craft Harbors toward overcoming the physical and financial problems and uncertainties with which it has been plagued.
- Preliminary results of the workings of the "Instant Money Plan" recently put into use in the Purchasing and Stores Department.
- Findings in the two pilot work measurement studies approved by the Board in October.
- The financial results — costs less any offsetting savings — of the pilot Work Furlough Program which commenced on July 1, 1964.
- The dollar effects on aid programs — if measurable — of the Community Work and Training Program which came in with Assembly Bill 59 in early 1964.

— Conclusions and recommendations which stem from the forthcoming consultant's study of the Department of Real Estate Management.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis V. Cassaday, Chmn., Audit Com.

M. J. Bristol, Vice Chairman

H. J. Garretson

Mrs. Harry Erling Ljung, Sr.

Thomas F. McCue, Secretary

Arnold Munz

Elmer Niemoeller

Sam A. Sarkisian

CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE REPORT

It is with regret the Criminal Complaint Committee finds the end of the year 1964 has been reached without proper consideration of some of the broader problems which we believe need a good hard look.

The number one problem appears to be the terrific crime increase; the second is the narcotics problem, also increasing at an alarming rate. Our experience on the Grand Jury leads us to believe there is a definite relationship between these two, as to cause and effect. The number three problem appears to have a very definite relationship to the first two problems. We are concerned here with the recent decisions affecting the apprehension and detention of persons suspected or convicted of crime. Apparently these decisions have the effect of deterring the police officer in his efforts to protect the public.

The Criminal Complaints Committee strongly urges the legislators to give top priority to the problem of correcting this alarming situation by restoring to the law enforcement officers their proper authority to effectively carry out their sworn duties. Certainly the rights of the accused should be protected but not at the expense of the public safety. This committee firmly believes such legislation would be a step forward in reducing the rapidly increasing crime rate in this state.

The Grand Jury recognized the need for the recommended changes in the law and fully supported the Criminal Complaints Committee in its position regarding the crime problem. This support was evidenced by a resolution to the State Legislature by the Grand Jury, urging early action on corrective measures which will clearly protect the public interest and will effectively deter the criminal. It is requested by the Criminal Complaints Committee that all law enforcement agencies and legislative bodies in the County of Los Angeles support the Grand Jury in its efforts for remedial action to correct this alarming situation. It is further requested the news media give their full support, by alerting the public to this dangerous trend which is affecting law enforcement in this County and State.

It is urged that the incoming 1965 Grand Jury vigorously follow up these recommendations for effective law enforcement, because without follow up nothing will be done, and our efforts in this important area will be lost in a maze of governmental delays and excuses.

It is the opinion of this committee that the task of an aroused public in obtaining corrective legislative action will be a difficult one. There is definite indication that certain organized groups will oppose the proposed changes be-

cause of their own selfish interests, even though the general public will be benefited through the proposed changes.

There is one time consuming problem which makes the work of this committee much more difficult — that is, the letters to the Grand Jury by individuals claiming a felony has been committed by friends, relatives, workmen, business associates, etc. Others claim false testimony in court. After investigation we found about one out of one hundred had any basis for criminal consideration, the rest being matters for the civil courts, if there was cause for any action. We see no way to eliminate this problem.

The following summary is a statistical report of the cases processed through the 1964 Criminal Complaints Committee, resulting in Grand Jury indictments:

<u>Number of Indictments</u>	<u>Type of Case</u>
4	Bookmaking
3	Bribery
3	Burglary
2	Child Stealing
11	Conspiracy
1	False Evidence
1	Manslaughter
5	Forgery
6	Grand Theft
1	Kidnaping
3	Murder
142	Narcotics
16	Obscene Literature
5	Welfare Fraud
1	Perjury
<hr/> 203	TOTAL

In addition, there were six cases refused by the Criminal Complaints Committee, after briefing by a Deputy District Attorney; four, no indictment cases voted by the Grand Jury.

The committee is indebted to Deputy District Attorney Fred Henderson, Investigator Joseph A. Gebhart, and their secretaries, for their technical assistance and advice. These people were very helpful and cheerfully responded to all our requests.

MERRILL J. CATE
Chairman

CARL G. BUSCH

FRANK W. FEE

ALVA C. GARROTT

CHAS. K. KAMAYATSU

MRS. CHARLES PALMER

**PETITION OF THE 1964 LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY TO
THE MEMBERS OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE
REGARDING THE DOCTRINE OF PRE-EMPTION**

WHEREAS the 1964 Los Angeles County Grand Jury members were requested by E. L. Mueller, Chief of Police of Culver City, Los Angeles County, California, and Donald E. Olson, City Attorney of that city, to conduct an inquiry into the effect upon the enforcement of its local anti-gambling ordinances in light of the fact that the court has applied the doctrine of "pre-emption" rendered in the decision of the Carol Lane case, 58 Cal. (2nd) 99, and

WHEREAS the application of said doctrine necessarily affected other communities as well, the inquiry was therefore broadened to include the following persons, who appeared and testified before the Grand Jury at its session on September 16, 1964:

Thomas C. Lynch	Attorney General
William B. McKesson	District Attorney, L.A. County
Peter J. Pitchess	Sheriff, Los Angeles County
Roger Arnebergh	City Attorney, Los Angeles
William H. Parker	Chief of Police, Los Angeles
W. J. Mooney	Chief of Police, Long Beach
Donald E. Olson	City Attorney, Culver City
Charles Lugo	Captain, Culver City Police Dept.
E. Reinbold	Chief, Santa Monica Police Dept.
W. E. Slaughter	Chief, San Fernando Police Dept.
Thomas M. Rees	Member California Senate
George A. Willson	Chairman, Assembly Committee on Judiciary, California
Mrs. Norma L. Yocum	Mayor, City of Alhambra
Don D. Bercu	City Attorney, City of Alhambra

and

WHEREAS, the testimony of all of these witnesses clearly indicated that the application of the pre-emption doctrine not only permits the playing of Panguingui, which was the original reason for requesting a Grand Jury inquiry, but the doctrine opens the door as well for practically all forms of organized commercial gambling in the cities and unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles, and

WHEREAS, if the doctrine of pre-emption, as established in the Carol Lane case, is applied to make local ordinances completely ineffective, it then would automatically give legal asquiescence to organized commercial gam-

bling, thus tacitly inviting and encouraging its open and unrestrained practice, a situation which is utterly abhorrent to all decent right-thinking citizens, and

WHEREAS it was further developed in the hearing that the application of said doctrine also tends to cripple the efforts of law enforcement to cope with the practice of prostitution or to allow the arrests of common drunks except under a limited set of circumstances, both of which situations are in need of correction; this being particularly so in our large cities where the harmful effects of these evils are most apparent, and

WHEREAS, the testimony presented to the Grand Jury served to highlight that, once organized commercial gambling is permitted to operate openly under the protection of the law, the scum of the underworld would swarm in to our metropolitan areas bringing with them their whole bag of sinister tools for the operation of graft, corruption, violence, prostitution, illicit sex and those other forms of crime which always accompany such easy, fast and abundant money,

NOW THEREFORE the 1964 Los Angeles County Grand Jury petitions the Honorable Members of the State Legislature of California to take prompt appropriate action to give to the cities and counties of this state the right of local option so that each such community will be empowered to enact such local ordinances deemed necessary to control their special local problems.

Specifically, the 1964 Los Angeles County Grand Jury suggests that the members of the Legislature of the State of California consider the following actions:

1. To amend the appropriate state statutes, which particularly relate to gambling, vice, and kindred areas, to clearly indicate that such statutes shall not pre-empt the enforcement of local ordinances.
2. To initiate a constitutional amendment which shall accomplish these same objectives.

