

LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY



FINAL REPORT 1989-90

FINAL REPORT
LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY
1989-90



LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

PETER F. SCHABARUM, FIRST DISTRICT

KENNETH HAHN, SECOND DISTRICT

EDMUND D. EDELMAN, THIRD DISTRICT

DEANE DANA, FOURTH DISTRICT

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH, FIFTH DISTRICT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Grand Jury would like to acknowledge the special efforts made by the Grand Jury staff, without whom the panel would not have been able to complete its work. Our Grand Jury Office Manager, Kathy Spann, deserves a special note of appreciation for her invaluable experience and assistance, our Legal Advisor, Lawrence E. Mason, for his advice and counsel, our Investigator, Jane Rihn, for her availability and cooperation, and lastly, to our Bailiff, Deputy Anita Williams of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. We also thank Sara Sproul and Ron Sato of the Los Angeles Superior Court for their assistance in completing this final report. Printing by Paradise Printing, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<p>1989-90 Los Angeles County Grand Jury ... ii</p> <p>Grand Jury Roster iii</p> <p>Judges and Grand Jury Staff iv</p> <p>Audit Committee 1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Selection of the Contract Auditor 1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Conduct of Audits 1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A Study of the County's Internal Control Certification Program 2</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A Review of the Monitoring of County Contracts 4</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Prior Grand Jury Recommendations 6</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Analysis of Comments 7</p> <p>Criminal Justice Committee 11</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Grand Jury Hearings 11</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Citizen Complaints 11</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Two Way Interacting Audio Video Procedures 11</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Santa Monica Courthouse 13</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Substance Abuse Prevention Programs 17</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department - Aero Bureau 22</p> <p>Economy, Efficiency and Environment Committee 29</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Control of Ocean Pollution 29</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Operation and Maintenance of the Freeway Call Box System 34</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Emission of Noxious Odors from a Commercial Incinerator in the City of Lynwood 35</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Establishment of a Landfill in Elsmere Canyon 35</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Southern California Rapid Transit District Management of Construction Contracts ... 35</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Awarding of Security Contracts for Policing the Metro Blue Line 36</p> <p>Family and Children Services Committee 39</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A Study of the County's Efforts to Prepare Minors in Its Care for Emancipation 39</p>	<p style="padding-left: 20px;">Background Investigations of County Employees Involved with Children 41</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Substance-Exposed Infant Problem in Los Angeles 42</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Emancipation Planning 45</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Los Angeles County Office of Education 46</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Los Angeles Unified School District 46</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Department of Children's Services 47</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Juvenile Court Security 48</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Los Angeles County Probation Department .. 48</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Truancy Mediation Program 49</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Gangs 50</p> <p>Government Operations Committee 55</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Review of the Assessor's Office 55</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">County's Contracting Policies, Procedures and Operations 61</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Redevelopment Fiscal Review Process in Los Angeles County 64</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A Review of Local Agencies' Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Certification Program 66</p> <p>Health Services Committee 69</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Volunteerism in County Hospitals 69</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Capacity Constraints for Residential Drug Treatment Programs in Los Angeles County 71</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Evaluation of Drug Treatment Programs 74</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Evaluation of Security Measures in Place at County Outpatient Mental Health Facilities 76</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Comprehensive Health Centers 81</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Hospitals 81</p> <p>Jails Committee 85</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Los Angeles Police Department 85</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department ... 85</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Court Security 88</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Jail Inspections 90</p> <p>Ad Hoc Committee - Jail House Informants Investigation 95</p>
--	--



GRAND JURY 1989-90

Seated left to right: Dorothy Wrightson, Rachel Rooney, Gilbert Wyland, Morris Golden, Ann Cooper, Paula Cook, Sallee Crookston, Karen Weiss

Standing left to right: Irene Ehrlich, William Hirsch, Alexander Haynes, Sandra Edwards, Homer Hopps, Carl Johnson, Rudy Pino, Albert Penalber, Lewis Diamond, Max Van Doren, Sheran Hoye, Rodger Thisdell, Al Podell, Leo George, Anne Finn

1989-90 GRAND JURY ROSTER

MEMBER	COMMUNITY	NOMINATING JUDGE
Paula Cook	Altadena	Maurice Hogan, Jr.
Ann Cooper	Arcadia	Richard A. Lavine
Sallee Crookston	Santa Monica	Raymond Cardenas
Lewis Diamond	Sylmar	James M. Sutton, Jr.
Sandra Edwards	North Hollywood	William Masterson
Irene Ehrlich	Van Nuys	Robert H. O'Brien
Anne Finn	Sunland	Irwin J. Nebron
Leo George	Burbank	Michael Tynan
Morris Golden	Sherman Oaks	Richard A. Lavine
Alexander Haynes	Lynwood	Alfred Margolis
William Hirsch	Encino	W.H. Winston, Jr.
Homer Hopps	Whittier	Sara Radin
Sheran Hoye	Los Angeles	Richard P. Byrne
Carl Johnson	Los Angeles	Richard F. Charvat
Albert Penalber	Lynwood	Rosemary Dunbar
Rudy Pino	La Canada	Rosemary Dunbar
Al Podell	Encino	Haig Kehiayan
Rachel Rooney	Pasadena	Ronald Sohigian
Rodger Thisdell	Glendale	Leslie Light
Max Van Doren	Arcadia	James Natoli
Karen Weiss	Malibu	Miriam Vogel
Dorothy Wrightson	Pasadena	Maurice Hogan, Jr.
Gilbert Wyland	Valencia	Haig Kehiayan



Honorable Richard P. Byrne
Presiding Judge,
Superior Court



Honorable David Horowitz
Supervising Judge,
Superior Court



GRAND JURY STAFF

Left to right: Anita Williams, Bailiff, Kathy Spann, Office Manager, Lawrence E. Mason, Legal Advisor, Jane Rihn, Investigator

FOREMAN'S STATEMENT



FOREMAN ANN COOPER

July 5, 1989 began an exciting year for our 1989-90 Grand Jury. I was fortunate to have been appointed Foreman on August 21, 1989, following the resignation of my predecessor. This has been a year to remember. It is doubtful if any single year in any of our lives has held so many memorable experiences, learning opportunities, and chances for personal growth. We wish to express our thanks to our excellent secretary, Kathy Spann, and our capable and most needed Legal Advisor, Deputy District Attorney Larry Mason. I am especially grateful to Judge David Horowitz and Presiding Judge Richard P. Byrne for their patient support and guidance during difficult times.

The 1989-90 Grand Jury has had a unique year. We inherited from the 1988-89 jury the responsibility for conducting an investigation into the December 1988 complaint regarding the use of jailhouse informants. Due to a conflict of interest declared by the District Attorney, the prior jury secured the appointment of independent counsel in May, 1989. By then they had no time to deal with the problem.

In late October 1989, the contract with original counsel expired and this jury voted to continue the investigation. This jury decided to seek other independent counsel. It was agreed with the Presiding Judge that this jury would be permitted to research and make its recommendation as to who should represent the Grand Jury for the completion of the task.

After much investigation and many interviews we asked Attorney General John Van De Kamp to appoint Douglas Dalton, Esq. The appointment of Mr. Dalton was made in late December 1989. Our jury thanks Mr. Dalton for his thorough, meticulous and professional approach in completing this difficult task.

Our committees have had to do double duty—completing their chosen projects while having to work around our jailhouse informant hearing dates. These hearings often ran from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. with a 30 minute lunch break. The jurors had been advised that if they missed any portion of the 300-400 hours of testimony they might not be allowed to participate in a final vote. This resulted in a tremendous strain on everyone's time and emotions during the final few months of our term.

This Grand Jury, from October 26, 1989, until early January 1990, was virtually without active and effective legal guidance for the jail house informant investigation. This unusual circumstance which arose with the Los Angeles County Grand Jury could occur again in any county. Provision of counsel to assist a Grand Jury in situations of this kind should be given priority. Our experience should not be allowed to reoccur.

I am proud to have served as Foreman of the 1989-90 Grand Jury. We learned a lot about Los Angeles County and accomplished a great deal. The only difficulty with serving on the Grand Jury is—"What do you do for an encore!"

1989-90 GRAND JURY OFFICERS

Ann Cooper, Foreman

Karen Weiss, Foreman Pro Tem

Paula Cook, Secretary

Max Van Doren, Secretary Pro Tem

Rodger Thisdell, Sergeant-At-Arms

AUDIT COMMITTEE



AUDIT COMMITTEE

Seated left to right: Max Van Doren, Morris Golden, Chair, Rudy Pino

Standing left to right: Homer Hopps, Irene Ehrlich, Dorothy Wrightson, Sheran Hoye

AUDIT COMMITTEE

Purpose

The Grand Jury derives its responsibility and authority from the California Penal Code Sections 925, 925a and 928 to investigate and report on the management policies and fiscal needs of county offices and departments, joint powers agencies and special purpose assessment and taxing districts within Los Angeles County, and to make fiscal audits of cities within the county.

The Grand Jury is empowered to engage the services of experts to assist in its investigations. The Audit Committee was delegated by the Grand Jury to interview and make its recommendations in the selection of a contract auditor.

Selection of the Contract Auditor

The Audit Committee interviewed 12 accounting and management consulting firms. Upon recommendation of the committee, the Grand Jury selected Ernst & Young as its contract auditor. The Grand Jury's budget for reviews, audits, and investigations was \$361,640.

Conduct of Audits

Subjects for examinations and reviews are selected by the Grand Jury and are performed by the contract auditor after approval by the Grand Jury. The auditor then prepares a proposal and an estimate for approval prior to the commencement of each audit. The committee administers the contract on behalf of the Grand Jury.

The following contract audits were undertaken in 1989-90 and are reported under the committee name appearing in parenthesis.

- A Study of the County's Efforts to Prepare Minors in its Care for Emancipation (Family and Children Services Committee)
- Volunteerism in County Hospitals, including the Survey of Volunteers (Health Services Committee)
- Review of the County Assessor's Office (Government Operations Committee)

- A Study of the County's Internal Control Certification Program (Audit Committee)
- Study of County's Contracting Policies, Procedures and Operations (Government Operations Committee)
- Background Investigations of County Employees Involved with Children (Family and Children Services Committee)
- Review of the Procedures Used in Certifying Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (Government Operations Committee)
- Study of the Substance-Exposed Infant Problem in Los Angeles (Family and Children Services Committee)
- Capacity Constraints for Residential Drug Treatment Programs in Los Angeles County (Health Services Committee)
- Redevelopment Fiscal Review Process (Government Operations Committee)

The full reports of all contract audits are available and are on file at the office of the Grand Jury, the City of Los Angeles Public Library, the Los Angeles County Law Library, and at various university libraries.

A. A STUDY OF THE COUNTY'S INTERNAL CONTROL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

PURPOSE

Internal controls are the policies, procedures, and actions taken to protect the financial and operating integrity of an organization. An example of an internal control would be the requirement that all travel expenses be authorized prior to reimbursement.

Los Angeles County relies on a variety of methods to ensure the creation and maintenance of an effective internal control system. One major element of the Auditor-Controller's program is the Internal Controls Certification Program (ICCP). The ICCP involves the self-assessment by each department of its own internal control environment using a questionnaire. It is the purpose of this audit to review the ICCP and to offer recommendations to the Auditor-Controller's office to enhance the effectiveness of the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that the Auditor-Controller:

1. *Schedule (by department) the field reviews to be performed with respect to the Internal Controls Certification Program (ICCP) in its five-year audit plan. Currently, the Auditor-Controller does not specifically schedule field reviews by department in its five year plan.*
2. *Schedule field reviews and/or training sessions for all departments as soon as possible. We found that there is no prioritized goal of conducting field reviews in all departments as soon as possible.*
3. *Develop a training program which includes separate modules for each level of departmental administration. The county has no coordinated training program which includes separate modules for each level of employee.*
4. *Ensure involvement, guidance, and follow-up with the departments by:*
 - *contacting each department regarding their desk review memos; and*
 - *ensuring the centralized departments' coordinating representatives have a thorough understanding of the ICCP's purpose and methodology.*

We found interest at the department level for increased guidance from the Auditor-Controller's office in conducting the ICCP.

5. *Compile a list of reported weaknesses by department in a format suitable for cross-reference and informal tracking. Continue its policy of not reporting self-identified weaknesses on the biannual audit report until confirmation of failure to identify or remedy a weakness is obtained through a field review or other review or audit. To date, findings from the ICCP have not been summarized in a readily usable format and compared across all departments.*
6. *Include a standard format for reporting assessable units in the ICCP questionnaire package. Currently, departments report their lists of assessable units on an inconsistent basis.*
7. *Emphasize the importance of following the fiscal manual when the updated manual is reissued in 1990. We observed that some departments do not consult the fiscal manual in designing their procedures.*
8. *Continue to design and conduct training programs oriented toward specific controls. Our review of the questionnaires revealed several common weaknesses in internal controls.*

9. ***Provide a sample memo format and recommend the level of management signature desired to be used for internal departmental communications initiating the annual ICCP. We found that departments vary in senior level commitment to ICCP.***

10. ***Resolve discrepancies relating to the departments' ICCP methodology by:***

- ***revising the questionnaire cover memo to emphasize common errors;***
- ***ensuring that a copy of the memo reaches the assessable units involved;***
- ***conducting training programs and continuing to follow-up;***
- ***ensuring that all parties understand the methodology and the reasoning behind it; and***
- ***conducting field reviews as soon as possible for all departments.***

B. A REVIEW OF THE MONITORING OF COUNTY CONTRACTS

PURPOSE

The Grand Jury wanted to determine whether the performance of contractors was being properly monitored. Proposition A type contracts were of main concern. Proposition A, Work Performed by Independent Contractors was approved by the voters on November 7, 1978. The county's policy, as stated in its Contract Development Program Manual is to:

- Maintain essential program service levels at reduced costs
- Identify program areas in which contracting with the private sector provides a cost-effective alternative to performing the work with county employees
- Significantly reduce the county work force by contracting with the private sector at reduced costs

When a department determines that it would be either feasible or cost-effective to contract out a service, and after approval of the County Counsel, Chief Administrative Officer, the Auditor-Controller and others, contracts may be made with private contractors. The county's decision to contract out a service is based on the savings between its "avoidable costs" and the contract price. Indirect costs, such as departmental and county-wide overheads are ordinarily not avoidable.

Contract monitoring manuals and/or monitoring program checklists had been written

by each department reviewed. The County Contract Development Program Manual is being updated to reflect the changes in the county organization. The monitoring of the contracts that the grand jury reviewed seems, for the most part, to be effective.

The recommendations are applicable to the departments reviewed. With the expansion of contract services, greater emphasis should be placed on monitoring.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Department of Health Services, the Department of Public Social Services and the Department of Mental Health increase their contract monitoring staffs.***

An example of the growth of outside contracting is in the Department of Health Services. There, the number of contracts increased from eight in fiscal year 1980-81 to 43 in fiscal year 1988-89. The number of personnel monitoring those contracts was 18 in 1981, and is 12 currently. However, some contracts are monitored by department personnel on site. Because of staffing levels, some contracts are not monitored as frequently as is desirable.

- 2. The County Administrative Officer require that all county contracts, where feasible, contain incentive provisions to encourage greater efficiency and cost reductions.***

The dietary contracts at the Los Angeles County/University of Southern California Medical Center and at Martin Luther King, Jr./Drew Medical Center contain incentive provisions. These provisions provide that the county will also participate in the savings. At the Los Angeles County/University of Southern California Medical Center the contractor has earned an incentive. At Martin Luther King, Jr./Drew Medical Center the contractor has replaced its manager to make necessary improvements and to reduce costs. A small incentive is now being earned at that facility.

The GAIN contract with Maximus, Incorporated, in addition to other compensation, provides for payment of \$150 to the contractor for each participant in the program who (1) obtains and retains full-time unsubsidized employment for more than six months and (2) the participant's employment results in termination or reduction of aid to families with dependent children benefits of at least 50 percent. In the highest month so far, the contractor has received \$1,500.

- 3. The Chief Administrative Officer instruct departments to monitor small contracts early in their term, and provide checklists or instructions to small contractors regarding county requirements.***

An \$89,000 one-year contract was reviewed. Little monitoring was done until three months before the end of the contract term. Although there appeared to be many discrepancies, such as poor accounting records and expenditures without complete documentation, the contract was allowed to continue and was paid in full. Small contracts tend to be overlooked.

4. *The Chief Administrative Officer mandates that departments formalize and expand training programs for contract monitors.*

A number of contract monitors are experienced employees who worked in the department prior to the time of the contract but were not trained specifically as monitors. Due to turnover and the growth in the number of contracts, the pool of experienced employees has declined and new employees lack training.