THE 1964 LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY

By J. T. BLALOCK, FOREMAN

DATED: Tuesday, September 22, 1964.

JAILS COMMITTEE REPORT

In compliance with the terms of Section 923 of the California Penal Code the following Jails Committee was appointed January 23, 1964, by the foreman, Mr. J. T. Blalock.

Carl G. Busch, Chairman
Merrill J. Cate
S. H. Edmondson (deceased)
Frank W. Fee
Alva C. Garrott
Chas. K. Kamayatsu
Mrs. Charles Palmer

The committee held its organizational meeting January 30, 1964. All members of the committee were present; Chairman Busch, presiding, appointed Chas. K. Kamayatsu secretary.

Due to the large number of jails in Los Angeles County the committee agreed to divide itself into three inspection teams, as follows:

TEAM NO. 1	TEAM NO. 2	TEAM NO. 3
Frank W. Fee, Capt. Merrill J. Cate Alva C. Garrott	Carl G. Busch, Capt. S. H. Edmondson	Chas. K. Kamayatsu, Cap. Mrs. Charles Palmer

The jail locations were divided geographically, as far as possible, so as to save as much time and mileage as possible. All of the facilities within the County have been inspected, except Avalon, which the committee felt could be excluded because of its distance, smallness, and inspection during the previous summer. A total of 83 installations, not including Juvenile camps, were visited. These were:

Alhambra	Compton	Glendale
Altadena	Covina	Glendora
Antelope Valley	Culver City	Harbor Division
Arcadia	Downey	Hawthorne
Azusa	East Los Angeles	Hermosa Beach
Bell	El Monte	Highland Park
Beverly Hills	El Segundo	Hollenbeck
Burbank	Firestone Park	Hollywood
City of Industry	Foothill	Huntington Park
Claremont	Gardena	Inglewood

Lakewood
La Verne
Lennox
Lincoln Heights
Long Beach
Lynwood
Malibu
Manhattan Beach
Maywood
Mira Loma
Monrovia
Montebello
Monterey Park
Montrose

Newhall
Newton Street
North Hollywood
Norwalk
Palos Verdes
Pasadena
Pomona
Redondo Beach
San Dimas
San Fernando
San Gabriel
San Marino
Santa Monica
Saugus

Seventy-seventh Street
Sierra Madre
Signal Hill
South Gate
Temple City
Torrance
University
VanNuys
Venice
Vernon
West Hollywood
West Los Angeles
West Valley
Whittier
Wilshire

Not a single case of imprisonment or holding of suspects without charge beyond the 48 hours required by law was found.

A number of irregularities were found and immediately corrected, such as dirty toilets, poor lighting, uninspected soda-acid fire fighting canisters, etc. — instances which will not be reported here separately. A signed inspection sheet, listing conditions found at each jail, is on file.

In addition to the foregoing the entire Grand Jury made the following inspections:

Old County Jail (Hall of Justice)
L. A. City Police Central Jail
General Hospital Detention Quarters
Wayside Honor Farm
Las Palmas

New County Central Jail
L. A. Police Crime Laboratory
Sybil Brand Institute
Juvenile Hall
Los Padrinos

The crowded condition of the County Hall of Justice Jail reported by previous Grand Juries still exists; it is gradually being reduced, but cannot be eliminated until the new County Central Jail is fully staffed. On the day of inspection there were 2248 prisoners quartered in a facility having a listed capacity for 1800.

The new Central County Jail is completely modern and one of the finest facilities of its kind in the West. Only two-thirds of the jail capacity were in use on the day of the inspection because of inadequate manpower.

The Los Angeles City Central Jail and Police Administration Building, 150 North Los Angeles Street, is probably the finest and most modern facility

in the nation. Chief William H. Parker is to be most highly commended for his ability to attract, train and maintain the highest standard of officers for the economical management of the department, its efficiency, and above all, for his forthright manner of maintaining discipline.

The General Hospital Detention Facility for Men greatly needs expansion; an average of 60 prisoners per day occupy space designed for 35.

Sybil Brand Institute for Women is completely modern, with some remaining capacity. Captain Ruth Johns, Chief Joe Gaalken, and their staff, are to be highly commended for their efficient, economical, and humane operation of the facility, and particularly for their outstanding efforts in the training and rehabilitation program leading to a normal civil life after release.

The Wayside Honor Farm is one of the finest operations of its kind in the nation. It consists of 2800 acres with many old, wooden, World War I barracks used for housing prisoners in the minimum security section. On June 18, 1964, the day of the Grand Jury visit, there were 927 prisoners in the maximum security section and 1095 in the minimum security section. After screening and aptitude tests, the minimum security prisoners are put to work affording training and rehabilitation in the Mechanical Shop, Sheet Metal, Plumbing Shop, Carpenter Shop, Printing Shop, Electric Shop, Dairy, Bakery, Farm, Aggregate Plant, etc. The products and services provided by this facility pay approximately 57% of its operational cost. If the oil royalty is added, then 73% of its operational cost is paid.

Antelope Valley Sheriff Station does not conform to the State of California Fire Code in that there is no escape door to the trustees' quarters.

Firestone Park Sheriff Station has inadequate ventilation in the jail section. The modification and enlargement of the booking room would increase security to personnel. Could be done at nominal cost.

Glendora. Closed. Jail condemned by County Health Department in January 1964. All arrestees taken to San Dimas Sheriff Station.

Highland Park Police Station. Existing wooden wall between the desk and jail section should be replaced with a brick wall, having a door activated by the desk officer. This could be constructed without great expense.

Malibu Sheriff Station does not conform to California minimum jail standards or County Fire Code, and is entirely inadequate as now used. Installation of overhead sprinkling system, as recommended by the Fire Department, and installation of additional toilet facilities, should be done immediately.

Mira Loma Facility urgently needs the augmentation and modernization of the existing equipment and the replacement of old barracks with modern, code-conforming structures. The sanitary facilities as a whole are adequate, but not up to minimum jail standards.

Montrose Sheriff Station. Highly unsatisfactory. Does not conform to minimum jail standards, or the County Fire Code. Also, has inadequate toilet facilities. Building is far too small; was constructed prior to 1930 and was not designed for its present use.

Newhall Sheriff Station. Similar to Montrose, only older. Facility is on private property leased by the County. Cell block over 30 years old.

Norwalk Sheriff Station needs separate bath and toilet facilities for trustees' section. At present two shower stalls and toilets serve the needs of 216 men and 8 trustees. The station is also in need of a squad room for briefing.

Pomona. Most modern facility visited. Financed by bonds. Occupied in 1963; designed to reach capacity in 1980. Has closed circuit TV control over tanks and corridors; cells equipped with listening devices; air conditioning; and only three prisoners.

Saugus Rehabilitation Center is an excellent facility for the rehabilitation of alcoholics. It is efficiently operated and well maintained. It has an average of 1050 prisoners, with a capacity for 1200. Age of the inmates averages 35 years, — mostly repeaters; all are required to work. The facility grows vegetables and fruits on 580 acres for County-operated institutions. There is a shoe shop, paint shop, canvas shop, and toy loan repair shop for those inclined to learn a trade.

Venice. Ventilation in jail section inadequate. Needs heavy screens over windows west of custody cells. Several prisoners have escaped by breaking the windows.

Vernon. No facilities for women and juveniles. No shower stalls. Does not conform to minimum jail standards.