C. PRIOR GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

PURPOSE

The members of the Grand Jury are volunteers desiring to be of service to their community. They want to know, and to let the community know, if their efforts have any impact. One method to determine the effectiveness of a grand jury is to analyze and tabulate the responses to the recommendations and findings of prior grand juries by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. Section 933(c) of the California Penal Code provides that 90 days after the grand jury submits a final report that the board shall comment on those findings and recommendations.

The recommendations and findings made by the 1987-88 Grand Jury were selected for analysis because of insufficient time for the county to implement the recommendations of the 1988-89 Grand Jury.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

1. *The succeeding grand juries follow-up on the work of the previous grand jury.*

The 1987-88 Grand Jury made a total of 175 recommendations and findings. The following tabulation is from an analysis of the Comments on the Findings and Recommendations of the 1987-88 Los Angeles County Grand Jury in its Final Report Released July 26, 1988 prepared by the Chief Administrative Office, dated October, 1988.

ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS

- 1. Concurrence with the recommendations and findings 38%
- 2. Qualified concurrence with the recommendations and findings: agreed with the intent of the recommendation, but qualified because of the suggested method recommended; qualified because of the budgetary constraints on implementation 17%
- 3. Recommendations were already in the process of implementation 19%
- 4. Recommendations and findings were being studied 10%
- 5. Recommendations and findings were ambiguous 3%
- 6. Implementation of recommendations and findings were not under county jurisdiction 3%
- 7. Non-concurrence with the recommendations and findings 10%

Following up on prior grand jury recommendations and findings is an effective method of establishing continuity in the grand jury system. Lack of continuity is a weakness in the grand jury system.

2. *The succeeding audit committees of the grand jury regularly attend the meetings of the County Audit Committee.*

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors should be commended for having established a County Audit Committee which is effective and performs the important function of following up and tracking all audits within the county. By attending the County Audit Committee meetings, the grand jury can gain an insight into the operation of the county. It will also be helpful in avoiding possible duplication of effort, and the grand jury will learn of the areas in the county which are of concern.

APPENDIX

Persons Interviewed

J. Tyler McCauley, Chief, Audit Division, Auditor-Controller Department
John Campbell, Economy & Efficiency Commission

Department of Health Services

Fred Leaf, Chief, Inspection and Audit Division
Lucille Brake, Staff Analyst, Contract Monitoring Division
John I. Mayemura, Inspection and Audit Division
Katrina L. Rogers, Inspection and Audit Division
William Rooney, Administrator, Administration Support Services, LAC/USC Medical Center
John A. McClurg, Manager, Contract Operations, LAC/USC Medical Center
Patricia Fullenweider, Assistant Hospital Administrator, Martin Luther King, Jr./Drew Medical Center
Essie Milligan, Hospital Administration, Martin Luther King, Jr./Drew Medical Center
Andres C. Martinez, Administrator, Rancho Los Amigos Medical Center

Department of Public Social Services

Lynn Vodden, Administrator, Audit Liaison Services
John Cappello, Welfare Fiscal Manager III, General Relief/Food Stamp Planning Division
Raul G. Ramirez, Welfare Administration, GAIN Operations
Jacob R. Aguilar, Division Chief, AFDC/Refugee Planning

Department of Mental Health

Francis J. Dowling, Chief Deputy
Margie Hildebrand-Cherry, Audit Compliance Team
Bernardine Anderson, RN, MSN, Program Review Division

Department of Community and Senior Citizens Services

David Moehler, Planning Supervisor

Site Visits

Los Angeles County/USC Medical Center
Martin Luther King, Jr./Drew Medical Center
Rancho Los Amigos Medical Center
Ware Association
Gateways Hospital
Dubnoff School
Mental Health Association
South Gate High School Adult Education
Intervale Senior Services, San Gabriel Valley YWCA

Contract Monitoring Reviewed

The Dietary Services Agreement at Los Angeles County/USC Medical Center (Department of Health Services)
The Dietary Services Agreement at Martin Luther King, Jr./Drew Medical Center (Department of Health Services)
The laundry contract at Rancho Los Amigos (Department of Health Services)
The contract for AIDS Information (Department of Health Services)

Agreement for nutrition/supportive services for elderly persons with the San Gabriel Valley YWCA (Department of Community and Senior Citizens Services)

The contract for education of emotionally disturbed minors at the Dubnoff School (Department of Mental Health)

The contract for emotionally disturbed persons at Gateways Hospital (Department of Mental Health)

The Mental Health Association contract for juveniles (Department of Mental Health)

Case Management Services Agreement between the County of Los Angeles and the Maximus, Inc. (GAIN Program) (Department of Public Social Services)

The Los Angeles Unified School District GAIN Program contract (Department of Public Social Services)

The California Employment Development Department GAIN Program contract (Department of Public Social Services)

Documents Reviewed

Los Angeles County Contract Development Manual

Policy and Procedure Manual, Department of Health Audit Compliance Team

Program Review Policy and Procedures Manual, Department of Mental Health, Program Review Division

Contracts Management Manual for Service Providers under the Older Americans Act, Department of Community and Senior Citizens

Generic and Program Specific Monitoring Handbook, Department of Community and Senior Citizens Services

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE



CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Seated left to right: Carl Johnson, Gilbert Wyland, Sheran Hoye

Standing left to right: Rachel Rooney, Sandra Edwards, Chair, William Hirsch

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Purpose

The Criminal Justice Committee was responsible for reviewing, investigating and responding to the criminal complaints received from citizens during its term. In addition, it was also responsible for reviewing requests for indictment and investigative hearings by the District Attorney and Attorney General, as well as requests for the issuance of subpoenas.

The committee, as part of its review of the various areas within the criminal justice system within the county, conducted four studies, which resulted in the completion of four reports.

Grand Jury Hearings

During this term, the Grand Jury heard eight criminal matters, including an extensive investigation into the use of jail house informants which commenced shortly after the term began, and which was concluded during the week of June 18, 1990.

Citizen Complaints

The committee received 30 criminal complaints during its year. With the assistance of the Grand Jury Legal Advisor and its District Attorney Investigator, all of the complaints were reviewed, investigated or turned over to an outside agency for further investigation. Each complainant was notified of the disposition made by the committee.

A. TWO WAY INTERACTING AUDIO VIDEO PROCEDURES

PURPOSE

The Criminal Justice Committee conducted a follow-up study of the two-way interacting audio-video procedures which were reported by the 1987-88 Grand Jury. During the course of this study, the committee became aware that the audio-video projects currently in operation were but a very small facet of what should be expanded into a county-wide telecommunications network, allowing all county departments to be equipped with a comprehensive communications system.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Board of Supervisors expedite and implement the Central Courts Video Project which has been proposed by the Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee (CCJCC).***

The Glendale and South Bay Municipal Courts Video Arraignment pilot projects have enabled both judicial districts to conduct arraignments, pretrial hearings, pretrial settlement hearings, disposition hearings, discovery motions, bench warrant pick-up hearings and probation violation hearings by using an audio-visual communication link. All participants in the programs feel the projects have been highly successful and have resulted in the following positive benefits:

- Reduction of judicial officer and courtroom time;
- Improved efficiency of court proceedings;
- Reduced transportation of in-custody defendants;
- Earlier release of in-custody defendants;
- Reduction of overcrowded detention facilities;
- Improved courthouse and detention facility security.

The CCJCC made a proposal in 1989 to implement a video arraignment and teleconferencing pilot project linking the municipal arraignment court in the Criminal Courts Building (CCB) to the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) Central Division lockup. The proposal included providing telecommunication hook-ups from various LAPD divisions to the District Attorney's Office in the CCB so that case filings can be obtained without personal conferences between police investigators and filing deputies in the District Attorney's Office, which would allow police detectives to spend more time working on their caseloads. Three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000.00) has been funded from the County Cable Franchise Fee Fund for implementation of the project.

- 2. The Board of Supervisors expand the audio-video arraignment project to provide for a telecommunications link-up between police and sheriff jail detention facilities and municipal courts in the county.***

A municipal court video arraignment project can be implemented on a county-wide basis by connecting audio-visual communication links from the Los Angeles County Central Jail Inmate Reception Center and police detention facilities to municipal court

judicial districts within the county.

Proposals and studies have been made to link various police department facilities to municipal courts within their judicial districts so as to enable video arraignments to take place without having to transport in-custody defendants to court.

- 3. The Board of Supervisors implement the recommendations of the Telecommunications Management Review, so that the Internal Services Department (ISD) can develop a comprehensive county-wide telecommunications network.***

An audio-visual communication link-up between the courts, police and sheriff detention facilities could be expanded to connect to other county departments, utilizing sophisticated, state-of-the-art technology.

At the present time, there does not appear to be a comprehensive policy within the county with respect to the use of audio-visual telecommunications.

- 4. The Board of Supervisors initiate a study to develop a cost recovery and financing system for a county-wide telecommunications network which will enable it to be funded through user fees. A county-wide audio-visual telecommunications network should be implemented through the ISD.***

A telecommunications organization could be set up within the ISD which would have overall responsibility for developing and implementing a county-wide telecommunications network.

The ISD is currently developing a strategic plan to become an entrepreneurial organization which is competitive, market driven and financially self-sufficient.

A creative financing methodology is needed to enable the county to generate the amount of funds needed to implement capitol projects which are required to adequately enable its departments to run smoothly and efficiently.

B. SANTA MONICA COURTHOUSE

PURPOSE

The purpose of this committee's inquiry is to determine whether the existing courthouse in the Superior Court West District (Santa Monica) is adequate to serve the needs of the community. In addition, what steps, if any, need to be taken on both a short and long term basis to enable it to operate in a manner which will meet the needs for a courthouse facility which will process both criminal and civil cases efficiently.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Board of Supervisors take immediate steps to relocate the Santa Monica Area Office of the Los Angeles County Probation Department outside of the courthouse to offices in the Santa Monica-West Los Angeles area.***

The Santa Monica Courthouse is occupied by the West District of the Superior Court, the Municipal Court of Santa Monica Judicial District, the Clerk's Offices of both courts, the District Attorney's Office, the Public Defender's Office, the Probation Department's Area Office and various county departments which support the operation of the courts.

The Santa Monica Area Office of the Los Angeles County Probation Department is located on the second floor of the courthouse. It has a staff of 65 persons. Its functions do not require it to be located within the courthouse. It would be able to perform its tasks if it were located within a reasonable distance from the courthouse.

- 2. The Board of Supervisors allocate funds for the temporary renovation of the second floor of the Santa Monica Courthouse to add additional courtrooms for the superior court and additional office space for the district attorney and public defender.***

The offices of the district attorney and public defender are two to three times over capacity at the current time. There are virtually no facilities for deputy district attorneys or deputy public defenders to interview victims, witnesses or clients when preparing cases for court proceedings. Almost every room and closet in both offices are currently being used to house lawyers and support staff; case file boxes are placed on either side of the corridors in the public defender's offices for lack of storage space, creating a dangerous condition.

- 3. The Board of Supervisors allocate funds for the temporary renovation and reduction of the size of the third floor cafeteria so that additional conference and office rooms can be constructed on an interim basis, pending completion of a new courthouse.***

The size of the cafeteria on the third floor of the courthouse could be reduced and still accommodate those persons who utilize it during the day. By reducing the size of the cafeteria and constructing either courtrooms or conference rooms, some of the problems which currently occur on a daily basis could be alleviated temporarily.

- 4. The Board of Supervisors review and restructure the Master Courthouse Construction Program to provide for the construction of a new courthouse***

in the Santa Monica-West Los Angeles area at the earliest possible time, with adequate parking facilities for courthouse staff and users.

The Santa Monica Courthouse was constructed in the 1950's with a design for four courtrooms. In the early 1960's, additions were added to the north and south ends of the building, providing office space in the north wing and six additional courtrooms. During the 1970's, three mobile courtroom modules were placed in the courtyard located at the rear of the original structure.

Subsequent to the addition of the modular courtrooms, modifications have been made inside of the courthouse to add courtrooms to the first and second floors. There are currently 20 courtrooms, 15 of which are used by the superior court and five which are used by the municipal court.

The size of the municipal and superior court clerk's offices have not increased since their initial construction. This has resulted in a severe shortage of work space and a severe shortage of storage space. Records which are normally kept in the clerk's office for a considerable length of time are now sent to archives in Los Angeles. As a result, the public frequently has to wait for weeks before it can obtain records from the clerk's office.

There is no jury assembly room for the superior court; it has been converted into a courtroom.

The lack of a sufficient number of superior courtrooms has necessitated utilizing quarters at Santa Monica City Hall for one courtroom and renting facilities at a nearby hotel to enable civil trials to be conducted by a rent-a-judge, utilizing court staff and juries from the superior court.

There is no jury box in the master calendar superior courtroom. The courtroom is shared by the supervising judge and another judge. The calendar is called during the morning sessions; law and motion cases are heard in the afternoons. The supervising judge is required to conduct settlement conferences and calendar matters in chambers in the afternoon hours.

The number of family law cases filed in the Superior Court West District has decreased over the past five years because there are no courtrooms or judges available to hear family law trials. Lawyers file family law cases in the Central District rather than the West District so that cases can be tried and concluded more quickly.

The municipal arraignment courtroom is too small to adequately handle the volume of cases which are heard on a daily basis. There are not enough seats in the courtroom to accommodate those persons who are required to appear for court proceedings.

The municipal small claims courtroom is located in a small conference room, which is inadequate to seat litigants who are waiting to have their cases heard. Those persons have to wait in the corridor outside of the courtroom, near the arraignment court, causing congested areas which are sometimes utilized to walk in-custody defendants to and from court.

From 1971 through 1988, the number of cases filed in the Los Angeles Superior Court has increased by 50.8%. During the same period the number of cases filed in the Superior Court West District has increased by 91.8%, while the number of filings in the municipal court has increased by 67%.

The 1988 Master Courthouse Construction Program of Los Angeles County places the Santa Monica Courthouse construction in the Third Tier of the Robbins Courthouse Construction Fund, and anticipates a courthouse for 17 superior courts and five municipal courts, with an estimated completion date of 1992-93. There are three other courthouse construction projects included in the Third Tier of the Program. There are currently no plans which have been made to implement construction of a new courthouse in Santa Monica. The estimated completion date for a new courthouse cannot be met at the current time. There are no current estimates for completion of a new courthouse.

A coordinated effort is being made by the superior court, district attorney and public defender to reduce the length of time it takes to conclude criminal cases pending in the Santa Monica West District. In order to achieve the desired goal of having no more than ten percent of the pending criminal cases older than six months, more trials are occurring now than in past years, causing the courthouse facility to be utilized to its maximum capability.

5. The Board of Supervisors enter into negotiations with the City of Santa Monica for the purpose of obtaining more parking spaces within the existing parking facility at the Santa Monica Courthouse, on an interim basis pending construction of a new courthouse facility. In addition, the Grand Jury recommends the City not lease out its vitally needed parking spaces.

The parking facilities at the Santa Monica Courthouse are owned and operated by the City of Santa Monica, which serves the Santa Monica City Hall, Police Department and Civic Auditorium, as well as the courthouse. Increased commercial development in the immediate area and increased personnel requirements for the courthouse have caused the parking facility to reach its maximum capacity.

Approximately 400 parking spaces at the parking facility have been leased to a construction company which is developing a hotel in the immediate area, thereby reducing the amount of parking available to courthouse users during the period of time required to complete the development.

There are no assigned parking places for courthouse personnel, district attorneys or public defenders. Frequently, district attorneys and public defenders are required to leave the premises during the day in the course of their work. When they return there often is no parking available. They then have to park at the beach and take a shuttle bus to the courthouse, which is time consuming and nonproductive.

6. The Board of Supervisors authorize the Sheriff and the Marshal to allocate additional officers to staff the lock-up facilities at the Santa Monica Courthouse to provide adequate security for staff and users, on an interim basis, pending construction of a new courthouse facility.

Lock-up facilities in the Santa Monica Courthouse are totally inadequate to meet the requirements of the superior and municipal courts. There are five superior courtrooms which are equipped to handle felony cases for defendants who are in custody. The superior court utilizes six courtrooms outside of the secure areas to handle felony trial matters for in-custody defendants. Three of the six courtrooms require that bailiffs walk in-custody defendants outside the secure areas and through the public corridors within the courthouse to bring them to the courtrooms. There is no access to the lock-up facilities from some of the municipal courtrooms, which requires in-custody defendants to be brought to the courtrooms through the public corridors and the corridors adjoining the judges' chambers.

During the past five or more years, there have been numerous escape attempts from both the municipal and superior courts. One escape attempt resulted in the shooting death of an inmate who overpowered a deputy sheriff in the lock-up facilities.

C. SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAMS

PURPOSE

The Committee has chosen to study, as one of its projects, some of the programs administered in the area of substance abuse which focus on prevention among children and young adults. Two major law enforcement agencies within the county, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and the Los Angeles Police Department have wide ranging educational programs in effect which are targeted for the school districts. The Substance Abuse Narcotics Education Program (SANE) is operated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department; the Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program (DARE) is operated by the Los Angeles Police Department.

**Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
Substance Abuse Narcotics Education Program (SANE)**

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Board of Supervisors conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness of the SANE Program in preventing substance abuse among youth within the county. The Grand Jury further recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue to support the SANE Program and allocate additional funds for SANE so that it may expand its programs to reach school children in grade levels from kindergarten through high school.***

The SANE Program was initiated in 1985. It currently operates in 50 of the 83 school districts within the county, excluding the Los Angeles Unified School District, teaching in grades four through six. SANE utilizes a co-teaching approach in the classroom, whereby a deputy sheriff who has been professionally trained, works with the classroom teacher. The program uses a curriculum which has been developed into four component parts: self-esteem; coping and decision making skills; dealing with peer pressure; and basic knowledge, which research has shown to be the most effective way to teach substance abuse prevention.

Although SANE has been operating within the county for five years, a study to determine its effectiveness in reducing the incidents of substance abuse has not been conducted. Such a study could evaluate the results which may have been achieved since the program's inception, and could determine how the program could be made more effective.

While the main focus of the SANE Program is directed to substance abuse, it does not place enough of an emphasis on alcohol and tobacco abuse prevention. An expanded SANE Program, which works with all grade levels from kindergarten through high school and which places an emphasis on total substance abstinence, including alcohol and tobacco abstinence, would further increase the positive effects on youth in the community.

- 2. The Board of Supervisors support the enactment of legislation which would mandate every school district within the county, and every private school within the county, to implement a substance abuse program, utilizing SANE as a model substance abuse program.***

Of the 83 school districts within the county, SANE operates in 50 of the districts. There is a significant number of school districts within the county which do not currently have a substance abuse program in existence. The school districts and private schools which operate within the county are not required to contract with either SANE or any other substance abuse program for the benefit of its students.

- 3. The Board of Supervisors initiate a study to determine the feasibility and costs involved to implement an "after school" program utilizing various county departments, in order to complement the results which have been achieved and are provided by SANE during the classroom program.***

The substance abuse epidemic did not arise overnight, but evolved out of a series of societal circumstances over an extended period. As such, it will not be eradicated overnight. Prevention programs must be expanded and sustained for a long enough period of time to allow them to impact the problem of substance abuse.

Programs need to be created and made available to school children of all levels after the school day is ended. Because of societal changes, including the two-income family or the one-parent home, issues such as "latch-key kids" need creative solutions. After school programs need to be created that provide for the nurturing, supervision, and adult leadership which will prevent this generation of children from walking the path of substance abuse and gang participation.

- 4. The Board of Supervisors initiate a study to coordinate law enforcement, education, parental and community involvement in creating a community wide system to complement the drug prevention program now being utilized by SANE.***

SANE, in cooperation with school districts within the county, provides the basic fundamental tools which have and can continue to have a dramatic impact in reducing substance abuse. Parental and community involvement must be emphasized, however, as school and law enforcement programs alone cannot turn the tide. True partnerships of all of the system components: parents, community, schools, and law enforcement must be forged.

There must be a spirit of collaboration and cooperation among those dedicated to the drug prevention effort that transcends differences of opinions, approach, or competition for scarce resources.

- 5. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department continue to use the film entitled "Drugs, Pregnancy and Youth," in the SANE Program and that it incorporate the film into its program for junior high school students.***

The use of the film, "Drugs, Pregnancy and Youth" at the high school level indicates the harmful affects which can fall upon pregnant youths. The incidents of teenage pregnancy affects not only high school girls, but those of junior high school age as well. An expanded use of the film directed at girls in the junior high school level would increase the awareness of the potential problems affecting girls who engage in drug and substance abuse during pregnancy.

**Los Angeles Police Department
Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE)**

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The City of Los Angeles continue to support the DARE Program and allocate additional funds to the Los Angeles Police Department for DARE so that it may expand its programs to reach school children in grade levels from kindergarten through high school.***

The DARE Program was initiated in 1983. The Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) collaborated to launch a drug use prevention education program, which currently utilizes trained police officers who teach the program in grade levels four through six. In addition, DARE operates a junior high school program which is taught by both the classroom teacher and the police officer.

DARE utilizes a highly structured curriculum which has been developed by LAUSD, which focuses on four major areas: (1) Providing accurate information about tobacco, alcohol and drugs; (2) Teaching students decision-making skills; (3) Showing students how to resist peer pressure; and (4) Providing students with ideas for alternatives to drug use.

An independent evaluation of DARE concluded that the program has exceeded its goals of helping students combat peer pressure to become substance abusers. The findings, however, indicate that the alcohol abuse prevention aspect of the program has not produced similar results. An expanded DARE Program, which works with all grade levels from kindergarten through high school and which places an emphasis on total substance abstinence, including alcohol and tobacco abstinence, would further increase the positive effects on youth in the community.

- 2. The City of Los Angeles initiate a study to determine the feasibility and costs involved to implement an "after school" program utilizing various city departments, in order to complement the results which have been achieved and are provided by DARE during the classroom program.***

The substance abuse epidemic did not arise overnight, but evolved out of a series of societal circumstances over an extended period. As such, it will not be eradicated overnight. Prevention programs must be expanded and sustained for a long enough period of time to allow them to impact the problem of substance abuse.

Programs need to be created and made available to school children of all levels after the school day is ended. Because of societal changes, including the two-income family or the one-parent home, issues such as "latch-key kids" need creative solutions. After school programs need to be created that provide nurturing and supervision of school children, and which can provide adult leadership which will prevent this generation of children from walking the path of substance abuse and gang participation.

- 3. The City of Los Angeles initiate a study to coordinate law enforcement, education, parental and community involvement in creating a community-wide system to complement the drug prevention program now being utilized by DARE.***

DARE, in cooperation with LAUSD, provides the basic fundamental tools which have and can continue to have a dramatic impact in reducing substance abuse and gang participation. Parental and community involvement must be emphasized, however, as school and law enforcement programs alone cannot turn the tide. True partnerships of all of the system components: parents, community, school, and law enforcement must be forged. There must be a spirit of collaboration and cooperation amongst those dedicated to the drug prevention effort that transcends differences of opinion, approach, or competition for scarce resources.

CONCLUSION

One of the fundamental problems facing youngsters in Los Angeles County is peer pressure emanating from gang activity in local neighborhoods, which forces participation in gang activities. Narcotics addiction and trafficking, as well as violent crime, are becoming increasingly more prevalent in the gang community. Increased education and awareness of the pitfalls of becoming associated with and involved in gang activities needs to be addressed at the earliest level of education. The SANE and DARE Programs have the knowledge, experience and ability to further address these problems through an expanded curriculum.

The Grand Jury commends the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and the Los Angeles Police Department for their efforts to prevent substance abuse through communication and education.

- 1. The Grand Jury recommends that the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and the Los Angeles Police Department expand the SANE and DARE Programs to include more extensive gang prevention education in their current curriculums.***

2. ***The Grand Jury recommends that the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and the Los Angeles Police Department continue to meet quarterly to discuss mutual concerns and exchange ideas regarding the SANE and DARE Programs.***

D. LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT AERO BUREAU

PURPOSE

The Criminal Justice Committee chose, as one of its projects, to conduct a follow-up study of the 1985-86 Grand Jury's report on the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Aero Bureau. In so doing, the Committee sought to ascertain whether those recommendations which had been implemented enabled the Aero Bureau to more effectively accomplish its mission.

The Committee made site visits to the Aero Bureau headquarters at the Long Beach airport, inspected the facility, interviewed its Commander and Lieutenant, spoke with personnel assigned to the Bureau, and participated in operational flights.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

1. ***The Board of Supervisors approve an allocation of funds for three additional deputy sheriffs as generalist-observers to be assigned to the Sheriff's Department Aero Bureau.***

There are currently 26 pilots assigned to the Aero Bureau. Five are sergeant-pilots, the balance deputy-pilots. Two deputy-pilots were added to the complement subsequent to the report of the 1985-86 Grand Jury. In addition, the Bureau's fleet of helicopters was modernized with the purchase of ten new MD 500 helicopters and one additional FLIR (Forward Looking Infrared) unit, giving the Bureau a total of two. One of the deputy-pilots is assigned to patrol the Malibu station area and the other is assigned aerial patrol responsibilities at the Santa Clarita Valley station. One additional deputy-pilot patrols the Antelope Valley area. The deputy-pilots assigned to Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley stations operate from those facilities. However, their aircraft are maintained by mechanics at the Aero Bureau in Long Beach and are inspected weekly.

There are six deputy sheriff generalist-observers permanently assigned to the Aero Bureau headquarters facility in Long Beach. Three observers are assigned to the helicopter patrol units at the outlying stations mentioned above. However, they are permanently assigned to those respective stations as patrol officers, working as observers for the helicopter patrols.

In addition to utilizing its fleet of 16 helicopters and two fixed-wing aircraft for special operations, 80 percent of the Aero Bureau's flying hours are dedicated to patrols averaging four and one-half to five hours each eight-hour shift, in support of ground units county-wide. Using guidelines set up by the military, Sheriff's Department pilots are limited to a maximum of 100 flight hours per month. In addition, pilots are required to perform ground tasks at the Bureau, as well as maintaining flight proficiency.

Deputy observers are not limited insofar as the number of flying hours is concerned. As a result, they fly an average of approximately 120 hours per month. Each helicopter patrol unit is required to operate with an observer. In order to accommodate the two-man operation of the helicopter patrols, the Aero Bureau is not able to operate an efficient night patrol operation seven days each week. Deputy observers are currently working large amounts of overtime, which causes a "burnout factor" and which reduces the effectiveness of the patrol operation.

In order to enable the Aero Bureau to efficiently operate night patrols in the Los Angeles basin seven days each week, utilizing a 56-hour work week for the helicopter crews, three additional observers should be assigned to the Bureau. The effect would be to reduce the number of overtime hours worked by the remaining six observers and better enable the Bureau to accomplish its mission of support for ground units in the Los Angeles basin during the hours when the greatest amounts of criminal activity take place within the County.

2. The Board of Supervisors approve an allocation of funds for one additional civilian services assistant for the Sheriff's Department Aero Bureau.

There is currently one services assistant assigned to the Aero Bureau. His responsibilities include a myriad of assignments in support of the Aero Bureau operation. One of his primary tasks is to see that the service and maintenance facility at Long Beach Airport is maintained properly. In that regard, he oversees a work crew which is made up of work-release inmates who are actually sentenced prisoners working off their sentence under assignment by local courts. Those individuals are not trained in any way, shape or form in the operations of an aviation facility, nor can they be given specific tasks to be accomplished around the facility without supervision.

The Aero Bureau has not had a permanent services assistant assigned to the work-release crew so as to be able to adequately supervise it, or to be able to assure that sensitive equipment is not being mishandled, and that the facility is kept in a clean and workable condition at all times, which is required in such an operation. Until recently, personnel have been assigned to the Aero Bureau to fill in at that position on an ad-hoc basis for short periods of time. The frequency with which

personnel have been assigned for that purpose is diminishing, resulting in more time having to be spent at that task by the sole services assistant, taking away time which needs to be used in other tasks at the Bureau.

3. The Board of Supervisors approve an allocation of funds for two additional helicopter mechanics for the Sheriff's Department Aero Bureau.

There are 11 mechanics, including two supervising mechanics, plus one chief mechanic, to service the 16 helicopters and two fixed-wing aircraft which make up the Aero Bureau fleet. The Sheriff's Department utilizes an industry-wide standard of allocating one mechanic for every one thousand hours of flight time. It is currently understaffed, in that the Aero Bureau fleet's annual total number of hours flown is approximately 14,000. The supervising mechanics, in addition to performing regular maintenance duties on the fleet, spend a large percentage of their time assisting the nine line mechanics who maintain the fleet.

The mechanics who are currently assigned to the Aero Bureau are working many overtime hours. Utilizing the mechanic crew too many hours in any given week could result in inferior workmanship and attentiveness, which could lead to errors and unsafe aircraft operating conditions.

The Aero Bureau's Operational Readiness Rate has been set at 70 percent. This means that at any given time, 70 percent of the fleet should be able to be airborne. Currently, the Operational Readiness Rate is between 60 and 65 percent. The reduction in the Operational Readiness Rate is due primarily to the aircraft being out of service for various reasons. The Aero Bureau makes an important contribution to law enforcement in our county and should be fully supported.

APPENDIX

Two-Way Interacting Audio Video Procedures

Persons Interviewed

Daniel F. Calabro, Commissioner, Glendale Judicial District
Merle B. Chandler, Jail Supervisor, Glendale Police Department
Susan P. Clemens-Guthrie, Public Defender, San Diego County
Christopher Crawford, Court Administrator, Municipal Court, South Bay Judicial District, Torrance
Richard T. Freeman, Chief, Court Services Division, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
Laura Green, Deputy Public Defender, Los Angeles County
Michael P. Judge, Public Defender, Bureau Chief, Central Court Operations, Los Angeles County
Warren B. Kastner-Treisman, Deputy City Attorney, Criminal Division, City of San Diego
Robert Mimura, Executive Director, Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee, Los Angeles County
Robert B. Stephens, Telecommunications Administrator, Information Resources, Chief Administrative Office, Los Angeles County
Robert Taylor, Commander, Los Angeles Police Department
David J. Thompson, Chief of Police, City of Glendale
Timothy W. Tower, Judge of the Municipal Court, San Diego Judicial District
Frank Zolin, County Clerk/Executive Officer, Los Angeles Superior Court

Documents Reviewed

Central Courts Video Project Proposal, Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee, September 1989
The South Bay Municipal Court Interactive Video Proceedings Report, prepared for the Judicial Council Workshop, Oakland, California, February 1988, Project Coordinator, Christopher Crawford, Court Administrator
Interactive Video Proceedings Municipal Court South Bay Judicial District for Countywide Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee meeting December 1989, Christopher Crawford, Court Administrator
Telecommunications Management Review
Third Year End Report Video Arraignment Pilot Project, Glendale Municipal Court December 1989

Santa Monica Courthouse

Persons Interviewed

Ronald H. Carroll, Head Deputy District Attorney, Santa Monica Branch Office, Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office
Carol Collee, Regional Director, Field Services Bureau, Los Angeles County Probation Department
Edgar Gilmore, Head Deputy Public Defender, Santa Monica Branch Office, Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office
Michael Henry, Division Chief, Public Safety Division, Chief Administrative Office
William K. Koska, Santa Monica Bar Association
Darryle Mahood, Assistant Chief, County Clerk's Office, Santa Monica Branch
Sandra Polin, Santa Monica Bar Association
David M. Rothman, Supervising Judge, Los Angeles Superior Court, West District
Laurence D. Rubin, Presiding Judge, Santa Monica Judicial District
Frank S. Zolin, County Clerk/Executive Office, Los Angeles Superior Court

Documents Reviewed

Los Angeles County Superior Court District Filings Comparison
Los Angeles County Superior Court Monthly Conspectus
Los Angeles County Superior Court Civil and Criminal Profile
Santa Monica Municipal Court Total Filings Report
County of Los Angeles Master Courthouse Construction Program, 1988

Substance Abuse Prevention Programs

Persons Interviewed

Larry Anderson, Area Commander, Field Operations Region II, LASD
Richard Bargas, Officer, DARE Division, LAPD
Michael J. Bostic, Captain, Commanding Officer, DARE Division, LAPD
Doug Campbell, Sergeant, DARE Division, LAPD
Mark Caswell, Officer, DARE Division, LAPD
R. Davidson, Sergeant, Operation Safe Streets, LASD
Hugh Decker, Sergeant, DARE Division, LAPD
David D. Dotson, Assistant Chief, Bureau of Special Investigation, LAPD
K.L. Giberson, Sergeant, DARE Division, LAPD
Larry Goebel, Lieutenant, DARE Division, LAPD
Grace Hardeman, Deputy Sheriff, LASD
Jim Harris, Detective, Prison Gang Unit, LAPD
Judith Lewis, Lieutenant, SANE Unit, LASD
Walter W. Mitchell, Commander, Bureau of Special Investigation, LAPD
Duane T. Preimsberger, Chief, Field Operations Region II, LASD
Richard Stocks, Officer, DARE Division, LAPD
Robert Taylor, Commander, Support Services Bureau, LAPD
Rene Topalian, Assistant Director, Drug Abuse Programs, Los Angeles County Department of Health Services

Site Visits

Drug Rehabilitation Centers
Darby Elementary School
Normandie Street School
Miramonte School
Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee meetings
Los Angeles Police Department Crime Lab
Los Angeles Sheriff's Department Crime Lab

Documents Reviewed

"Drugs, Pregnancy and Youth"
Evaluation and Training Institute

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Aero Bureau

Persons Interviewed

Bob Pash, Area Commander, Field Operations Region III, LASD
James A. DiGiovanna, Lieutenant, Aero Bureau, LASD

Site visit

Aero Bureau, Long Beach, California

ECONOMY, EFFICIENCY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE



ECONOMY, EFFICIENCY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Seated left to right: Albert Penalber, Rodger Thisdell

Standing left to right: Carl Johnson, Chair, Leo George

ECONOMY, EFFICIENCY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Purpose

The Economy, Efficiency and Environment Committee was created to investigate the impact of public and private industrial and commercial operations on the environment.