SUICIDES: On inquiry, the Jails Committee chairman was informed there had been three suicides during the year, — one within the Los Angeles City Jail system and two within the County system; that there had occurred 56 attempted suicides, — 13 within the Los Angeles City system and 43 within the County system; that all were the result of aggravated depression; that each one was investigated by the appropriate detective division concerned; that the Coroner made a post-mortem investigation of each successful suicide;

that internal distribution of each report was made to the concerned division and that the deaths were reported to the State Criminal Bureau of Identification.

BRUTALITY: At times throughout the year considerable newspaper publicity was given to several alleged brutality cases within the County Jail. Inquiry revealed that during the year 33 complaints were made,—25 occurring within the County system and 8 within the Los Angeles City system. Those occurring within the County system were investigated by a special Sheriff's board. Those within the City by the Internal Affairs Division; complaints by a Federal prisoner, by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Of the 25 complaints filed in the County 15 were found without fact or substance, 7 were unsustained. Of the 8 complaints filed in the City system 4 were unfounded, 3 were not sustained, and 1 was sustained. Disciplinary action taken in the sustained complains resulted in 2 resignations in lieu of discharge, 1 two-week suspension without pay, and 1 five-day suspension without pay.

WORK FURLOUGH: The Jails Committee was particularly interested in the Work-Furlough Program authorized by the Board of Supervisors to commence on a limited basis July 1, 1964. This is a program whereby carefully screened, sentenced prisoners are permitted by the Courts to work at their regular employment during the day and then return to custody at night, weekends, and holidays. The money earned to be placed in a trust fund for each furlougee and administered by the Probation Department for the support of the prisoner's family, the maintenance of the prisoner, his personal expenses, and payment of debts, if any. The prisoners are quartered separately at Biscailuz Center in custody of the Sheriff's Department, and are the responsibility of the Probation Department on leaving the facility. The number of prisoners have gradually increased to 33 as of November 17, 1964, and will reach the authorized maximum of 60 on or about January 1, 1965. As of November 17th there have been no escapes and only one failure. No evaluation of the program in regard to any of its major features; namely, Rehabilitation benefits, Monetary costs, Reimbursement to the County, Savings in welfare costs, or Recidivism of work-furlougees as compared to prisoners receiving conventional treatment is possible at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Jails Committee recommends that the Chief Administrative Officer complete negotiations with the City of Los Angeles for the purchase of the **Lincoln Heights Jail** and the **Saugus Rehabilitation Center** at a reasonable price. Both of these facilities are badly needed, and if not purchased soon would have to be replaced elsewhere at a much greater cost.

2. We recommend that the Chief Administrative Officer complete studies, and expedite construction, of regional jails in the **San Fernando Valley**, **San Gabriel Valley**, and the **Southern Area**, as provided in a master plan on file with the Chief Administrative Officer. The jails to be so located that they will be able to serve several judicial districts, anticipate future growth and eliminate much of the existing prisoner transportation.
3. We recommend that the Chief Administrative Officer initiate immediate steps leading to the construction of a new women's facility. **Sybil Brand Institute** is expected to reach its capacity about July 1, 1965.
4. We recommend that the existing ancient **Malibu**, **Montrose**, and **Newhall Sheriff Stations** be replaced as soon as possible, in accordance with the master plan on file with the Chief Administrative Officer.
5. We recommend that the Chief Administrative Officer begin as soon as possible the construction of a modern laundry at the **Mira Loma Facility** large enough to handle all County institutional work, then establish rates sufficient to amortize the investment within the life of the equipment, provide for its replacement and necessary maintenance. This would eliminate the present laundry at the General Hospital and provide room for other needed improvements; it would also replace the ancient, worn-out, existing equipment at Mira Loma, which has frequent failures and excessive maintenance costs. We understand that a comprehensive laundry survey by the Victor Kramer Company, independent laundry analysts, is almost completed.
6. At the **Wayside Honor Farm** we recommend that the existing wooden, fire-hazardous, World War I Army barracks now in use be replaced as soon as possible with fire code-conforming structures.
7. At the **Antelope Valley Sheriff Station** jail we recommend the construction of an escape door in the east wall of the trustees' quarters, in order to conform to the State Fire Code.
8. At the **Firestone Park Sheriff Station** jail we recommend better ventilation; also the enlargement and modification of the booking room for better security.
9. At the **Norwalk Sheriff Station** jail we recommend the immediate installation of adequate wash and toilet facilities in the trustees' quarters.
10. At the **Highland Park Police Station** jail we recommend that the existing south wooden wall between the desk and jail be replaced with a brick or concrete wall, having a door activated by the desk officer.

11. At the **Venice Division Police Station** jail we recommend the immediate installation of heavy metal screens over the windows west of the cells.
12. We recommend that the Chief Probation Officer furnish the 1965 Jails Committee a copy of his **Work-Furlough Program** evaluation report to the Board of Supervisors as soon as completed. We further suggest that the Probation Department's legal consultant be requested to furnish information concerning proposed modifications and legislative changes before they occur.
13. We recommend that the 1965 Jails Committee request that the Sheriff's Department and the Los Angeles City Police Department submit to them reports of investigations relating to suicides, brutality and use of excessive force as soon as completed.

We sincerely thank the other members of the 1964 Grand Jury for their generous time and cooperation in assisting us in our inspections throughout the year.

We wish to express our appreciation to the following officials for their courtesy, cooperation, time, transportation, and explanations, without which we could not have accomplished the work:

1. Hon. Peter J. Pitchess, Sheriff of Los Angeles County
2. Undersheriff James F. Downey
3. Chief Joe M. Gaalken, Jail Division
4. Chief J. V. McLaughlin, Corrections Division
5. Capt. Robert F. Karney, Transportation Bureau
6. Mr. Leland C. Carter, Chief Probation Officer
7. Chief William H. Parker, Los Angeles City Police Department

We also wish to thank Deputy District Attorney Fred M. Henderson, Investigator Joseph A. Gebhart, Secretary Lila S. Boyd, and Secretary Johanna Friederich for their capable assistance.

Respectfully submitted,

JAILS COMMITTEE

Carl G. Busch, Chairman
Merill J. Cate
Stephen H. Edmondson (deceased)
Frank W. Fee
Alva C. Garrott
Charles K. Kamayatsu, Secretary
Mrs. Charles Palmer

PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT

Immediately after the impaneling of the 1964 Los Angeles County Grand Jury, among the standing committees appointed for the year were the Schools, Juvenile, and Social Services. The appointed personnel on each of these three committees was identical, embracing the following:

Mrs. Frances K. Doll, Chairman of the Juvenile Committee
William J. Goss, Chairman of the Social Services Committee
Howard J. Green, Chairman of the Schools Committee
Mrs. Claire L. Bass
Ozro D. Leas
Mrs. Harry Erling Ljung, Sr.
William Middleton
Mrs. Margaret M. Tegart

Almost immediately a joint meeting of these three committees was called and it became clear that the three committees shared many common interests. As an example, there were problems in the Schools Committee, such as drop-outs, with which the Juvenile Committee would be equally concerned. Again, most of the County detention homes, while dealing with the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents, also maintained special schools, which naturally would demand the attention of both of these committees. Again, in the study of welfare cases, while this would clearly be in the province of the Social Services Committee, much of this study would deal with the causes for juvenile delinquency and would also tend to indicate that, in underprivileged homes, proper schooling for the children would undoubtedly be a subject for the Schools Committee to consider. In other words, the work of these three committees seemed so interlocked that it would be practically impossible to determine where the work of one committee began and the work of another ended. Furthermore, if each of these committees were to work independently of the others, separate secretaries, separate minutes, and separate meetings would be required. Therefore, it was suggested that while each committee should retain its appointed chairman, the three committees would work more effectively with the addition of one general overall chairman and one secretary. Our foreman was heartily in accord with these conclusions, whereupon Mr. Green was appointed as Chairman and Mrs. Bass was elected as Secretary, while the overall committee was to be known as the Public Services Committee. This plan has worked out most successfully.