Areas of Concern

- A. Control of Ocean Pollution
- B. Operation and Maintenance of the Freeway Call Box System
- C. Emission of Noxious Odors from Commercial Incinerators in the City of Lynwood
- D. Establishment of a Landfill in Elsmere Canyon
- E. Merger of the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission and the Southern California Rapid Transit District
- F. Awarding of Security Contracts for Policing the Metro Blue Line

Methods of Investigation

The committee interviewed complainants, made on-site tours and investigations, interviewed management and operating personnel and reviewed plans.

A. CONTROL OF OCEAN POLLUTION

PURPOSE

A complaint filed by Heal the Bay of Santa Monica alleged that contaminated water from Ballona Creek, which is fed by the Los Angeles basin storm sewer system is responsible for over 70 percent of the remaining pollution in Santa Monica Bay. This report seeks to identify the agencies responsible for the operation and maintenance of this system and actions to help reduce the quantity of contaminants that enter the storm sewers.

SCOPE

The cleaning of catch basins and storm sewers as discussed herein relates only to debris and solid matter and does not attempt to address toxic chemicals. However,

any public education programs discussed are directed toward the deposit of all foreign materials into catch basins, whether solid debris or toxic chemicals.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Grand Jury recommends that the Los Angeles City Council:

- 1. Provide funding for a computerized inventory system to document and schedule the cleaning and maintenance of over 50,000 catch basins in the city.***
- 2. Develop a program to use persons who are court-sentenced to perform community service for cleaning catch basins that do not require safety equipment or special training.***
- 3. Employ private contractors in the two months prior to the rainy season to clean catch basins that have not been cleaned or are in need of recleaning.***
- 4. Institute a vigorous public education program to inform citizens of the environmental consequences of discarding refuse into gutters and catch basins. This program must include any adjacent cities or political entities which discharge storm water into the city system.***
- 5. Investigate the feasibility of amending the current sewer service tax ordinance to dedicate a portion of this tax revenue to the maintenance and operation of the storm sewer system.***

The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors:

- 1. Change the catch basin cleaning contract monitoring procedure to the system that was in use prior to 1988.***
- 2. Develop a program to use persons who are court-sentenced to perform community service for cleaning catch basins that do not require safety equipment or special training.***
- 3. Institute a vigorous public education program to inform citizens of the environmental consequences of discarding refuse into gutters and catch basins. This program must be coordinated with and include any incorporated cities or political entities which discharge storm water into the county storm sewer system.***

The Grand Jury recommends that governing bodies of all incorporated cities within Los Angeles County:

1. ***Cooperate with the governmental entity (either the County or City of Los Angeles) into whose storm sewer system the city discharges water in order to:***
 - A. ***Develop a public education program to inform citizens of the environmental consequences of discarding refuse into gutters and catch basins.***
2. ***Develop a program to use persons who are court-sentenced to perform community service for cleaning catch basins that do not require the use of safety equipment or specialized training.***
3. ***Appropriate sufficient money, personnel and equipment to ensure that discharge from drains for which the city is responsible meets the standards of the system receiving that discharge.***

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The committee contacted staff personnel from Los Angeles County, the City of Los Angeles and the larger incorporated cities of Los Angeles County who are responsible for the maintenance and cleaning of catch basins. Interviews and field inspections were conducted to acquaint the committee with the problem in general and techniques, procedures and special problems involved in the cleaning of catch basins.

The committee also interviewed the complainant and staff personnel from the County Department of Beaches and Harbors who are on the receiving end of this problem.

The committee inspected several hundred catch basins in 16 incorporated cities plus extensive areas of the County and the City of Los Angeles. All, except a very few, of these basins were shallow enough to be fully viewed from the street without special entrance equipment.

The committee interviewed personnel from the Investigation Division of the Los Angeles County Chief Administrative Office and studied their 1989 report regarding the catch basin clean-out contracting program.

The committee also interviewed executives of the Service Employees International Union, Local 660, who contend that their members are deprived of work by the clean-out contracting program.

FINDINGS

Storm water enters the sewer system by flowing into catch basins from gutters in the streets and other channels. When a heavy rain occurs, the force of the water carries any debris that has collected in the catch basin, through the lateral connectors, into the storm sewer and ultimately into Santa Monica Bay, Los Angeles Harbor, Long Beach Harbor or San Pedro Bay.

The Los Angeles area receives no appreciable rain from May through September. During this period, large amounts of debris collect in the catch basins through the action of winds, irrigation run-off, and intentional dumping by citizens. It is essential that this material be removed prior to the rainy season.

The committee initiated its investigation with a visit to Ballona Creek, which carries a large portion of the water that is discharged into Santa Monica Bay from the Los Angeles basin storm sewer systems. The banks of the creek were littered with every kind of debris imaginable. Most prevalent were plastic bottles, cups, plates, straws and packaging materials. Also in abundance were motor oil containers, which suggests that the used motor oil was likewise deposited in the storm sewer. This debris is deposited on the creek banks by falling tides, then carried out to sea by subsequent high tides. Once out to sea, it is captured by the waves, tides and wind which carries it ashore and deposits it on our beaches.

It is imperative that the catch basins be inspected on a routine basis and cleaned and re-cleaned as often as required throughout the year, just as we do with litter along our streets and freeways. In most cases debris or contaminants allowed to collect will be flushed out and into our harbors, bays and oceans by the next significant rainfall. This material will not wait until we get around to cleaning it up. In cases where the debris does not flush out, it causes a blockage that prevents the basin from doing the job for which it was designed, and results in intersection or street flooding.

Agencies responsible for the operation and maintenance of the storm sewer system are aware of this problem and are constantly trying to keep the system clean. However, the resources available to them are far too minimal to accomplish the task.

Los Angeles County is responsible for the maintenance of approximately 64,000 catch basins, and the City of Los Angeles approximately 52,000. Responsibility for maintenance of catch basins in the incorporated cities varies considerably. In most cities, the city is responsible for some catch basins and the county is responsible for some.

Catch basin cleaning procedures: Methods employed generally fall into two categories: manual cleaning with shovels, buckets, brooms and bags; or the more sophisticated and expensive vacuum truck.

Manual cleaning can, in the case of deep basins, present a danger factor due to the presence of toxic gases. However, these basins are relatively few and have been identified. The vast majority of basins can be cleaned by workers without special skills, equipment, or an unusual level of strength or physical dexterity. Manual cleaning on a very large scale is not conducive to the use of full-time civil service employees, due to the wide fluctuation of personnel needs throughout the year. The committee believes that the use of persons sentenced by the municipal courts to perform specified hours of community service may be a feasible solution. Such a program appears to work well for CAL-TRANS to clean up litter along the freeway systems.

The County of Los Angeles

The county uses private contractors, who submit bids to clean the catch basins in specific areas. The bid is based on a price per basin.

In 1987, the system for monitoring the cleaning contracts was a random inspection of 50 percent of the catch basins cleaned. This inspection was conducted by county personnel after the contract was completed but prior to the payment of the contractor.

In 1988, the monitoring system was changed to require the inspection of 100 percent of the catch basins cleaned. The inspections are now conducted by county inspectors who are on the scene with the cleaning contractor. The following table shows the effect of this change in contract monitoring.

YEAR	# BASINS CLEANED	PERCENT INSPECTED	PERCENT REJECTED	CLEAN-OUT PER BASIN COSTS	INSPECT. & ADM. PER BASIN COSTS	TOTAL PER BASIN COSTS
1987	64,115	50%	1.5%	\$8.21	\$2.50	\$10.71
1988	64,359	50% & 100%		6.92	5.29	12.21
1989	66,215	100%	-0-	8.91	9.21	18.12
1990	66,215	100%		8.91	9.24	18.15

The current system of 100 percent on-the-job inspection, has driven the costs of inspection and administration well above the cost of the actual cleaning. A return to the 1987 contract monitoring system would enable the county to almost double the number of basins cleaned for the same cost. The current system is not cost effective and does nothing to improve the quality of water discharged into the oceans, harbors and bays.

City of Los Angeles

The major portion of catch basins are cleaned manually by city employees. State Proposition 13 wiped out the catch basin cleaning program in 1978. All that remained were 16 employees, who were committed to responding to complaints and emergencies.

Since then, the city has increased funding to provide for 32 employees. Two-man cleaning crews are deployed in the downtown area 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Eight new vacuum trucks have been ordered and are scheduled to be delivered to the city by mid-summer. With this new equipment, the Department of Sanitation hopes to achieve a goal of 110,000 cleanings per year. Some basins do not require cleaning every year and others require cleaning three or four times yearly. In order to achieve this goal, it will be necessary to significantly increase the production of cleaning crews. A computerized system to manage and inventory the cleaning of the city's 52,000 catch basins would provide an essential tool to help management maximize the effectiveness of their personnel and new equipment. The skillful use of an automated system could identify trouble areas and precisely schedule cleanings on the basis of need.

Incorporated Cities

Responsibility for cleaning and maintaining catch basins is determined on the basis of who built and owns the drainage system, rather than on political boundaries. In most incorporated cities, the county is responsible for some catch basins and the city is responsible for some. In most cities the catch basin responsibility does not justify the cost of a vacuum truck. The cleaning is performed by hand, either by municipal employees or by private contractors. At least two cities (Glendale and Long Beach) own vacuum trucks.

CONCLUSION

If the quality of water discharged into the ocean is to be significantly improved, it is imperative that all parties concerned allocate considerably more resources towards this effort. However, additional and more timely cleaning by itself is not the final solution to this problem.

The best and certainly most cost-effective solution is a vigorous public education program. All entities involved must collectively develop and deliver a message that will acquaint the public with the environmental consequences of using our catch basins as dumpsters and trash bins.

B. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE FREEWAY CALL BOX SYSTEM

The committee found that there are 3600 call boxes in Los Angeles County. Many boxes are out of operation, but the operators have no way to determine the location or operating condition of a particular box. The system is comprised of 13 telephone lines, manned by only 32 operators on a 24-hour basis.

In 1988 a new agency, Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) was created to maintain and operate the call box system. The state legislature has authorized a \$1.00 motor vehicle registration surcharge to finance operation and improvements to the system. Since the formation of SAFE, nine additional operators have been authorized and new boxes will be installed that will automatically tell the operator its location and operating condition.

The Grand Jury decided that these actions are adequate and therefore, no recommendations are necessary.

C. EMISSION OF NOXIOUS ODORS FROM A COMMERCIAL INCINERATOR IN THE CITY OF LYNWOOD

The committee investigated a citizen's complaint of noxious odors emanating from a commercial incinerator operated by Cargill Chemical Products Division in the City of Lynwood. On a visit to the site by the committee, odors were detected but they were not of a highly noxious nature.

The committee requested a report from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). SCAQMD's reply stated that Cargil was not in violation of any rules, all equipment was operating properly and only eight complaints (five from one person) were received in two years.

The committee decided that there was not sufficient cause to continue this investigation.

D. ESTABLISHMENT OF A LANDFILL IN ELSMERE CANYON

The committee investigated a complaint from the Santa Clarita Civic Association contending that the proposed landfill will be detrimental to the quality of life in the area.

The committee contacted the Board of Supervisors and learned that the supervisors had voted unanimously to create the landfill and decided that further action by the Grand Jury was unwarranted.

E. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

A request to investigate the rehiring by the Southern California Rapid Transit District (SCRTD) of a contractor who was accused of illegal labor practices was received from the Board of Supervisors.

The committee learned that an investigation was underway by the State Department of Industrial Relations. In addition, the contractor was being prosecuted by the District Attorney's Office in relation to the same matter.

The committee interviewed original complainants to the Board of Supervisors as well as the Executive Director of the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission.

After its initial investigation, the Grand Jury determined that further investigation would be inappropriate at this time.

F. AWARDING OF SECURITY CONTRACTS FOR POLICING THE METRO BLUE LINE

A complaint from the Southern California Rapid Transit District Police Officers Association (SCRTD POA) requested that the Grand Jury investigate the award of a security contract to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

The selection of a contractor was a decision of the SCRTD and the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission. The Grand Jury decided not to initiate an investigation because there was not sufficient time for this panel to complete it and the Grand Jury has no power to alter or recind a decision of the agencies involved.

APPENDIX

Persons Interviewed

Judith Berlin, Business Agent, Local 660 SEIU, AFL/CIO
Robert D. Cashin, Manager, Local 660 SEIU, AFL/CIO
Larry Charness, Chief, Planning Division, Los Angeles County Department of Beaches & Harbors
Greg Elliot, Photographer, Heal-The-Bay
Sandra Flores, Volunteers of America
Mark Gold, Staff Scientist, Heal-The-Bay
David Guthman, Head Deputy, Environmental Crimes/OSHA Division, Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office
Michael J. Henry, Chief, Public Safety Division, County of Los Angeles
Dave F. Irwin, City of Long Beach Bureau of Public Service
Ramon L. Jellison, Wastewater Collection Manager II, City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Sanitation Bureau, Wastewater Collection Systems
Clyde W. Lockley, Captain, Highway/TSM Program, California Highway Patrol
Orville McCollom, Deputy Director, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
John K. Mitchell, Head, Water Quality Section, Waste Management Division, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
Bill Pasley, Lieutenant, Operation Officer, Communications Center, California Highway Patrol
Kahler V. Russell, Assistant Deputy Director, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
D. Wayne Schumaker, Chief, Safety & Sanitation Division, Los Angeles County Department of Beaches & Harbors
Jack M. Skadsem, Special Investigation Unit, Los Angeles County Chief Administrative Office
Thomas A. Tidemanson, Director, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
John Vos, Street Superintendent, Street Section, City of Glendale
Steve Weingarten, Business Agent, Local 660 SEIU, AFL/CIO
Tom Wood, Director of Public Works & Transportation, City of Pasadena

FAMILY AND CHILDREN SERVICES COMMITTEE



FAMILY AND CHILDREN SERVICES COMMITTEE

Seated left to right: Rudy Pino, Karen Weiss

Standing left to right: Anne Finn, Sallee Crookston, Chair, Lewis Diamond

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

Purpose

The purpose of the Family and Children's Services Committee was to investigate, seek and improve delivery of specialized services to the families and children of Los Angeles County.

A. A STUDY OF THE COUNTY'S EFFORTS TO PREPARE MINORS IN ITS CARE FOR EMANCIPATION

PURPOSE

This study was to identify what actions Los Angeles County is taking to prepare minors who are emancipating from county programs. Los Angeles County is responsible for thousands of youth through the programs administered by the Departments of Children's Services, Probation and Education. For most of these young people, turning 18 marks the end of their participation in many assistance programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors and the appropriate Department Heads:

1. *Make emancipation preparation services a formal part of their curriculum and programs. Currently, the Probation Department and Office of Education, as well as independent school districts, are not required to provide or emphasize these services to youth.*
2. *Continue to support the development of the Department of Children's Services Independent Living Program through:*
 - *Advocating continued federal support of the program with the California Congressional delegation.*
 - *Considering enhancements to the Independent Living Program proposed by the Department.*

The Independent Living Program has had some positive impact including:

- *Bringing an increased awareness to those involved in foster care of the need to prepare foster youths for emancipation.*
 - *Providing the catalyst for building relationships among the many agencies that deal with foster youths.*
3. *Define services needed by emancipated foster youths and identify mechanisms for developing a post emancipation program to meet these needs. Currently, there are very limited services available to the emancipated foster youths after they leave the county's care.*
 4. *Seek changes in federal eligibility requirements to allow foster youths to accumulate savings in excess of \$1,000 in anticipation of their eventual emancipation. Foster youths are unable to make adequate financial preparations for emancipation under existing eligibility regulations. Basic housing and schooling costs can easily exceed the amount they are permitted to save.*
 5. *Require the Independent Living Program assessment questionnaire be completed (1) by someone who knows the child at least moderately well, or (2) after additional knowledge is obtained about the child through interviews with the child, the child's parents or foster parents, school personnel, or other individuals in a position to know the child's needs. We found that assessments were often completed by personnel with little or no knowledge of the youth.*
 6. *Define Independent Living Program services required to be provided by the independent living skills programs under contract, including the minimum amount of time spent with each youth on each specific element of the program. Currently, the Independent Living Program's contracts with the independent skills centers define only a general list of services to be provided without defining a specific level of service.*
 7. *Require standardized Independent Living Program performance reporting from the independent skills centers and conduct periodic performance reviews of both the skills centers and the Community College Foundation. Further, a standard format for performance reporting should be developed. Currently, there is no evaluation by the Department of Children's Services of the services which are being provided as part of the Independent Living Program by the independent skills centers or the Community College Foundation.*
 8. *Require the Independent Living Program document services provided to each foster youth in that youth's file. Without this information, it is impossible to provide ongoing needs assessment and emancipation planning. We found no*

record of the emancipation services that have been provided to each youth in the files kept by the Independent Living Program.

9. *Require the Independent Living Program work more closely with the group homes to develop emancipation programs and ensure emancipation needs are considered in group home placements. Currently, there is little coordination between the Independent Living Program and foster group homes. This results in a lack of awareness of emancipation programs or consideration of these programs in placement decisions.*
10. *Require the Independent Living Program coordinate and facilitate the access of foster youth to Regional Occupational Programs. The Regional Occupational Programs currently have no formal relationship with the Independent Living Program or any other segment of the Department of Children's Services.*

B. BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS OF COUNTY EMPLOYEES INVOLVED WITH CHILDREN

PURPOSE

Los Angeles County provides a myriad of services to children. Delivering these services involves teachers, aides, food workers, social workers, counselors, maintenance workers, drivers and other people employed by the county or by its contractors.

The purpose of this study was to document the procedures and precautions being taken to protect children from persons with inappropriate backgrounds. This study also reviewed the controls used when contractor personnel supervise children away from the supervision of county personnel.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors and the appropriate Department Heads:

1. *Develop consistent policies and procedures with regard to the hiring criteria of employees who work directly with children. Currently, each county department working with children has a different set of guidelines relating to criminal backgrounds for hiring personnel and contractors.*
2. *Develop consistent policies and procedures with regard to evaluating offenses committed by personnel while being employed. Our findings show there is no consistent policy among county departments with regard to an employee being arrested and/or convicted of a crime while employed by the county.*

3. ***Establish personnel files on each "contract employee" which shall include the background investigation and clearance paperwork. Currently, departments do not maintain personnel files of contract employees.***
4. ***Maintain appropriate files in order to allow verification of the background clearance process. Currently, the Department of Children's Services does not maintain the background check clearance documentation or fingerprint cards of its employees in background clearance files.***
5. ***Require all personnel to wear visible identification badges at all times when they are in the presence of wards of the court. We found many instances where personnel from the Department of Children's Services Transportation Division were not wearing professional attire or identification badges. This diminishes the level of security and control that should exist to protect and make children comfortable.***
6. ***Closely monitor contract provisions with regard to background checks with outside providers of services for children. Currently, the county is not adequately monitoring the contractors' performance.***
7. ***Conduct thorough background investigations of all licensed foster parents prior to the placement of Department of Children's Services youth in the homes. Fingerprint record checks may not be sufficient to evaluate the appropriateness of foster parent applications. The advantage of this action must be weighed against the potential adverse impact on foster parent recruitment.***

C. SUBSTANCE-EXPOSED INFANT PROBLEM IN LOS ANGELES

PURPOSE

Los Angeles County has seen a significant increase in the number of substance-exposed infants (SEIs). In 1985, there were 543 "drug babies" identified. In 1986, there were 915. By 1987, the number almost doubled to 1,619. The estimated number identified in 1989 is over 3,000—almost twice the 1987 level.

Infants born to drug abusing mothers are at increased risk of prenatal morbidity and mortality. Children born addicted are also at risk of numerous long term medical, developmental and behavioral problems beyond the newborn period. In addition, children born to parents who are substance abusers are at much higher risk of child abuse and neglect.

These infants and parents with multiple needs for services addressing their drug treatment, mental health, and parenting issues have a tremendous impact on the county's child welfare services, health, social services, educational and legal systems.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors and the appropriate Department Heads:

- 1. Develop consistent policies and protocols for identifying, screening, and referring substance-exposed infants. There is currently no consistent county-wide policy as to who gets tested and when. There is substantial variation both in policy and procedure.***
- 2. Enforce existing laws requiring reporting of all infants exposed to drugs; and lobby at the state level for mandatory drug and alcohol testing at the prenatal and delivery stages. Drug testing is not mandated either prenatally or at birth. In addition, testing and reporting is left to the attending physician's discretion and thus private facilities are not reporting substance-exposed infants.***
- 3. Enhance access to drug rehabilitation services for pregnant and parenting drug addicts and their families. Our findings suggest that there are limited community resources available to pregnant drug-using mothers.***
- 4. Investigate services being provided at the contract group nurseries and determine whether the contract price is justifiable when compared to the reimbursement rate of foster care. Our findings show that these contract group nurseries are not accepting medically fragile drug-exposed infants as intended by the county's contract. Therefore, the medically fragile infants are being placed with specially trained foster parents at substantially lower rates, i.e., \$600 as compared to \$3,700 a month.***
- 5. Develop strategies for better identifying and assessing the needs of substance-exposed infants. From our review, the county is currently not identifying 85 percent of the substance-exposed infants.***
- 6. Evaluate the impact of Senate Bill 2669 and consider lobbying the state against its passage due to the change in mandatory reporting of substance-exposed infants. Senate Bill 2669 stipulates that infants with positive toxicological tests will not automatically be referred for child welfare services, but rather will be referred to a public health nurse to make an assessment.***
- 7. Develop and implement structured educational programs for all patients in family planning and prenatal clinics on the effects of drug use during pregnancy.***

8. ***Create an inter-agency task force to develop a county-wide strategic plan to address the interdisciplinary needs of substance-exposed infants, over the life-cycle from prenatal exposure through school age. The county currently lacks a strategic plan to address the issue of the pregnant and parenting addict and her children.***
9. ***Request that the courts consider not awarding custody to the mother until she successfully completes the drug rehabilitation program. Our findings showed that custody is often awarded to the mother prior to the completion of her drug rehabilitation program.***
10. ***Evaluate the effectiveness of the Welfare and Institutions Code Section 330 contracts as a means to reunify mother with infant and enforce the completion of contract terms prior to the 12 month expiration. Our findings showed that Welfare and Institutions Code Section 330 contract renewals were being made for mothers who failed to complete the drug rehabilitation program within the contract period, who continued drug usage and/or gave birth to another "drug baby."***
11. ***Develop uniform strategies with the local school districts and special education programs to better meet the needs of the substance-exposed infants entering the school system. There is currently no curriculum established specifically addressing drug-exposed children that have behavior disorders and processing delays, nor are there any special classes developed to help these substance-exposed infants overcome their difficulties. Teaching strategies for "drug babies" are being developed in the PED studies and need to be incorporated into the school lesson plans.***
12. ***Improve training for teachers by bringing in specialists on the developmental impacts of drug exposure as well as developing teaching strategies. As studies on substance-exposed infants develop, teachers are finding that they lack the educational training to cope with these children. Schools are turning to their districts for program assistance since special education programs are not tailored to meet their needs.***
13. ***Appoint a headstart coordinator to identify the developmental needs of substance-exposed infants placed at county facilities, including MacLaren Children's Center and Bienvenidos. Substance-exposed infants placed in group homes such as MacLaren Children's Center or Bienvenidos are not receiving special early intervention services. These substance-exposed infants are often not identified for any developmental problems and do not get a chance for referral into any prevention or special education programs.***

- 14. Establish appropriate cost-effective mechanisms for the medically fragile infants. Evaluate the feasibility of increasing payments to foster care parents who provide care for medically fragile infants. Currently, the county has contracted with group nurseries to care for these infants, however, the nurseries are not accepting a substantial number of them. The nursery contract price is \$3,700 per infant per month, whereas the price for foster care is \$621.***

D. EMANCIPATION PLANNING

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Department of Children's Services continue to evaluate foster child eligibility for the independent living program. Referrals to the community colleges and the skill centers should be made early in the year for all juveniles turning 16 years of age that year.***
- 2. The Department of Children's Services create a transition counseling program of six to nine months culminating in emancipation of the young adult. This program should be set up to assist the young adult in locating housing, securing employment, school registration and managing savings.***
- 3. The Department of Children's Services create programs to plan for the successful emancipation of all young people in their care.***
- 4. The Department of Children's Services create group-foster-emancipation homes to ease the minor in the transition from foster care to independence.***
- 5. The Department of Children's Services evaluate the potential for reunification of minors with their families. If reunification is unlikely, all placements should be made with emancipation in mind.***

The community colleges and skill centers do not receive the names of eligible students early enough in the budgeted year to complete the required programs. Many young adults were not prepared to be on their own at age 18. The committee visited group homes, juvenile facilities and probation camps. The committee learned many children facing life on their own at age 18 are under the supervision of the Department of Children's Services while living with relatives. Children and foster children in juvenile halls and probation camps do not have access to the independent living program. They are not receiving any emancipation planning services from the county other than that received from the schools.

6. The Los Angeles County Office of Education form a task force for emancipation. This task force should consist of school district representatives. The goals of the task force should be:

- a. To share available curriculum.**
- b. To distribute and develop courses of study that prepare non-college bound students for success in the workplace.**
- c. To distribute information to the school districts to enable them to:**
 - (1) Offer emancipation supportive classes for the non-college bound students.**
 - (2) Offer classes to prepare non-college bound students for independent living.**

Questionnaires sent to all county school districts revealed that 45 percent of the graduating students were entering the work force. In many districts the offered elective independent living classes were selected by only four to 20 percent of the students.

E. LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATION AND FINDING

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Los Angeles County Office of Education locate suitable sites for establishing additional community school programs.**

Community schools are a viable alternative for youngsters released from probation camp or who have difficulty functioning in the traditional school environment. Funding from the Average Daily Attendance fund is available for additional community schools if locations can be found.

F. LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

RECOMMENDATION AND FINDING

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Los Angeles Unified School District Special Education Program at J.P. Widney High School be expanded to include swimming and water safety.**

Widney High School has an adaptive physical education program being taught by teachers who majored in physical education for the physically handicapped. Well qualified teachers are teaching handicapped children physical education and therapy. They participate in various sports in their school and surrounding communities. Sadly lacking is a swimming pool for these handicapped children. The availability of such a pool would allow these children to participate in additional sports as well as receiving a strong therapeutic value. J.P. Widney High School sits on a parcel of five acres with more than adequate space to support a swimming pool. Hiring of additional personnel would not be a factor as Widney High School has qualified teachers available.

G. DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Department of Children's Services' shelter care providers improve procedures for escorting children to the court check-in desk.***
- 2. The Department of Children's Services improve activity programs for the children waiting to go into court in the shelter care facilities.***
- 3. The Department of Children's Services immediately cease using the current "Introductory" video tape.***

More attention should be given to the needs and comfort of the child arriving at court to ensure proper check-in and care. This can be a traumatic experience. The child should be familiar with the court process including the role of the social worker, the judge and the lawyers. The video tape presently in use is unacceptable. As presented, the tape fails to accomplish its purpose in that it does not adequately explain the court process in a manner which is understandable to the five to ten-year-old age group which it is intended to reach. Within shelter care the primary activity is viewing television. This is not a proper activity for school-age children.

It is vital to have appropriate shelter care activities planned prior to construction of the new dependency court facility as it may be necessary to rearrange the shelter care areas to meet the program needs. Early planning would allow the facility and the program to be mutually supportive.

4. *The Board of Supervisors support the current Juvenile Dependency Court proposal for a testing center at Eastlake Juvenile Hall.*

The committee found that complete and accurate data collection is essential to meaningful evaluation of the system of out-of-home-placement of children. Data must be collected on many facets of the system including: What are the needs of the child upon entering the system? Are these needs met? Why is a placement made? Does it succeed or fail? The committee has observed that significant delays are caused by not having the required test results available to the court. A central testing facility would eliminate delays due to missing test results.

5. *The Department of Children's Services establish visitation centers where children under supervision may visit with their parents, relatives and friends.*

The committee has discussed family visitation with representatives of the Juvenile Dependency Court, Department of Children's Services and foster parents. Often visitations are restricted by travel distances or security reasons. The committee supports the concept of secure and central visitation centers.

H. JUVENILE COURT SECURITY

RECOMMENDATION AND FINDING

The Grand Jury recommends that:

1. *The Los Angeles Superior Court review the security surroundings of the juvenile courts, particularly in areas where the Los Angeles County Probation Department personnel load and unload children.*

Both the number of juvenile offenders and the severity of charges has increased dramatically. Probation officers transport juvenile offenders to court without benefit of armed security, placing the probation officers, offenders and the public at risk.

I. LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

1. *The Probation Department continue to raise salaries for entry level employees commensurate with the responsibilities.*

2. *The Board of Supervisors support the continuation of the Probation Department camp program and its expansion.*
3. *The Probation Department increase parenting, sex and health education classes in camp programs.*
4. *The Probation Department reestablish home and school monitoring of children on probation.*

The committee supports the camp program, which meets the correction needs of juvenile offenders in a supportive educational environment. Low entry level pay scale makes it difficult for the probation department to attract quality personnel. The committee concurs with the findings of the 1986-87 Grand Jury Final Report recommending that probation camp salaries be increased. The committee also concurs with the findings of the 1986-87 Grand Jury Final Report recommending that home and school monitoring be reinstated. The elimination of this program would leave no place to house juvenile offenders. The committee met and spoke with juveniles and counselors about parenting and sex education and learned that many juveniles are already parents. Successful parenting, sex and health education programs offered by the Los Angeles County Office of Education could be extended into the probation camps.

J. TRUANCY MEDIATION PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

1. *The District Attorney's Office continue its support of the Truancy Mediation Program.*
2. *The District Attorney's Office evaluate the processing of truancy cases in order to reduce the time involved.*
3. *The Board of Supervisors encourage the school districts to continue their participation in the School Attendance Review Boards (SARB).*
4. *The Board of Supervisors encourage the school districts to aggressively pursue truants through the use of family contact programs, community service support groups and cooperative programs with cities and law enforcement.*

The deinstitutionalization of status offenders in 1977 created a fast growing area of school related juvenile crime. Children at risk of becoming status offenders are first identified through truancy. The committee attended School Attendance Review Board meetings, met with district administrators and surveyed attendance procedures. The

committee found these efforts are returning children to school and the increased average daily attendance funds pay for the costs of the SARB.

K. GANGS

While we were investigating the juvenile justice system in Los Angeles County, the Family and Children's Services Committee met with various Los Angeles County area gang enforcement units in order to gain a better understanding of the increased impact of gang activity on juvenile offenses. These agencies referred us to the various video tapes which are being used to train law enforcement agencies and to increase public awareness of the gang problems facing Los Angeles County.

The committee encourages the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to direct more attention towards the education of parents and communities in order to more effectively decrease gang activity. This can be done through greater circulation of those video tapes now available to the community.