Throughout the year the committee as a whole invited a number of County officials and heads of important County agencies, to acquaint the committee with the operations of the various departments, so that we might explore their

workings in depth. Knowing that the opinions of these important guests would be of interest to the entire Grand Jury, it became the policy of the Public Services Committee to schedule speakers for dates when the Grand Jury would not be otherwise engaged. The Grand Jury was so responsive and showed such general interest that we would suggest to the 1965 Grand Jury a continuation of this practice, for the information we received gave all of us a picture of the social conditions in Los Angeles County that we would say is invaluable.

In presenting these speakers we always had the full cooperation of our foreman. Not only did he urge full participation but made it a point to be present at practically every meeting.

We further suggest that the new Grand Jury consider the continuation of the Public Services Committee, for it has seemed to us that the work of the three committees was made easier because they were working "under one tent." If the new Grand Jury decides to pursue this plan, we would further suggest that the overall chairman should not be given a double duty. In other words, he should not be chairman of either the Juvenile, Social Services, or Schools Committee.

The list of guests who appeared before us embraced every facet of the work which fell within the province of any or all of the three committees. What particularly impressed us about those who honored us with their presence was their sincere dedication to their jobs. In fact, to each it was more than just a job; it was a civic responsibility. Many of these men who had offered themselves for public service could, if they had so desired, have been highly successful in more lucrative fields. It is fortunate for Los Angeles County to have a corps of such wonderful workers.

We sincerely appreciated the appearances of the following guests, who outlined the functions of their various departments. They were most helpful in answering the many questions that the Jurors put to them. In the order of their appearance the list included:

Mr. James W. Briggs, Deputy County Counsel
Mr. George Wakefield, Assistant County Counsel
Hon. Peter J. Pitchess, Sheriff of Los Angeles County
Inspector Harold Stallings, Sheriff's Juvenile Division
Mr. William A. Barr, Superintendent of Charities, L. A. County
Dr. C. C. Trillingham, Superintendent of Schools, L. A. County
Inspector Jack G. Collins, Juvenile Bureau, L. A. Police Department
Mr. Karl Holton, Sr. Consultant, Youth Opportunities Board of
Greater Los Angeles

Mr. John W. Landrum, Consultant with the Los Angeles County
Superintendent of Schools
Dr. George Chaffee, Head of the Audio-Visual Department,
Los Angeles Schools
Mr. Jerome Sampson, Executive Secretary, State Social Welfare Board
Mr. Ralph Goff, Deputy Director, State Social Welfare Board in
Los Angeles
Mr. Ellis P. Murphy, Director of L. A. County Bureau of Public
Assistance
Mr. Felix Rusnack, Chief of Rehabilitation and Employment Division,
Bureau of Public Assistance
Judge H. Eugene Breitenbach, Presiding Judge of Juvenile Court
Mr. Jack B. Tso, Counsellor in Mental Health, L. A. County
Mrs. Yasuko Shiraishi, Counsellor in Mental Health, L. A. County
Mr. Melvin Thale, Deputy District Attorney assigned to Psychiatric
Court
Judge Roger Alton Pfaff, Court of Domestic Relations and Conciliation

The Public Services Committee also paid various visits to County institutions, such as Juvenile Hall, Las Palmas School for Girls, Los Angeles County General Hospital, Antelope Valley Juvenile Camps, McKinley Home for Boys, Juvenile Court, Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, Los Padrinos Juvenile Facility, MacLaren Hall, Psychiatric Court, Camp Oak Grove, Harbor General Hospital, Corona Rehabilitation Center, and others, and in most cases invited the rest of the Grand Jury to accompany them on these tours.

This report has dealt only with the functioning of the committee of the whole. It does not include the specific work of each committee, which will be found in their individual reports.

The committee was most fortunate in selecting Mrs. Claire L. Bass as its secretary. Her excellent minutes recorded more than simply the parliamentary procedures of the committee. Instead they included all the salient data concerning the workings of the many departments and institutions which we visited. Also, in the minutes, are complete and accurate summaries of the main points made by the various department heads and other luminaries who appeared before the Grand Jury and gave us the guidance which we needed. The committees which succeed us could greatly benefit by examining her very complete and informative minutes.

No report of this committee would be complete without a word of thanks to the Grand Jury staff: Mr. Fred M. Henderson, Mr. Joseph A. Gebhart, Mrs. Lila S. Boyd, and Mrs. Johanna Friederich. Without the wholehearted help,

courtesy, and efficiency of this staff, our work would have been considerably impaired.

It was a privilege to serve as chairman of the Public Services Committee, every member of which enthusiastically cooperated at all times during a year when the workload of the three committees turned out to be far heavier and more exacting than any of us had anticipated.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD J. GREEN, Chairman
Public Services Committee

JUVENILE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Juvenile Committee has been particularly impressed by those whose concern has been concentrated on the problems of our youth.

We wish to express our admiration for the dedicated manner in which the entire personnel have responded to their responsibilities.

While the committee appreciates the necessity in many cases for the detention of juveniles in foster homes and County institutions, nevertheless it is the feeling of the committee that it is equally true that this is not necessarily the best solution to each individual problem. Authorities such as Judge Roger Alton Pfaff, of the Conciliation Court, for instance, believe that the interest of the child might best be served by permitting him to remain in his natural surroundings, even if the conditions are not completely harmonious. Certainly there are times when a child would be better off to be allowed to participate in his home surroundings rather than to become the product of institutional environment.

Inspector Harold Stallings, of the Sheriff's Juvenile Division, stated to the committee that the home, school, and law enforcement services should recognize when a child is headed for trouble. The need is for more counseling and mental therapy programs, — particularly for the younger children of the third and fourth grades who have behavioral problems.

According to Sheriff Peter Pitchess, of Los Angeles County, the main cause of juvenile trouble is a general withdrawal from responsibility. Problem juveniles usually have had little or no religious training, too much leisure time, bad parental example, and too much freedom in indulgence.

It would be a fallacy to believe that any one Juvenile Committee could solve all of these problems, but a word of encouragement was given by Judge H. Eugene Breitenbach when he stated that in California the rate of juvenile delinquency shows a slight decline in the past two years.

FRANCES K. DOLL, Chairman
Juvenile Committee

Mrs. Claire L. Bass, Secretary

William J. Goss

Howard J. Green

Ozro D. Leas

Mrs. Harry Erling Ljung, Sr.

William Middleton

Mrs. Margaret M. Tegart

SCHOOLS COMMITTEE REPORT

The Schools Committee was impressed with the particularly fine work of the teachers in the special schools connected with such institutions as Juvenile Hall, Las Palmas School for Girls, and MacLaren Hall. Early in our term Dr. C. C. Trillingham, Superintendent of Schools in Los Angeles County, had stressed the fact that the salary paid to these teachers was not commensurate with the salary paid to the teachers performing like functions in the City Schools. Finding this to be the case, we brought the matter to the attention of the County Board of Supervisors and suggested that they pursue this matter. We appreciate the prompt action that was then taken by the Chief Administrative Office of Los Angeles County, who recommended to the Board a one-step salary increase for the teaching staffs in County-run schools for the next fiscal year. The Board of Supervisors promptly approved this recommendation.

Since reading is a fundamental requirement of all education and since tests show most of the juveniles sent to probation camp are extremely retarded in their reading ability (indicating a possible relationship to delinquency), we would recommend an intensive program of remedial reading be included in their curriculum.