APPENDIX

Interviews and Site Visits

Alex Ackerman, Director, Camp Holton
Sheila Anderson, Director, Children's Institute International
Howard Baker, Personnel Officer, Department of Children's Services
Victor Barrera, Judge, Long Beach Juvenile Court
Xylina Bean, Martin Luther King Hospital
Diane Bickler, Director, Juvenile Court Services, Department of Children's Services
Paul Boland, Presiding Judge, Los Angeles Juvenile Court
Phyllis Bramson, Legislative Analyst in Senator Robert Presley's Office
Thelma Brown, Director, House of Uhuru
Russ Carr, Director, Resident Care, MacLaren Children's Center
Robert Chaffee, Director, Department of Children's Services
Children's Shelter Care, Department of Children's Services, Criminal Courts Building
Trula Worthy Clayton, Superintendent, Sylmar Juvenile Hall, Probation Department
Dean Cooper, Oscar J's Sightseeing Tours, Inc.
Leo Cortez, Probation Department
Rita Cregg, Superior Court Child Advocate
W. Robert Crigler, M.D., Skill Center, Penny Lane
Kaoji Dassalign, Command Post, Department of Children's Services
Jay Davis, Principal, Widney High School
Mary Dedrick, Director, Camp Scott
Dana Denard, Ph.D., Medical Director, House of Uhuru
Eugene DeSoto, Deputy Director, Probation Department
Michael Duran, Director, Probation Department
Don Dvoritz, Principal, Central Juvenile Hall, Probation Department
Daniel Eberhart, Director, Skill Center, El Centro Human Services
Cindy Edmonds, Administrator, Department of Children's Services
Bill Finton, Staff Assistant, Detention Services Bureau, Probation Department
Gil Freetag, Executive Director, Dubnoff School
Gene Gilden, Children Services Administrator, Department of Children's Services
Herb Goron, Deputy Sheriff, LASD
Ruby Grant, Nurse Manager, Martin Luther King Hospital
Mary Jane Gress, Executive Director, Harbor View Adolescent Center
Johnnie Hampton, Contract Monitoring, Department of Children's Services
Ahnad Hamza, Oscar J's Sightseeing Tours, Inc.
Leslie Hanke, Deputy District Attorney, Truancy Mediation
James Harris, Detective, LAPD
Virginia Harris, Project Director, Independent Living Program, Department of Children's Services
Jeannette Hartman, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Education
Jane Henderson, Administrative Assistant, Senator Robert Presley
Paul Higa, Assistant Superintendent, Central Juvenile Hall, Probation Department
Paul Higa, Director, Camp Kilpatrick
Barbara Hillard, R.N., House of Uhuru
Dr. Judy Howard, UCLA, Toddlers Expert
Yvonne Hudson, Senior Employment Relation Representative, Department of Children's Services
Curtis Jackson, Deputy Sheriff, LASD
Maxine Johnston, President, Weingart Center

Harvey Kawajaki, Head Department Personnel Technician, Department of Children's Services
Gerry Keeble, Special Assistant, Executive Office, Department of Children's Services
Tom Kratochuil, Operations Director, Camp Gonzales
David Levine, Camp Rocky, Probation Department
Malcolm Linstead, Human Services Network
Grace Linstead, Ettie Lee Home for Youth
Charles Lloyd, Director, Rancho San Antonio
Sharon Logan, Chief, Countywide Services, Department of Children's Services
Armando Lopez, Executive Director, Rancho Los Amigos
Carlos Lopez, Officer, LAPD
Hervle Lowery, Deputy Director, Field Services Bureau, Probation Department
Cindy Martinez, Office of Education
Richard Martinez, Assistant Juvenile Court Administrator
Helen Maxwell, Director, MacLaren Children's Center
Wesley Mc Bride, Sergeant, LASD
Eva S. Mc Craven, Administrative Director, Hillview Mental Health Center
David Means, Long Beach Juvenile Court Lockup
Larry Miller, SARB Coordinator, Santa Monica/Malibu School District
Mark Mitlock, Director, Wilshire West School
Jim Miyano, Supervisor Edmund D. Edelman's Office
Lee Morrison, Director, Boys Republic
Debra Nielson, Administrative Director, Team House
Allen Oberstein, Executive Director, Department Legal Services Corp.
Maxine Omundson, Principal, Camp Gonzales
Shirley Phillips, Controller, APT Transportation
Terry Pierson, Assistant Superintendent, Pupil Services, Santa Monica/Malibu School District
Gary Polinsky, Commissioner, San Fernando Juvenile Justice Center
Ted Price, Director, Court Schools, Office of Education
Maria Puerdas, Project Director, MacLaren Children's Center
Fred Roe, Counselor, Camp Gonzales
Sandor Rosenfeld, Assistant Principal, Santa Monica/Malibu School District
Joi Russell, Special Assistant, Department of Children's Services
Dr. Barbara Saloman, UCLA
Sister Bridget Sanchez, Teacher, ISEA community school
Bill Savant, Assistant Principal, Santa Monica/Malibu School District
Robert Sieke, Director, Camp Louis Routh
Sherman Smith, Judge, Inglewood Juvenile Court
Carlos Sosa, M.S.W., Assistant Director, Department of Children's Services
Alice Stelle, Guardian Ad Litem, Superior Court Child Advocate
Ginger Sumner, Administrator, Harbor View Adolescent Center
Hershel Swinger, Ph.D., Children's Institute International
Ernie Takamoto, Probation Officer, Probation Department
Kathryn Tracey, Chief Deputy, Department of Children's Services
Armando Vasquez, Director, Skill Center, Penny Lane
Diane Wagner, Child Abuse Hotline
Jerry Watkins, Director, Administrative Services, MacLaren Children's Center
Kathleen West, M.P.H., Eden Center at King/Drew
Chris Wong, Probation Officer, Probation Department
Janet Wright, Supervisor, Boys Republic

Dr. Lynn Yonakura, Harbor/UCLA Medical Center
Ruth Zacarias, Attorney, San Fernando Valley Neighborhood Legal Services
Dr. Peter Zucker, Clinical Director, Harbor View Adolescent Center

Video Tapes Viewed

Gang Violence, Medina Productions 1989
Gangs: A Matter of Choice
Gang Business: Crips & Bloods
Gang Unit Management
Mean Street #9
Lords of the Street
BBC
60 Minutes, West Coast Story, 1970's, Dan Rather
 1989 Street Gang Statistics
 Street Gangs: Bloods & Crips, Arizona Department of Public Safety 10/89
 Southern California Gang Listings, 1989, California Gang Investigators Association
 Detective Support Division, Gang Activities Section 1-88
 Street Gangs, Challenge for Law Enforcement, Charles Cahill
 Gang's All Here, Channel 11, Mike Carroll
 What Mother Takes Baby Gets I, II, III, Video Guys

Documents Reviewed

Transport Service Agreement by County of Los Angeles and APT Medical Transportation Co., Inc.
Probation Transportation Memorandum, March 4, 1989
Department of Children's Services, Transportation Contract Monitoring Reports, August 4, 1989
Transportation Service Agreement by County of Los Angeles and Oscar J's Sightseeing Tours, Inc.
County of Los Angeles Transportation Service Invitation to Bid
Bureau of Family Support Operation Intake Procedures
A Multi Service Court School Program for Juvenile Offenders, A Preliminary Report, Robert Gilmart Ph.D.,
 November, 1989
Various Curricula — Los Angeles County Board of Education, Santa Monica/Malibu Unified School District,
 Los Angeles Unified School District, Redondo Union High School
Los Angeles County School Districts Annual Financial Report 1987-88, selected 1988-89 data
UCLA School of Social Welfare, Aging Out of Foster Care, October 31, 1988; Two Year Profile of Youth,
 May 1, 1989; Aging out of Foster Care: Year One, Executive Summary, December 11, 1988
Private Sector Services for Families and Children in Los Angeles County, Los Angeles Roundtable for
 Children, September, 1989
Report of El Centro Human Services Corporation regarding Independent Living Program, September 29,
 1989 including curriculum of Independent Living Program
Los Angeles County Office of Education, Los Angeles County Regional Occupational Program, 1989 Program
 Schedule
Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, Truancy Mediation Program, October, 1989
Los Angeles Times, April 9, 1990, California Commentary, Foster Children, April 10, 1990, Foster Children,
 A Charade of Justice for Adults Only, Jonathan Freeman
Los Angeles Times, February 28, 1990, Dropouts Dropback in at City Project, Sandy Banks
Responses to Truancy Questionnaires sent to school districts within Los Angeles County
Los Angeles County Department of Health Services, Drug Abuse Program, 88 Drug Related Costs in the
 County of Los Angeles, Irma H. Strantz, Ph.D., October, 1989
Children Center Annual, May 1, 1990
MacLaren Inspection by Superior Court, November 14, 1989

Correspondence regarding MacLaren Inspection
Courthouse Shelter Care
Dependency Court Filings Report, 1986, 1987 and 1988
Children with Special Needs, Drug Exposed Children, Mary Giammona, M.D., Sylvia Villarreal, M.D.,
Children's Research Institute of California, October, 1988, September, 1988
California Foster Care Network, Shelter Care Study, Health, Mental Health and Education Assessments,
Children's Research Institute of California, 1985
Draft, Los Angeles County Foster Care Network, Emergency Shelter Care Project
Testimony, House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, April 15, 1988
Emergency Shelter Care in California, The Children's Research Institute of California, 1989
Boland, At Risk Program, Truancy Mediation Report, Leslie Hanke, February 1989 through December,
1989, February 28, 1990
No Care Mothers, No Hope Babies, Los Angeles Times, May 15 and 16, 1990, Jonathan Freeman
Feds Guess \$5 Billion for Crack Babies, Wave Newspapers, May 15, 1990, United Press International

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE



GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Seated left to right: Gilbert Wyland, Dorothy Wrightson, Rachel Rooney

Standing left to right: Morris Golden, Paula Cook, Chair, Irene Ehrlich

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Purpose

The Government Operations Committee was created to look into the practices and procedures of cities and agencies of the county and to investigate complaints sent to the Grand Jury involving these entities.

Background

We included a study of the policies and procedures by which the county solicits, reviews and monitors service contracts. In 1987-88 the Grand Jury had made a number of recommendations concerning the Assessor's Office. This committee reviewed the implementation of agreed upon improvements needed and made additional recommendations. The committee also looked into the fiscal review process in various redevelopment projects and studied the procedures, applications and processes that local government agencies use in certifying disadvantaged business agencies. Citizens' complaints were investigated including a look at the Bureau of Family Support operations of the Office of the District Attorney, the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation, rent control in Santa Monica, the sale of city property in South El Monte to certain businesses and developers and a review of the response to the audit of the West Covina Community Redevelopment Agency by the 1988-89 Grand Jury.

A. REVIEW OF THE ASSESSOR'S OFFICE

PURPOSE

The Government Operations Committee of the 1989-90 Los Angeles County Grand Jury engaged Ernst & Young to review the Office of the Assessor in Los Angeles County. The purpose of the review was to:

1. Determine the implementation status of the 1987-88 Grand Jury recommendations.
2. Assess the impact of the implemented recommendations.
3. Identify other possible improvement opportunities.
4. Develop a high-level plan for the Assessor and Auditor-Controller to resolve the outstanding system interface exceptions.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

Twenty-one of the 33 prior recommendations were accepted by the Assessor. Of those accepted, ten have been fully implemented by the Assessor. Seven recommendations were accepted and have been partially implemented while two were in the process of being implemented at the time of this review. Two others were accepted but the Assessor has not taken significant action to implement them. The Assessor did not agree with 12 of the 33 prior recommendations.

The financial impact of not fully implementing the original 1987-88 Grand Jury recommendations is estimated as:

- \$9.1 million net annual interest being lost due to processing delays and exceptions; of this amount, \$.6 million of revenue improvement has already been achieved.
- \$5.8 million of uncollectable tax revenue, as of April, 1990, due to ongoing processing exceptions.

The Grand Jury recommends that:

1. *The Assessor take further action on the following seven 1987-88 Grand Jury recommendations:*

Note: Quotations from the 1987-88 Grand Jury report are copied verbatim.

A. *1987-88 Recommendation 5*

"The Grand Jury recommends that the County Board of Supervisors consider passing an ordinance to instruct title companies to assist the homeowner in completing a homeowner's exemption claim during the escrow process."

B. *1987-88 Recommendation 14*

"The Grand Jury recommends that the Assessor build a system interface between the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the City of Los Angeles Building and Safety Department." (This recommendation should have read: The Grand Jury recommends that the Assessor build systems interfaces between its systems and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the City of Los Angeles Building and Safety Department.)

C. 1987-88 Recommendation 15

"The Grand Jury recommends that an audit be conducted within the Assessor's Office to assure that all tax bills have an adequate audit trail in the Assessor's computer system."

D. 1987-88 Recommendation 19

"The Grand Jury recommends that the Personal Property Division investigate whether payroll taxes can be used as a vehicle for streamlining the discovery portion of the canvass."

E. 1987-88 Recommendation 20

"The Grand Jury recommends that the Personal Property Division field appraisers review new building permits filed to improve the ability to identify new commercial and industrial building construction and reduce escapes."

F. 1987-88 Recommendation 25

"The Grand Jury recommends that the Audit group in the Personal Property Division review expanding its personnel headcount to conduct an increased number of audits beyond those mandated by law and the limited number of other audits conducted."

G. 1987-88 Recommendation 26

"The Grand Jury recommends that the Assessor continues to maintain a central record of conflict matters which would include the following:

- *Documentation of disciplinary actions.*
- *Documentation of all judgments on the ethics matter.*
- *All disclosure forms (gifts, financial interest, and outside employment).*
- *Documentation indicating that all disclosure forms have been reviewed and who has reviewed them.*
- *Documentation verifying that each prescribed conflict of interest procedure is carried out even when no problems are discovered.*
- *Ethics Committee minutes."*

2. The Assessor's Office develop procedures to eliminate the causes of the most common public service inquiries.

The volume of correspondence and investigations in the Ownership Services Bureau of the Assessor's Office has increased approximately 90 percent in the last year. Although the Assessor's Office has reduced the backlog in the correspondence and investigation

areas, the number of incoming inquiries initiated by the public is cause for concern. Property tax law is not static. However, changes in the law do not appear to account for the increased experiences.

The public inquiry system currently under design for the Assessor, Auditor-Controller and Treasurer-Tax Collector is expected to assist these property tax agencies in more efficiently routing inquiries to the most appropriate agency. The system is not expected to reduce the number of persons who have property tax questions.

Based on the volume from July, 1989 through January, 1990, there will be over 120,000 inquiries to the Assessor's Office in fiscal 1990. These inquiries involve approximately five percent of all the parcels in the county. Although received by the Assessor, many of these inquiries may relate to Auditor-Controller or Treasurer-Tax Collector activities.

There are approximately 20 full-time equivalent staff involved in the correspondence and investigation units. The employees in the investigations area are among the most knowledgeable of the Assessor's staff. A reduction in the volume of public inquiries would enable some of these valuable staff to be reassigned to more productive activities.

3. The Assessor identify the most common causes for File Activity Reports, and then implement procedures to reduce the frequency of priority File Activity Reports resulting from those most common causes.

The number of prioritized File Activity Reports (FARs) in fiscal 1990 has increased approximately 135 percent above the number in fiscal 1988. Prioritized FARs are computer system messages indicating that an abnormal situation exists for a transaction, such as a change of ownership. One example of a FAR is an edit error when the transaction is entered to the Optimum Computer System. (The Assessor uses the Optimum Computer System for processing real property assessment.) FARs can occur when there is inaccurate data on a transaction or on a parcel in the Property Data Base maintained by the Optimum System.

4. The Assessor's Office, working with the Auditor-Controller, hire staff and develop a strategy to resolve the outstanding exceptions resulting from interfaces to the Tax Roll and Secured Tax Roll Systems.

In the past three years, the Assessor, Auditor-Controller and Treasurer-Tax Collector have implemented new computer systems that support the generation of tax bills. The Assessor's Office has a substantial backlog of transactions from the Optimum System that has not been accepted by the Auditor-Controller and Treasurer-Tax Collector systems (the Tax Roll (TR) and Secured Tax Roll (STR) Systems) to either generate supplemental bills or tax refunds. These outstanding exceptions make it difficult to trace transactions from the Optimum System to the TR and STR Systems. Because many of these exceptions affect prior tax years (1983-1988), the problem becomes more complex and difficult

to resolve, given the processing requirements of the old and new systems and the multiplicity of transactions that will be required to get them resolved. The number of staff currently assigned to work these exceptions in the Assessor's Office is not adequate to handle the backlog, and neither manual nor automated solutions have yet been identified to process many of the remaining exceptions. Approximately eight percent of all parcels in the county are affected by these billing and refund exceptions. This results in a substantial public service problem for all three departments. The impact of this recommendation is estimated as:

- \$5.8 million annual interest lost
- \$2.4 million uncollectable tax revenue as of April, 1990

The Assessor and Auditor-Controller are working cooperatively with the Grand Jury to develop a plan to resolve this situation.

5. The Assessor's Office work closely with the Treasurer-Tax Collector on redesigning the tax bills to clarify the forms and help reduce resulting taxpayer inquiries and confusion.

The Treasurer-Tax Collector is revising the tax bills from one standard tax bill format used for all types of bills to a unique bill format for each type of bill (e.g., supplemental, information only, and corrections bills). Taxpayers should get clearly marked bills with explanations on the back which are specific for each type of bill. This change will allow the Assessor's Office to more fully explain those parts of the assessment and taxation process which are unique to the Assessor's Office and to help reduce taxpayer confusion.

6. The Assessor's Office expedite the process to automate the deed and change of ownership information provided by the Recorder's Office. The Assessor and Recorder should access deed and change of ownership documents using a shared document imaging system.

The Assessor's Office processes over 400,000 changes of ownership per year. The timely processing and input of this information into the Optimum System would expedite the processing of value and ownership information needed to generate supplemental bills. This area of processing is labor intensive and time consuming, and is subject to delays when information received from the Recorder's Office is incomplete or illegible. The Assessor's Office is evaluating the possibility of using an imaging system to record the deed information to improve the processing time and to provide on-line access to documents.

7. *The Assessor's Office modify the transfer system to support monthly transfer listings.*

The transfer listings are run five times per year. Three of the five listings are run between March 1 and May 31, primarily so the transfer values can be processed for the annual roll which is prepared about June 30. The first transfer listing after May is prepared in October, four months later. Because the transfer listings are scheduled infrequently, many transfers appear on each listing. This results in a greater number of comparable sales and a greater percentage of computer appraisals. Since the transfer listings are used to identify comparable sales for computer appraisal purposes, the Assessor's Office believes that more frequent transfer listings would result in fewer automated appraisals and, therefore, necessitate a greater number of manual appraisals. This matter may need further study to mitigate any undesirable impact on the Assessor's workload.

8. *The Assessor's Office investigate using hand-held electronic input devices to reduce the amount of data entry and verification of personal property data.*

Since the previous study was concluded in November, 1988, microcomputer technology has advanced at a rapid pace. As a result, the capabilities of microcomputer based devices are being significantly enhanced, and the size/weight/cost of these devices are being reduced.

9. *The Assessor's Office upgrade or replace its personal property system to accommodate prior year data and allow for changes on an exception basis.*

There are approximately 375,000 business accounts. Approximately 175,000 of these accounts receive the "B" type property statements which do not require detailed data entry. The remaining 200,000 accounts are required to file business personal property statements which list classes of assets by year of acquisition. The current system requires this data to be reentered every year.

10. *The Assessor's Office develop an integrated lease and referral system.*

The Assessor's Office has decided to acquire the lease data base system developed at the County of Orange. Current plans call for modifications to that system and implementation of the revised system by July, 1990. An automated referral capability is one of the features of the lease data base system which may be acquired from the County of Orange.

This system should facilitate Assessor follow-up on business property statements from lessors. It should assist the Assessor's Office in more efficiently communicating referrals between the various real property and personal property valuation offices. The impact of implementing this recommendation will depend on the capabilities of the system

and how it is implemented by the locations involved. Since many of the referrals among the valuation groups are related to leased property, it appears the impact on the Assessor's operations would be more positive if the lease data base system would be integrated with an automated referral system. An integrated lease/referral system would reduce redundant data entry and the possibility of data entry errors.

One alternative to the personal computer based system available from Orange County would be to integrate the lease data base and referrals into the real and personal property systems with which Assessor staff are already familiar.

11. All existing employees be required to sign a Code of Ethics Certificate to ensure that they all receive copies of the new Code of Ethics. Also, employees should be aware of the forms, disclosure requirements, and penalties contained in the new Code of Ethics.

The Assessor's Office has recently made substantial revisions to the Code of Ethics which must be complied with by all employees. Training and educational sessions are to be provided to new employees, appraisers, and some supervisory employees on an annual basis. Because there are new provisions that affect all employees, every employee should be given a copy of the new Code of Ethics and required to sign the Code of Ethics Certificate that certifies understanding of the Code and the forms and procedures to be used for compliance.

12. The Assessor's Office provide a process to assure that the confidentiality of all employees who report alleged ethics violations be protected. Also the Assessor's Office should appoint an independent body to investigate all alleged ethics violations.

A procedure has been included in the Assessor's new Code of Ethics for reporting alleged conflicts of interest. Unless employees can be assured of confidentiality, it may be difficult for employees of the Assessor's Office to report such violations without fear of retaliation by another employee or manager.

B. COUNTY'S CONTRACTING POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND OPERATIONS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to identify how Los Angeles County contracts for goods and services, and determine how it ensures that contracted goods and services are provided within the contract requirements.

In conducting this study of the county's contracting activities, our objectives were to: (1) understand the county's contracting activities; (2) determine the effectiveness of

county contracting activities; (3) examine the consistency of policies and procedures among county agencies; and (4) recommend improvements where appropriate. The study did not address the contracts for supplies and equipment which the County Purchasing Agent administers under its "sundry services" agreements.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors and Chief Administrative Office (CAO):

- 1. *Develop an ordinance defining contracting requirements applicable to non-Proposition A contracts. The current ordinance applies only to Proposition A contracts which comprise a relatively small percentage (approximately four percent) of the total number of agreements of the county's contracts.***
- 2. *Develop comprehensive county-wide contracting policies, procedures and a manual applicable to non-Proposition A contracts. There are currently no county-wide policies, procedures, or a manual to provide guidance in contracting for non-Proposition A services.***
- 3. *Develop, for the Board of Supervisors' approval, a policy on conflicts of interest. There currently are no policies defining what constitutes a conflict of interest.***
- 4. *Develop a standard format for the submission of letters to the Board of Supervisors requesting contract approval and signature. The format of letters to the Board of Supervisors requesting contract approval and signature vary widely. A consistent format would facilitate Board understanding and approval.***
- 5. *Develop a centralized county-wide contracting information system to maintain information on:***
 - ***Qualified contractors (Bidder's List)***
 - ***Contract document formats***
 - ***Contractor performance indicators and monitoring methods***
 - ***Contractor performance histories***
 - ***Active county contracts***
 - ***Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Certification***
 - ***Other vendor information***

The county's 33 independent contracting agencies currently duplicate much of the effort required to contract for services.

6. *Develop a training function to provide training on county contracting policies, procedures and operations. There is no centralized training nor has there been any formal contracting training since 1985.*
7. *Enhance the ability of the Purchasing Department to provide centralized contracting technical assistance. Negotiated bidding to departmental contracting personnel. Many of the county's independent contracting organizations lack the expertise necessary to effectively contract for services.*
8. *Develop an optional centralized contract mediation function to intervene in the disputes between contracting departments and contractors. There currently is no designated mechanism to mediate disagreements between contracting departments and contractors.*
9. *Enhance the ability of the County Auditor-Controller to conduct periodic reviews of county contracting activities to ensure compliance with county policies. There should be an audit program for contracting operations to ensure contracts are being awarded in compliance with county policies and regulations and that active contracts are being adequately monitored.*
10. *Work with the Board of Supervisors to award contracts in excess of an annual cost of \$25,000 through a competitive process. Contracts in excess of \$25,000 that must be awarded through a non-competitive process should be submitted to the CAO for review and approval based on clear policies and criteria. It is estimated that between \$350 and \$450 million in active county contracts (about 46 percent of the total) were awarded through a non-competitive process. While it is important to note that it is not possible nor beneficial for the county to award all contracts through a competitive process, increased competitive awarding of contracts could significantly benefit the county.*
11. *Expand the list of eligible vendors in cases where insufficient proposals are received to make an award through a competitive process. If expansion of the list does not result in a competitive process, approval should be obtained from the CAO prior to award. Some contracts are being awarded when there is not adequate participation by potential vendors to make the process competitive.*
12. *Expand the use of penalty clauses within contracts as a method of enforcing contract compliance and performance without having to resort to contract termination. There is no policy on the use or enforcement of contract penalties. We found two-thirds of the contract organizations had terminated contracts if performance varied beyond contracted levels.*

- 13. Establish penalty clauses for contract non-performance that represent meaningful financial incentives for contractors to perform satisfactorily. In many cases, penalties assessed against poorly performing contractors were not sufficient to cause contractors to change their performance.**
- 14. Review the enforcement of penalty clauses for contract non-compliance or non-performance. Departments should make necessary adjustments in future contract monitoring and enforcement activities. Contract penalty clauses are often not enforced resulting in loss of an effective means of enforcing contract compliance as well as lost revenue to the county.**
- 15. Re-evaluate the use of bonding as a cost-effective means of ensuring contractor performance. Because of the cost associated with requiring bonding, and the limited need to resort to enforcing a claim against a bonding company, bonding may not be the most cost-effective means of achieving the county's intent.**

C. REDEVELOPMENT FISCAL REVIEW PROCESS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

PURPOSE

Each city and county in California has the ability to create a community redevelopment agency (CRA) for the purpose of alleviating blight within its jurisdiction. An agency is allowed to keep any property taxes which exceed the amount collected in the year prior to the adoption of the redevelopment plan. This increased tax is called the "tax increment," and it would otherwise be shared with the other affected taxing agencies such as the county, special districts, and the schools were it not for the redevelopment agency.

County governments are increasingly concerned about the loss of property tax increments to CRAs. Historically, counties have had little to say about the creation and financing of CRAs. There is considerable debate over whether or not the increased taxes would have materialized had it not been for redevelopment activity, but the magnitude of CRA finances is clearly big and growing bigger.

In Los Angeles County, there are 221 redevelopment projects in 62 cities. In 1988-89, the collective CRAs utilized \$316.1 million of property tax increments which would otherwise be allocated to the county (representing approximately 8.7 percent of the property taxes collected by the county in that fiscal year). This has increased threefold from \$106.9 collected by the CRAs in 1977-78. The county's share of the CRA tax increment was \$178.5 million in 1988-89, compared to \$42.0 million in 1977-78. This growth rate is greater than the overall growth of tax increments.

The Los Angeles County Grand Jury has been concerned about the financial impact which redevelopment projects have on the county budget. The jury is aware of certain projects which capture significant property tax increments at the same time the county is facing budget cuts. The jury also noted that the amount of property taxes allocated to CRAs has been growing rapidly in Los Angeles County. The jury is interested in whether the current fiscal review process is an effective way to balance the interests of the CRAs and the county.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Board of Supervisors lobby the State Legislature to devise a method to encourage Fiscal Review Committee (FRC) agreements without the threat of litigation. Alternatives such as arbitration or mediation could avoid "forced solutions" which may occur because cities and counties anticipate that no solution will lead to a lawsuit.***
- 2. The Board of Supervisors attempt to convince the legislature to shift the burden of proof in the fiscal review proceedings from the county to the CRA where CRAs already capture a specified percentage of the available property tax. The current process has the CRA develop findings and a position, and places counties in the position of challenging or threatening to litigate the matter. Where CRAs already capture more than five to ten percent of the property tax, the proposing agency should be required to justify the need for tax increment financing. This change would help counties achieve equitable agreements with CRAs.***
- 3. The Board of Supervisors lobby the legislature to require that the statutory contents of CRA plans and amendments be improved. County staff describe CRA plans as generally uninformative and vague. This information gap leads the county to spend additional research time to understand the project and develop a negotiating position.***
- 4. The Board of Supervisors lobby the legislature to mandate full pass-through of tax increments to a fire district, unless the district agrees to share the increment. Fire districts are particularly dependent on tax revenue from participating jurisdictions. Our review of recent CRA agreements showed that this dependency was recognized and the county fire district received the full pass through. A state mandate would ensure continuation of this protection for fire districts.***
- 5. The Board of Supervisors establish a policy that the county will charge interest on deferred tax increments. The rate should be tied to the county treasurer's investment rate or the rate charged to the CRA for loans from its city. The***

interest change would compensate the county for its deferring some or all of its tax increment during the project's duration.

- 6. *The Chief Administrative Office focus the fiscal review process on addressing the specific financial burden placed on the taxing agencies by a project. We found that the FRC process sometimes involved agreements on matters far beyond the boundaries of CRA fiscal impact.***
- 7. *The Chief Administrative Office negotiate to require CRAs to use increased sales taxes produced within the project area to retire CRA debt prior to using property tax increments. This would reduce the incentive for CRAs to rely totally on property tax increments which could be used by other governmental entities.***

D. A REVIEW OF LOCAL AGENCIES' DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this study was to review and document the procedures, applications and processes local government agencies use in certifying disadvantaged business enterprises (DBEs) and secondarily to assess how effective these programs have been in fostering economic growth in DBEs. In addition, the study was to solicit opinions regarding the DBE program and certification process from currently certified DBEs.

Government has become aware of the need to assist minorities and women who are trying to build their businesses. These businesses are perceived as disadvantaged to the extent that, historically, they may have been discriminated against in obtaining financing or new business.

In order to assist these businesses, government at various levels has developed DBE programs. The objective of these programs is to offer disadvantaged businesses the opportunity to obtain contracts financed with public funds.

Under each DBE program, a certification process evolved to verify the authenticity of DBEs and to prevent majority-owned firms from fraudulently obtaining work. The certification procedures defined by each agency are outlined by law or administrative regulation. We found no currently reviewed DBEs which did not meet certification guidelines as long as the documented procedures were followed, and supporting documentation was scrutinized.

The study focused on three of the largest DBE certifying organizations within Los Angeles County. They were:

- Southern California Rapid Transit District (SCRTD)
- City of Los Angeles — Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA)
- City of Los Angeles — Department of Airports (DOA)

It should be noted that interviews with DBEs consistently produced complaints about the awarding of contracts. These findings and related recommendations are included in this report. Further investigation into this area of the DBE program should be considered by future grand juries. Currently, the Inspector General of the SCRTD Authority is conducting an extensive internal audit looking at the economic impact of the program on DBEs and SCRTD.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that the DBE certifying agencies reviewed within Los Angeles County:

- 1. Utilize a single agency to award DBE certifications. We recommend using SCRTD on a contract basis. Currently, certification effort is duplicated throughout the county. Each agency reviewed had its own staff, forms and procedures.***
- 2. Standardize the organization of individual certification files. It is difficult to find a specific piece of information within a file.***
- 3. Include a File Contents Summary Sheet in the file to easily determine what is in the file. It is difficult to tell whether all information has been received to enable the agencies to determine certification.***
- 4. Encourage prime contractors to use a variety of approved and qualified DBEs as subcontractors. Many DBEs complained that prime contractors use the same DBEs, as contracts are not well distributed.***
- 5. Establish a central clearinghouse for DBE contracts, so that DBEs can more easily know of available opportunities. Many DBEs criticized the contract notification process.***

The Grand Jury recommends that the Southern California Rapid Transit District:

- 1. Continue its thorough and professional certification process.***
- 2. Assist other agencies in strengthening their DBE certification processes.***

The Grand Jury recommends that the City of Los Angeles, Department of Airports:

- 1. Maintain certification files in accordance with the DOA's documentation requirements. Many of the DOA's certification files were incomplete.**
- 2. Modify the appeal process to place final appeal authority in the Executive Director's Office. This certifying office currently has this authority and, therefore, there is no third party reconsideration of applicants.**
- 3. Contact other agencies before granting automatic certification for CALTRANS DBEs. Other agencies sometimes deny CALTRANS certified applicants as unqualified for DBE certification. Automatic certification may result in the DOA awarding contracts to DBEs that do not meet the city's criteria.**
- 4. Update the DOA's certified DBE list quarterly. This is currently performed annually, providing fewer opportunities to recently certified DBEs.**
- 5. Conduct site visits of new applicants and confirm the information they submitted. The DOA was the only entity reviewed that did not routinely perform site visits as part of the certification process.**

The Grand Jury recommends that the City of Los Angeles — Community Redevelopment Agency:

- 1. Set a gross revenue ceiling or other objective criteria to establish whether or not an applicant is disadvantaged. This is currently a subjective interpretation.**

HEALTH SERVICES COMMITTEE



HEALTH SERVICES COMMITTEE

Seated left to right: Al Podell, Max Van Doren, Chair, William Hirsch

Standing left to right: Alexander Haynes, Sandra Edwards, Homer Hopps

HEALTH SERVICES COMMITTEE

Purpose

The committee chose as its focus to seek areas for study which might enhance the delivery of health care services without major expenditures.

Visitations were made to five county hospitals, University of California at Los Angeles Medical Center, Charles R. Drew Postgraduate Medical School, six comprehensive health centers, six health clinics, three substance abuse treatment centers and one mental health treatment center for adolescents.

Ernst & Young, the contract auditor, was asked to study the following topics:

- Volunteerism in County Hospitals
- Capacity Constraints for Residential Drug Treatment Programs in Los Angeles County

Additionally, in response to a citizen complaint, the committee reviewed the adequacy of security measures in place at county outpatient mental health facilities for the safety of staff and clients.