It seems that the Schools Committees of the Grand Juries for a number of years past have all been very much aware of the problem of dropouts in the County schools. There is no doubt that these dropouts have contributed greatly to the problem of juvenile delinquency. Yet none of the Schools Committees in the past seems to have found the answer to correct—or even minimize—this serious situation.

After attending a conference in Washington, D. C., which conference concerned itself with the subject, Mr. John W. Landrum, Consultant with the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, prevailed upon the County to permit him to experiment in two picked communities, where he intended to work upon this problem. The experiment has not been concluded, and perhaps when Mr. Landrum is ready to make his report it will at last give some

key as to what might be done. The incoming Grand Jury should certainly, in our opinion, pursue this with Mr. Landrum

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD J. GREEN, Chairman
Schools Committee

Claire L. Bass, Secretary

Frances K. Doll

William J. Goss

Ozro L. Leas

Lorraine Ljung

William Middleton

Margaret M. Tegart

SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT

When this committee was appointed by our foreman, little did we realize how wide in scope and diversified our work would be.

As the various heads of county institutions and welfare agencies appeared before us to fill us in on their responsibilities and what was required to carry on these important services, the enormity of the work they were doing was infinitely more than we could have ever contemplated. As we listened to Mr. George Wakefield, Chief Assistant County Counsel, and Mr. William A. Barr, Superintendent of the County Department of Charities, we learned that approximately half of the county budget was allocated to this department. In fact, the County Department of Charities is the largest of its kind in the country. It has a budget of \$392,000,000.00. It takes approximately 17,000 employees to administer it. In certain instances, the State and Federal government share in the operation.

Mr. Barr suggested that the committee visit the welfare institutions that are the responsibility of the county and make a thorough inspection of them to check on cleanliness, treatment of patients and indigents, and the methods of operation. This we have done. The chairman of the committee wishes to commend every member of the committee for the earnestness with which they cooperated throughout the year.

It was evident to us from the very beginning that the steady inflow of new residents into Los Angeles County requires a constant new look for those engaged in county welfare work. What might have been deemed sufficient to successfully carry on operations in today's planning often turns out to be less than adequate by the time the plan becomes operative, due to Southern California's unprecedented population growth.

As an example, on the committee's visits to the General Hospital, Rancho Los Amigos, and Olive View Hospital, while we found them to be well administered, with dedicated personnel, all were handicapped by over-crowding and lack of sufficient beds. New surgeries and the extension of a number of other facilities seem absolutely essential if these institutions are to function at top level. At Olive View many of the functions are being carried on in wooden dormitory buildings, since one of the main buildings was destroyed by fire in 1962. Happily, a bond issue (Proposition A on the November 3rd ballot) has been authorized, which provides the necessary financing to take care of the immediate needs of these three institutions.

Unfortunately, Proposition B failed to pass. It provided for a new Mac Laren Hall, to replace the present structure built thirty-six years ago, and more beds for MacLaren and Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall where conditions are so overcrowded that many of the children housed there are forced to sleep on the floor.

It appears to the committee that the voters do not understand how vital it is for these fine institutions to be enabled to do their job unhandicapped. We would recommend the employment of a high-powered professional public relations staff so that the public would be continually aware of the necessity of properly manning and supplying such institutions with whatever is needed to carry on their work.

A joint meeting of the Audit and Social Services Committees to hear Mr. Anthony Pizzaro, supervisor in the investigation section of the Department of Charities, was held. Mr. Pizzaro suggested a central investigative department to handle all departmental investigations in the county, to be responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer, rather than to the department being investigated. This committee recommends the adoption of this suggestion.

Mr. Jerome Sampson, Executive Secretary of the State Welfare Commission, admitted to the committee that answers to welfare problems are not easy, but the material which he furnished us, compiled after a year of study by the Governor's Welfare Commission, considers in depth every phase of the matter and would be of invaluable help to the incoming committee.

Judge Roger Alton Pfaff, Presiding Judge of consolidated Domestic Relations and Conciliatory Courts, informed the committee of the work of his courts which, he said, pay dividends in the form of child support money under Rule 28 and in keeping families together and off relief. He suggested that 1964 Grand Jury recommend that the county build a Family Courts Building, covering all related offices as well as the courts; also that the county hire an independent firm to make a thorough investigation of the Department of Charities and make recommendations for improvements. Our committee highly recommends that these recommendations be taken under serious consideration by the Board of Supervisors and would further suggest that the 1965 Grand Jury follow up on all these recommendations to determine if they have been acted upon.

We received numerous complaints against the county hospital from individuals, County Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli, and the El Monte Herald. The committee then made inspections of the hospital and, in teams of two or more, conducted personal interviews with more than thirty of these complainants in

their homes. In practically every incident, it was found that the hospital was blameless of any indiscretions or wilful negligence.

The general conclusion of the committee in regard to the complainants who were interviewed is that a majority of the complaints were at least two years old. There was some merit in the complaints regarding general housekeeping, but, in the main, this problem has been corrected. The remainder of the complaints were mainly due to a misunderstanding of hospital procedures and law.

A committee of three made an investigation of the admittance room at General Hospital. Since that investigation the floor plan has been changed so that over-crowding no longer exists. Objections which were once well founded are no longer valid because the new admitting room eliminates any cause for criticism. Of course, there are always those who will find fault with any hospital, whether county-owned or private.

In our opinion the county has grown so large that the only complete solution to problems which might arise would be decentralization.

After the full jury had toured General Hospital, it recommended to the Board of Supervisors that a comparative study of salaries of nurses in the jail section of the Los Angeles County General Hospital with those in county jail facilities be made, resulting in a one-step raise in salary for county hospital jail section nurses being granted.

Following two visits to the Psychiatric Court, number 95, and inspection of 36 sanitariums housing court patients and an appearance before the committee of Mr. Jack Tso, Counsellor in Mental Health, of the court and Mr. Melvin Thale, Deputy District Attorney assigned to this court, it was voted by the committee to recommend to the jury that it recommend:

1. That the State Department of Mental Hygiene, Bureau of Private Institutions, be even more careful and strict in their investigation of private institutions' housing Psychiatric Court patients and those under the MAA program.
2. That the county institute a study of the cost and feasibility of operating facilities similar to the Saugus Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center for Psychiatric Court patients.
3. That a study be made of the adequacy of the present allowance of \$205.00 per patient.

4. That such legislation as is necessary be presented to prohibit the hiring of state mental hospital parolees as attendants at sanitariums handling mentally ill persons.
5. That such legislation as is necessary be presented to make it possible for a relative or friend to file a petition alleging, upon probable cause that a person is an addict, in order to provide that person the opportunity to be examined by court appointed doctors and to provide immunity from civil or criminal liability for those filing such a petition. Also, to make it possible for peace officers or health officers to apprehend and cause to be detained in the county hospitals persons they know to be addicted or in danger of becoming addicted.

This committee strongly recommends that a facility for the care of Psychiatric Court patients to accommodate at least 300 be established at once. It is our strong opinion the county can do this job for less cost with better care than is now available and because a source of accommodations for this type of patient in private sanitariums is rapidly disappearing. The private sanitariums claim that they can not do an adequate job for the \$205.00 permitted that they receive for the care of the Psychiatric Court placed patients.

We have recommended to the jury that they adopt a resolution to be forwarded to the State Legislature in regard to the handling of suspected or narcotic addicts. (This resolution as adopted by the jury, follows this report.)

At Mr. Tso's suggestion the committee made an inspection tour of Warm Springs Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center and Corona Narcotics Rehabilitation Center and were favorably impressed with the facilities and their administration.

The committee has made inspection tours at Harbor General Hospital, Rancho Los Amigos, and Olive View Hospital, and found them to be well administered, with dedicated personnel, but handicapped in some cases by outdated buildings and lack of sufficient personnel.

In closing the report of this most important committee, we would like to say that this is but a short summary of the many investigations, visits, and interviews undertaken by the Social Services Committee this year.

We would also like to thank and congratulate our Foreman, Mr. James T. Blalock, for his never-ending help, courtesy, and advice throughout the entire year.

The Social Services Committee recommends to the 1965 Grand Jury, as a result of our experiences this year on the new joint committee, known as the Public Services Committee, that this plan be continued, as outlined in a report of our most efficient Chairman, Mr. Howard J. Green, in his report under the heading of Public Services Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM J. GOSS, Chairman

MRS. CLAIRE L. BASS, Secretary

MRS. FRANCES K. DOLL

HOWARD J. GREEN

OZRO D. LEAS

MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.

WM. MIDDLETON

MRS. MARGARET M. TEGART

WILLIAM J. GOSS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
SECRETARY

MRS. CLAIRE L. BASS
J. T. BLALOCK
M. J. BRISTOL
CARL G. BUSCH
LOUIS V. CASSADAY
MERRILL J. CATE
MRS. FRANCES K. DOLL
S. H. EDMONDSON
FRANK W. FEE
H. J. GARRETSON
ALVA C. GARROTT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
1964 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90012
629-2451

WILLIAM J. GOSS
HOWARD J. GREEN
CHAS. K. KAMAYATSU
OZRO D. LEAS
MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
THOMAS F. MCCUE
WM. MIDDLETON
ARNOLD MUNZ
ELMER NIEMOELLER
MRS. CHARLES PALMER
SAM A. SARKISIAN
MRS. MARGARET M. TEGART

December 4, 1964.

Dear Mr.

Mr. Jack B. Tso, Counsellor in Mental Health, Psychiatric Department, Superior Court 95, Los Angeles, California, appeared before the 1964 Los Angeles County Grand Jury on October 30, 1964. He brought to the jury's attention the need for providing legal methods for committing persons alleged to be addicted to narcotic drugs who are not also charged with the commission of a crime.

Mr. Tso told the Grand Jury that a mother, under present law, could not place her son under the jurisdiction of the Superior Court for the purpose of having her son committed for treatment for such addiction unless her son was also charged and convicted of a felony.

The Grand Jury felt that amendments to the law were necessary to permit commitment of persons addicted for treatment for their addiction in order to stem the rising tide of the use of narcotics, especially by young people in our city, county and state.

The Grand Jury asked Mr. Tso to review the present statutes and prepare a suggested form of amendments to our present laws which would accomplish this necessary objective and at the same time set up protective procedures which would prevent abuse of such power. We are enclosing herewith the resolution adopted by the Grand Jury containing the suggested appropriate language.

I am sure that you are aware of the terrible problem presented by the spread of the use of narcotics within this state and will want

2.

to do everything necessary to stop the tide. Will you please lend your important support in having the present law amended to effect the purpose set forth in the resolution.

Yours very truly,

J. T. BLALOCK, Foreman

1964 Los Angeles County Grand Jury

JTB-b

(This letter to each member of State Legislature, Board of Supervisors, CAO, County Counsel, City Attorney. 24 Copies to Mr. Robert Blinn (C. A. O.) for members of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Commission.)

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS Mr. Jack B. Tso, Counsellor in Mental Health, Psychiatric Department, Superior Court 95, Los Angeles County, California, appeared before the 1964 Los Angeles County Grand Jury on October 30, 1964, and

WHEREAS Mr. Tso brought to the Jury's attention the need to amend the present narcotics laws to provide legal methods and protective procedures to commit a person alleged to be addicted to narcotic drugs who is not charged with the commission of a crime, and

WHEREAS Mr. Tso illustrated this need for such amendment by showing that a mother could not place her addicted son under the jurisdiction of the Superior Court for the purpose of having her son committed for treatment for such addition, unless her son was also charged and convicted of a felony, and

WHEREAS, the 1964 Los Angeles County Grand Jury requested Mr. Tso to prepare suggested amendatory language to the present applicable statutes to accomplish such purposes in form and substance as hereinafter set forth.

NOW THEREFORE the 1964 Los Angeles County Grand Jury petitions the members of the Legislature of the State of California that the following proposals pertaining to the involuntary commitment of a person alleged to be addicted to narcotic drugs, not charged with a crime, be adopted by the Legislature and enacted as a deletion and amendment to the present Penal Code Section 6500.

INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT OF PERSONS ALLEGED TO BE ADDICTED TO NARCOTIC DRUGS NOT CHARGED WITH A CRIME

A. PETITIONS

Any person may file in the Superior Court a verified petition alleging that there is in the county of jurisdiction a person who is addicted to the use of narcotics, or by reason of repeated use of narcotics is in imminent danger of becoming addicted thereto. The Counselor in Mental Health or the District Attorney shall prepare the petition and all other forms required in the proceedings for the commitment of such person to the Director of Corrections for confinement at the Narcotic Treatment and Rehabilitation Facility, when there is sufficient probable cause. When a petition is filed, neither the

person reporting or filing the petition nor his superior, nor the department or institution to which he is attached, or any of its employees shall be rendered liable, thereby, either civilly or criminally, if there was probable cause for the filing of said petition.

B. DEFINITION OF NARCOTIC DRUG ADDICT FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS ARTICLE

A "Narcotic addict", as used in this Article, refers to any person, adult or minor, who because of the use of any narcotic, as defined in Division 10 of the Health and Safety Code, except marijuana, enters into a state of periodic or chronic intoxication detrimental to the individual and to society.

C. IMPROPER AFFIDAVIT TO HAVE PERSON ADJUDGED A NARCOTIC ADDICT

Every person who knowingly contrives to have any person adjudged a narcotic addict, under this Article, unlawfully or improperly is guilty of a misdemeanor.

D. CONTENTS OF PETITION

The petition shall allege that there is in the county having jurisdiction a named person who is a narcotic drug addict, or because of repeated use of narcotics is in imminent danger of becoming addicted thereto. The petition shall also state the name, title and address of the party reporting the allegations to the petitioning party, as well as his statements supporting his belief that the person alleged to be addicted is in fact addicted. The petition shall further provide the address of the alleged narcotic addict; his telephone number if any; birthdate; age; sex; marital status; occupation; birthplace, a brief physical description and a statement that the person is in need of care, supervision and treatment at the narcotic detention, treatment and rehabilitation facility of the State of California.

E. COURT TO ACT ON PETITION

Whenever it appears by petition pursuant to this Article, to the satisfaction of a judge of the Superior Court in any county that any person therein is addicted to narcotic drugs, or by reason of repeated use of narcotic drugs is in imminent danger of becoming addicted thereto, the judge shall make such orders as may be necessary to provide for examination of the person and for the safekeeping; necessary medical treatment; care or restraint of the person

pending examination and/or hearing in the county psychopathic hospital; in his own home or in such other place as the Court in its discretion may designate for the safety and comfort of the person.

If the judge is satisfied, from the petition, that the person is addicted to narcotic drugs or in imminent danger of becoming addicted thereto that examination should be made, the judge shall issue an order notifying the person to submit to an examination at such time and place as designated by the judge. The person shall be permitted to remain in his own home or other place of domicile pending the examination.

If the petition is accompanied by the affidavit of a licensed physician alleging that he has examined such person three days prior to the filing of the petition and has concluded that, unless confined, such person is likely to injure himself or others, or if it otherwise affirmatively appears that said person because of his addiction, unless confined, is likely to injure himself or others, the judge may order that the person be forthwith detained in a place designated by the Court pending examination by the Court-appointed medical examiners. The judge may issue a similar order if the person fails or refuses to appear for examination when notified.

F. NOTICE OF EXAMINATION

At least one day before the time of examination, as fixed by the court order, a copy of the petition and order for examination shall be personally delivered to the person.

If the person alleged to be a narcotic drug addict is ordered detained pending examination and hearing, the judge shall issue and deliver to a peace officer of the county an order, directing that the person be, forthwith, apprehended and detained in the facility designated by the Court. A copy of the petition and order for detention and examination shall be personally delivered to the person at the time of apprehension and at least one day before the time of the examination as fixed by the Court.

G. APPOINTMENT OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS AND EXAMINATION

Upon an order by the Court that a person be examined, the Court shall appoint two medical examiners to examine the person alleged to be a narcotic drug addict to determine whether or not the person is addicted to narcotic drugs or in imminent danger of becoming addicted thereto. The medical examiners will submit their reports to the Court in writing and if the reports are to the effect that the person is not addicted nor in imminent danger of

addiction, the Court shall order the petition dismissed. If the reports are to the effect that the person is addicted or in imminent danger of addiction, the Court shall set a time and place of hearing and cause notice, thereof, to be served on the person.

H. NOTICE OF HEARING

If the medical examiners' reports indicate that the person is addicted to narcotic drugs or in imminent danger, thereof, a copy of the order setting a time and place of hearing shall be served upon the person at least one day before the time of hearing.

I. RIGHTS OF PERSON ALLEGED TO BE A NARCOTIC DRUG ADDICT

The person alleged to be a narcotic drug addict, at stages of the proceedings, shall have the right to be represented by counsel and at the hearing to present witnesses in his behalf and cross-examine witnesses. If he is unable financially to employ counsel, the Court shall, if necessary, appoint the Public Defender or counsel for him. The Court may issue subpoenas for attendance of witnesses at the hearing and the person sought to be committed shall have the right to have subpoenas issued for such purposes.

J. HEARING

At the hearing the Court shall determine whether the person is addicted to narcotics or in imminent danger of addiction. If the issue is determined in the negative, the petition shall be dismissed and the person, forthwith, released. If the issue is determined in the affirmative, the Court shall order the person committed to the custody of the Director of Corrections until such time as he is discharged by law. If the Court orders that the person be committed, it shall further order and direct the sheriff of the county to detain, confine and deliver the person to the proper authorities of the establishment designated.

K. WAIVER OF HEARING

The Court hearing to determine whether or not the person sought to be committed as an alleged narcotic drug addict or in imminent danger thereof, may be waived by the person, expressed in open Court, or in writing by the person prior to the court hearing.

L. JURY TRIALS

If the person so committed is dissatisfied with the order of the Court committing him to the custody of the Director of Corrections, he may demand a hearing by judge or jury in substantial compliance with the provision of Section 5125 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

M. ORDER FOR DISCHARGE FROM FACILITY OF PERSON NOT BEING FIT SUBJECT

If at any time after sixty days following receipt at the facility of a person committed pursuant to this Article, the Director of Corrections concludes that subject person is not a fit subject for confinement or treatment in a facility of the Department of Corrections, he may order such person discharged.

N. EXEMPTION FOR THE NARCOTIC OFFENSE REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT

A person committed to the custody of the Director of Corrections, pursuant to this Article, is not required to register pursuant to Article 6 (commencing with Section 11850) of Chapter 7, Division 10 of the Health and Safety Code.

RESOLUTION

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, this 24th day of November, 1964, that due to the nature of the preceding resolution being in the way of treating a narcotic drug addict in the same manner as a mentally ill person, that the following be adopted by the State Legislature and made a part, thereto, pertaining to the involuntary commitment of a narcotic drug addict not charged with a crime.

That a peace officer or a health officer may apprehend and cause to be detained in a county hospital a person who they have personal knowledge to be addicted to narcotic drugs or who may be in imminent danger of becoming addicted and who may constitute a danger to himself or to others, for a period not to exceed 72 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. The person apprehended and detained must be released within the 72 hour period or a petition alleging narcotic drug addiction filed and the person detained further pursuant to a proper court order.

THE 1964 LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY

By J. T. BLALOCK, FOREMAN

Dated Nov. 24, 1964

INSURANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

As part of its over-all responsibility to investigate and survey various aspects of Los Angeles County Government the 1964 Grand Jury inquired into the organization and operation of the County's Safety and Workmen's Compensation program.

Public agencies have long been confronted with special problems related to implementation of safety which arise from organizational structure and lines of authority. Los Angeles County with its 45,000 employees and 68 departments was confronted with a special challenge. In order to profit from the experience of industry, it is necessary that proven management principles be applied to better control occupational injuries and workmen's compensation risk.

As the result of a special study conducted early in 1963, it was decided safety in all operations could best be applied if authority were to be established, responsibility assigned, accountability enforced and controls created. On August 27, 1963, the Board of Supervisors vested the Chief Administrative Officer with all necessary authority for overall policy administration and assigned direct line responsibility to all department heads for safety within their respective jurisdictions.

The Civil Service Commission was delegated the responsibility of conducting a positive medical program to provide for such services as expanded first-aid facilities, post accident medical review, limited duty programs for injured employees capable of light duty assignments and for a County-wide safety training and education program. Full provision was also made for a trend detection system within the Civil Service Commission where accident experience is properly documented, reported and reflected in periodic accident experience reports.

Assignment of staff safety officers to major departments, together with a centralized safety training staff in the Civil Service Commission is in our judgment promoting safety on a County-wide basis and the objective now is to achieve "acceptance of personal responsibility by all employees for safety in County employment."

The Grand Jury is encouraged by the fact that the Board of Supervisors did not just approve the complete reorganization of the County-wide Safety Program last year and assume that favorable results would inevitably follow. On September 29, 1964 and again on November 10, 1964 by motions of Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, the Board instructed the Chief Administrative Office to

conduct additional studies, compile further cost statistics and report back to the Board with specific recommendations designed to effect even more economics of operation. It is also obvious that the interest and leadership of the Board has focused the attention of Department Heads on the importance of establishing more modern accident-prevention programs and more effective management controls. This has not always been characteristic of departmental management in the past.

There is a danger, however, that this momentum could easily be lost. The Grand Jury urges the Chief Administrative Officer to complete the study ordered by the Board at the earliest possible date. This Grand Jury specifically recommends immediate revisions to Section 231 of the County Salary Ordinance. The intent of this provision, which authorizes the continuation of 100% salary for one year from date of injury to industrially injured employees, is indeed laudatory and based upon a concern for employee welfare. We believe that the next effect is to extend a monetary incentive to the injured employee to stay away from his job after he is physically able to return to work. Thus, this is economically irresponsible and indefensible from the point of view of either sound administration or good personnel practice.

The Grand Jury is in complete agreement with the Board of Supervisors and various county officials in their continuing and mounting concern over the relentless cost increases of the past five years. Part, of course, can be traced to increased benefit levels, the raising of medical fee schedules, and the ever-widening perimeter of what constitutes a compensable injury. Once these are quantified, however, we are still left with staggering premium increases, which we believe in part at least can be attributed to needless and indiscriminate litigation before the Industrial Accident Commission, with resultant benefit to certain individuals or small groups at the expense of the general welfare of all our citizens. We are calling this matter to the attention of the Chairman of Governor Brown's Advisory Committee on Workmen's Compensation. (See letter immediately following this report.)

Respectfully submitted,

INSURANCE COMMITTEE

J. T. BLALOCK, Foreman
Chairman of Insurance Committee

LOUIS V. CASSADAY

MERRILL J. CATE

WILLIAM J. GOSS

WILLIAM J. GOSS
FOREMAN PRO TEM

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
SECRETARY

MRS. CLAIRE L. BASS
J. T. BLALOCK
M. J. BRISTOL
CARL G. BUSCH
LOUIS V. CASSADAY
MERRILL J. CATE
MRS. FRANCES K. DOLL
S. H. EDMONDSON
FRANK W. FEE
H. J. GARRETSON
ALVA C. GARROTT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1964 GRAND JURY
548 HALL OF JUSTICE
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90012
629-2451

WILLIAM J. GOSS
HOWARD J. GREEN
CHAS. K. KAMAYATSU
OZRO D. LEAS
MRS. HARRY ERLING LJUNG, SR.
THOMAS F. MCCUE
WM. MIDDLETON
ARNOLD MUNZ
ELMER NIEMOELLER
MRS. CHARLES PALMER
SAM A. SARKISIAN
MRS. MARGARET M. TEGART

December 14, 1964

Mr. Conrad J. Moss, Chairman
Governor's Advisory Committee
on Workmen's Compensation
611 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California

Dear Mr. Moss:

As part of its over-all responsibility to investigate and survey various aspects of Los Angeles County Government, the 1964 Grand Jury inquired into the organization and operation of the County's Safety and Workmen's Compensation program. In view of your Committee's responsibility to report to the Governor and the State Legislature on this extremely important field of law, we thought you might be interested in some of our observations and tentative conclusions as a result of examining the experience of County Government over the past few years.

First of all, and by way of general background, the County completely reorganized its internal Safety Program about a year and a half ago. Very briefly, this reorganization resulted in a decentralized approach to accident prevention with each Department Head being given responsibility and authority for the development of his own safety program. Over-all coordination and establishment of County-wide policy remained in the Chief Administrative Office and certain functions, safety training, medical review, statistical services, and reporting, were centralized in the Civil Service Commission. The Board of Supervisors approved the reorganization on August 27, 1963, and on the following October 15, formally approved detailed changes to the County Administrative Code to provide an ordinance basis for operational purposes.

It is important to note that the Board's concern was motivated primarily by steeply rising premium costs over the previous three years (the total net premium in fiscal 1964-65 is \$6,270,000); it is just as important to note that in actual operation the County's approach is designed to minimize the number of industrial injuries and to facilitate the quick and equitable adjustment of legitimate claims. It is perhaps unnecessary to emphasize to you that the above premium figure is raised from normal tax sources and represents \$0.052 of this year's general County tax rate. In view of this fact Workmen's Compensation is certainly a matter of legitimate Grand Jury concern.

In addition to an active and sophisticated accident-prevention program, the County has recognized that, under the best circumstances, accidents will still occur. Because of this, injured workers are carefully screened prior to their return to the job to assure they can safely perform their duties. Further, as evidence of County concern about the welfare of injured workers and their families, the County salary Ordinance contains very liberal salary provisions which are supplementary to Workmen's Compensation benefits.

These are all positive points which perhaps do not require further emphasis; however, in spite of what we believe to be a properly motivated and effectively organized program, the Board of Supervisors and various County officials express continuing and mounting concern over the relentless cost increases of the past five years. On the basis of the Grand Jury's investigation, we could not agree more.

Some of these rising costs can be traced to benefit-level increases, the raising of medical fee schedules and the ever-widening perimeters of what constitutes a compensable injury. Once these are quantified, however, we are still left with staggering premium increases which cannot be isolated as to cause. Frankly, we believe at least part of this can be attributed to what would appear to be needless and indiscriminate litigation before the Industrial Accident Commission.

In addition to alarm over the pure volume of cases which are litigated we are also concerned about the side effects of this volume upon the Industrial Accident Commission, the applicant, the employer, the legal firm which specializes in compensation practice, and ultimately the taxpayers of Los Angeles County. The vol-

ume of cases before the Commission is staggering and is increasing daily. We wonder whether the case-load is not increasing at a pace faster than the Commission can hire competent staff -- if this is true, the end result will be adjudication of cases on a peremptory or pseudo-administrative basis which will operate to the advantage of neither litigant. The applicant is often led to believe by employee and union groups (and certain law firms) that compensation benefits cannot be obtained unless a claim is filed with the Commission. We know of cases where applications have been filed and the employee is not aware that he has signed a document which institutes a legal process against his employer.

With respect to the firms which specialize in compensation practice it is clearly to the advantage of the injured worker to be represented by competent counsel. The price of such competence, however, is a distressing trend toward monopolistic tendencies, the concentration of such claims with a few of the larger compensation firms, and a spirited competition between such firms for a larger percentage of the "market," which may be defined on a geographic, jurisdictional, craft or professional basis. The tactics of such competition often require these firms to concentrate primarily on volume and there is no conclusive evidence which suggests any direct correlation between volume of filings and the best interests of each injured worker. It takes little perception to note that Commission filings often result in permanent disability ratings which the worker would have received had he never seen an attorney! Further, the extra percent or two on the permanent disability rating may be completely wiped out by the amount of the legal fee; in such case, the employee, or his survivors, can receive less than he would have had he not filed.

For the employer, litigation is always 1) expensive and 2) disruptive of good employer-employee relationships. The very nature of the adversary process pits the worker against his employer -- indeed, the title of the action is "John Doe versus the County of Los Angeles." It is particularly difficult for County management to understand the reason for filings made on cases where the injured worker is already receiving all benefits due him under State law (temporary disability and medical treatment) and County ordinance (supplementary salary payments). Involved in this kind of case is an assumption by the applicant's attorney which is as unique in logic as it is costly in practice, namely, that any compensable lost-time injury will eventually result in some kind of permanent disability rating.

Mr. Moss

4.

12-14-64

The impact of these facts upon the County taxpayer is so obvious as to not require elaboration. At a time when taxing levels are a matter of considerable concern to all citizens, the simple economics of Workmen's Compensation laws merit the closest and most careful examination. To the extent that some of the litigation in this field is needless and artificial, we believe that the results benefit certain individuals or small groups at the expense of the general welfare of all our citizens.

We hope that you find some of these observations useful in terms of your recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature. Certainly, any legislative changes should be made in the light of all information which your Committee has reviewed.

Very truly yours,

J. T. BLALOCK
FOREMAN

JTB-1b

PART THREE

INDEX TO RECOMMENDATIONS

	Page
FOREMAN'S REPORT	
Proposed Legislation re Doctrine of Pre-Emption	23
AUDIT COMMITTEE	
Contract Rates to Cities	32
Internal Audit Coverage	33
Eligibility for Aid Programs	34, 23
Excess Real Property Disposal	34
Application of Business Management Practices	35
Voter Majority Requirements on Bonds	36, 24
Future Investigations	37
CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE	
Granting Proper Authority to Law Enforcement Officers with Corrective Legislation	39, 23
JAILS COMMITTEE	
Purchase of Lincoln Heights and Saugus Rehabilitation Center	49
Studies and Construction of Regional Jails, Women's Facility, and Sheriff Stations	50
Laundry Services	50
Repairs of Existing Facilities	50, 51
Future Investigations	51
PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE	
Uniting of Committees	53
SCHOOLS COMMITTEE	
Remedial Reading Program	59
SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE	
Public Relations Staff	62
Central Investigation Department	62, 24
Family Courts Building	62, 25
Decentralization of Hospitals	63
Strict Inspections of Private Sanitariums with County Contracts	63
County Operated Mental Health Facilities	63
Employment of Mental Health Parolees	64
Legislation for Narcotic Addicts	64, 23
Uniting of Committees	65
INSURANCE COMMITTEE	
Revision to Section 231 of the County Salary Ordinance	78