A. VOLUNTEERISM IN COUNTY HOSPITALS

PURPOSE

The Los Angeles County Department of Health Services (DHS) operates six hospitals with an average of over 3,000 inpatients per day. The locations of these hospitals range from the Antelope Valley to inner-city East and Central Los Angeles. Faced with limited resources and growing demand for health services for the poor, these hospitals compete with private sector hospitals throughout the county for personnel. With the health care industry as a whole facing shortages of skilled personnel, many studies have identified the potential for non-skilled personnel to relieve nurses of portions of their workloads. The use of volunteers in public hospital settings provides a direct economic value to the hospitals and an indirect impact of making the hospital a more involved, vital part of the community.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the potential for expanded volunteer involvement to assist the county in meeting its workload demands despite limited resources, to relieve stress on existing personnel, and to indirectly link the hospitals to their communities in a more useful, positive fashion.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that the Department of Health Services and the individual hospitals:

1. ***Develop system-wide objectives and priorities for the use of volunteers and their role in the DHS system. Specifically, the programs should develop and implement:***

- ***Focused defined programs with identifiable contributions and outcomes;***
- ***Priority for high pressure, social service areas (emergency, trauma, labor and delivery, nurses and AIDS units);***
- ***Programs and recruitment efforts tailored to the priorities of alternative volunteer populations.***

From our review of the existing volunteer programs in place in the DHS system, we found that individual volunteer programs vary widely.

2. ***Increase the level of organization and support to the existing volunteer programs by creating a more structured and professional environment. Specifically, the programs should develop and implement:***

- ***Structured schedules***
- ***Job descriptions***
- ***Structured orientations***
- ***Resource manuals***
- ***Appropriate training***
- ***Performance evaluations***
- ***Internal organization.***

Currently there is limited structure in the majority of the volunteer programs in place and in several, the programs were passive and unstructured.

3. ***Make volunteer programs more project-specific in order to clearly define the need, volunteer role, contribution and outcome. This is designed to enhance recruitment, clarify internal and external understanding of roles and increase appreciation of volunteer contributions. Our findings showed the DHS system, as a whole, uses volunteer resources in many general roles rather than in focused programs.***
4. ***Use volunteers in high-pressure areas of the hospital that have a heavy demand for social support services, including: emergency/trauma; labor and delivery; and AIDS units, and consider expanding the role of the volunteer patient***

advocacy. We believe volunteers can address some of the support needs of the patients, enabling medical and social service professionals to focus their resources on those needs requiring selected intervention.

5. *Identify alternative, non-traditional populations that could provide increased volunteer services, develop targeted recruitment efforts, and define programs which respond to those groups' priorities. Populations to consider for targeted programs should include:*

- *Male volunteers*
- *Working professionals*
- *Retirees, older volunteers*
- *Patients*
- *Youth volunteers*
- *Mothers with small infants*
- *Handicapped*

Traditionally, volunteers in all settings have been predominantly middle-class, non-working women. Participants in focus groups of DHS hospitals closely followed this traditional profile. This segment of the population has declined and therefore the challenge is to find alternative populations to increase the volunteer pool.

6. *Devise a recruitment and retention strategy with specific goals and criteria for evaluation, consistent with implementation of other recommendations. Data on volunteer recruitment, retention, and turnover should be incorporated in each volunteer program. From our review of the DHS volunteer programs, there is no formal recruiting policy.*
7. *Develop and implement strategies to reduce barriers to volunteering. During our focus group discussions with the volunteers at the DHS facilities, many existing barriers to volunteering were identified, such as lack of awareness of need; lack of challenging or interesting positions; and lack of transportation. The county should work to reduce barriers to volunteer support.*

B. CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS FOR RESIDENTIAL DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

PURPOSE

The Los Angeles County Department of Health Services (DHS) has responsibility for the public health of an estimated population of 8,403,500 within the county. As a division of DHS, the Drug Abuse Program Office (DAPO) is responsible for

the administration of a comprehensive system of drug abuse prevention and treatment services using federal, state and county funding. The services include primary prevention, early intervention, outpatient detoxification, residential detoxification, outpatient "drug-free," and residential "drug free." DAPO negotiates contracts with and allocates funds to community-based agencies for the provision of drug abuse services. DAPO is responsible for monitoring programs and ensuring that agencies meet performance standards.

Representatives of DAPO and numerous directors of contract agencies have acknowledged that current treatment capacity is insufficient to meet the needs of drug abusers in Los Angeles County. As of January, 1990, approximately 1,400 individuals were on waiting lists for all types of drug treatment. Specifically, 531 were on waiting lists for residential and 400 for outpatient treatment. Although these figures decreased from the same period in 1989, they still understate suppressed demand since patients drop out of the system because of long waits. Increased capacity will be particularly important as greater numbers of drug users seek treatment due to stepped up user sanctions.

DAPO currently oversees 26 contracts with 17 agencies for the provision of residential drug treatment. These programs are important in preparing recovering drug abusers for re-entry into society. However, significant barriers (e.g., community resistance) have greatly limited the ability to start new programs, and make it almost impossible to gain "economies of scale" in developing capacity. While it is apparent that an increase in the number of treatment beds is necessary, this cannot be accomplished without reducing barriers to entry for potential new programs.

The purpose of this study was to examine the resource needs for developing new residential programs, to identify ways of reducing barriers to entry, and to explore the incidental benefits that additional residential programs would have on outpatient services.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors and the appropriate Department Heads:

- 1. Increase technical assistance to providers seeking to develop new or expand existing residential treatment programs with regard to fiscal, operational, regulatory and political issues which are likely to influence their success. Locating appropriate sites and the zoning processes require significant manpower and expertise. The process is extremely time consuming and costly. Specifically, the following items would increase providers' understanding of and ability to complete the process in a more timely, cost effective, and efficient manner:***

- *Development of a comprehensive guide (e.g., instruction manual) which outlines the necessary steps with helpful suggestions for starting a new program, or expanding an existing one.*
- *Assistance with and/or referral to agencies who specialize in land use and real estate matters (e.g., assistance regarding leases and lease options).*
- *Provide "clearing house" assistance to help providers effectively utilize available funding assistance through county agencies, including:*

*Los Angeles County Redevelopment Agency
Community Development Department (City of Los Angeles)
Other potential financial assistance organizations*

2. *Develop creative site acquisition strategies, including the options of acquiring sites or utilizing existing county sites and leasing them back to contract agencies. The county may also serve as a facilitator in integrating multiple compatible uses for an available site which is too large for a single program to use, or in providing space within operating county facilities. This could expedite the site selection process and ease the financial burden of entry costs.*
3. *Lobby cities to adopt zoning codes which facilitate access for providers, and ease code restrictions in unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The current process, with its bureaucratic layers, makes it almost impossible to gain "economies of scale" in developing capacity. Easing zoning restrictions is consistent with current federal policy.*
4. *Attempt to expedite the flow of federal funds to the providers. Because California is relatively politically decentralized, local agencies receive funds up to six months later than agencies in other states.*

Accomplishing this would alleviate some of the current system inefficiencies.

5. *Expedite county contracting to allow full use of funds. Some contract start dates are delayed, at times by several months. Agencies, in turn, do not have enough time to use all of the contract dollars. Unspent monies revert to the state at the end of the fiscal year. It is unclear whether current lags between contract agreement and date of initiation are a result of DAPO's inefficiencies, agencies' inability to meet contract terms promptly or a combination of the two.*

The DHS should, at a minimum, define the contract review process by steps using a PERT chart, and set target timing for processing each step. A hypothetical simplified example of such a model might include:

- STEP 1:** *Send contractor renewal contract document.
TIMING: Six weeks before contract expiration for renewals.*
- STEP 2:** *Review contractor submittal for completeness and accuracy, and
notify contractor of status.
TIMING: Within three days of receipt.*
- STEP 3:** *Complete internal department and County Counsel review of
completed contract and notify contractor of status.
TIMING: Within ten working days of package completion.*
- STEP 4:** *Resolve issues identified in internal review.
TIMING: Within ten working days of completion of internal review.*
- STEP 5:** *Submit to Board of Supervisors for approval.
TIMING: Within one week of issue resolution or internal review
completion, whichever applies.*

Each contract should have a docket sheet which is used to track its progress through the process, and the elapsed time associated with each step. Performance against the target timeline should be monitored retrospectively to evaluate the overall performance of the contracting process, and to identify any key steps which consistently delay the process. The performance of individual contract administrators should also be monitored using contract completion cycle data.

6. *Develop public educational materials and efforts regarding the benefits of drug treatment programs in order to offset the effects of the negative public perceptions.*

C. EVALUATION OF DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS

PURPOSE

The Health Services Committee chose, as one of its projects, to focus on drug treatment facilities within the county to determine:

- the effectiveness of drug treatment programs sponsored by Los Angeles County
- utilization of county funds to achieve success
- accessibility to drug treatment for those in need

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Department of Health Services require each drug treatment facility and outside contractor providing drug treatment to keep and maintain records of repeated treatment of clients in outpatient and inpatient facilities. This will enable the County to determine the success rate of drug treatment programs funded by the County.***

There are no records available through drug treatment facilities which would enable the County to formulate its success rate in drug treatment. Agencies engaged in drug treatment are unable to indicate how many times a client has participated in any drug treatment program. Nor are the agencies able to indicate how long patients are spending in the drug treatment facilities or if the program has been completed. In addition, the courts do not appear to have the ability to ascertain how many times a client has been referred to a program.

- 2. The Department of Health Services establish additional detoxification centers from existing sources of funds, through contractors, for the purpose of providing drug detoxification facilities.***

There are only two public drug detoxification facilities within Los Angeles County. County sponsored programs provide less than 50 beds for drug detoxification treatment. A successful drug treatment program requires additional drug detoxification beds. The County should utilize existing funding to provide more beds for the purpose of detoxification programs within the County.

- 3. The Department of Health Services increase the amount of services available for drug treatment. Drug treatment and preventative services should be provided the same emphasis as are programs and treatment facilities for other diseases.***

Waiting times for drug treatment vary in different parts of the County. Waiting times to enter drug treatment programs can run from two weeks to six months. The shortage of programs and treatment facilities has led to a priority system which causes many persons in need of treatment for substance abuse to be unable to obtain treatment. There are insufficient numbers of beds available for treatment of drug abuse, and there is an insufficient amount of existing funds available to create an adequate drug treatment program. Drug addiction treatment facilities must be made available to clients upon demand.

- 4. The Department of Health Services assist contract providers with locating and establishing drug treatment facilities, making available county-owned facilities whenever possible.***

Locating and securing drug treatment facilities is a major obstacle in drug treatment. Community resentment to drug treatment facilities in local neighborhoods often makes it necessary for clients seeking treatment to travel many miles away from their neighborhoods to obtain treatment. The lack of facilities is largely responsible for long waiting lists for those who seek to enter drug treatment programs. Persons who are interested in obtaining assistance will not seek help when and where long waiting lists exist. Existing county facilities which are not being fully utilized should be made available to contract providers of drug treatment.

5. The Board of Supervisors establish a drug treatment policy which includes prevention, treatment and law enforcement.

Drug treatment is not popular with the public. The public needs to be educated on drug treatment. The consequences of drug abuse should be taught at all levels in the classroom. There is no political pressure to provide treatment for drug abuse. The goal for treatment should be availability on demand. Priority should be established to reach pregnant women and those who have tested positive for AIDS. Treatment for drug abuse must be made accessible to the general public. There should be an alternative to treating drug abusers as criminals. The courts should be involved beyond the current referral program. The courts should work with the Department of Health Services to establish what kind of court sponsored program would be appropriate for drug abusers. Court ordered drug diversion has to go further than requiring that abusers attend meetings. The courts should order periodic drug testing as a follow-up.

D. EVALUATION OF SECURITY MEASURES IN PLACE AT COUNTY OUTPATIENT MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES

PURPOSE

The investigation was prompted by the fatal stabbing of a clinical social worker by a client at a county outpatient mental health clinic. The committee sought to evaluate the adequacy of existing security measures to ensure the safety of staff and clients.

Contact was made with three persons from the Department of Mental Health, two Cal-OSHA investigators and two representatives of unions representing mental health employees.

The committee prepared a questionnaire which was sent to 33 facilities for completion and return by mail. Nineteen were returned. Nine were completed by committee members during visits to the facilities. The questionnaire is set forth in the appendix. The number of affirmative and negative responses received as to each question is indicated. Not all questions were applicable to each facility.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Site visits to clinics, and review of questionnaires filled out by the clinics revealed varying degrees of safety and security. Factors which have limited the ability of the Department of Mental Health to increase the safety and security measures include the limited amount of funds which have been allocated to the Department of Mental Health, as well as time constraints necessary to implement desired measures at the various facilities.

Many experienced clinicians believe that openness in a clinical setting makes clients comfortable and encourages them to more fully disclose personal information needed by clinicians and increases the likelihood that treatment will be successful. On the other hand, recruitment and retention of staff is apt to become more difficult if employment in clinics is perceived as being dangerous--particularly when coupled with lower pay than is available in the private sector.

This aspect of the delivery of mental health services to clients merits increasing attention as more potentially assaultive clients are being served. Some of the reasons for this are:

- Major cuts in funding have resulted in treatment being limited to acute and chronically ill adults and severely emotionally disturbed children.
- Persons who would be institutionalized were it not for legislation enacted in the 1960's are impacting outpatient facilities, which facilities have not been funded as contemplated when the legislation was enacted. For example, California had 35,000 mental health hospital beds in 1966 with a population of 16,000,000 and 5,000 hospital beds in 1990 with a population of 29,000,000.
- Population growth in the county.
- Lengthy waits by clients to be interviewed in some facilities, causing them to become agitated.
- Many acutely ill persons are homeless. Possible complications arising from this are an increased vulnerability to substance abuse and failure to take prescribed medications due to lack of supervision. Also, some homeless persons seek assistance but do not meet criteria for services. When refused services, some of them become violent or threatening to staff.

The Grand Jury recommends that the Department of Mental Health consider implementing the following recommendations at its existing clinics, except for contract clinics and at those facilities whose programs are scheduled for contracting out in July, 1990. The Grand Jury further recommends that a greater emphasis be placed

on safety at mental health clinics. Implementation of safety and security measures approved by the Department of Mental Health and other county departments should receive a high degree of priority.

The Grand Jury recommends that:

1. ***Lighting should be made adequate at all parking facilities at mental health clinics. In the absence of a security guard, an escort system should be provided for the staff.***
2. ***Locked doors should separate the reception areas where clients wait, and staff areas where clinicians and other staff are working with clients. In addition, client waiting areas should be visible by the receptionist through use of unbreakable glass, so as to enable the receptionist to observe waiting clients and speak with them while being protected.***
3. ***Receptionists should receive training to enable them to detect suspicious behavior of clients, and alert clinicians by utilizing a "code" system.***
4. ***Security mirrors should be placed at turns in hallways of clinics which have client access.***
5. ***An interview room should be designated in each facility for potentially violent or unknown clients, with its interior visible to other staff members.***
6. ***Furniture should be arranged with a focus on employee safety with the desk being situated so that the clinician's back is not toward the door.***
7. ***Doors should be kept open during interviews with unknown or potentially assaultive clients. Opinions differ as to this practice with respect to known clients not deemed to be potentially assaultive. All views should be considered at the departmental level and a uniform policy established for all clinics.***
8. ***Decorative cushions should be placed in all interview rooms to double as protective devices.***
9. ***No objects which could be used as weapons should be readily accessible to clients.***
10. ***Rooms should be numbered as an integral part of an alarm system.***
11. ***At least one county safety officer should be stationed at each facility. Guards should be county employees rather than guards supplied by private contractors because:***

- a. *Selection of trainees is competitive, training is rigorous and thorough and limited specific training is now being given in coping with mentally ill persons.*
 - b. *The county can control tenure at facilities. Officers have an opportunity to become familiar with staff and clients. Turnover of private guards tends to be high, particularly of armed guards. Demand for armed guards is high in the private sector so the county tends to be assigned guards at the entry level.*
 - c. *Being career employees, they tend to be more willing to step between staff members and assaultive clients during altercations.*
 - d. *They are inclined to take more pride in their work. Their career paths are affected by their performance.*
 - e. *Since opinions differ as to whether security guard and receptionists should be trained to calm clients behaving aggressively due to personnel turnover and this function being outside their job descriptions, it would seem that the decision should be left to the discretion of each clinic director. At the least, clues should be provided as to behavior warranting the alerting of clinicians. Security guards should know how to accept clues from clinicians in assisting them to cope with aggressive behavior.*
12. *With respect to those clinics which do not have alarm systems in place in areas of potential contact with clients, including hallways, consultants should be retained to evaluate and recommend effective emergency systems on a least-cost basis. Alternatives to expensive systems requiring installation of wiring in existing facilities might be paging systems, phone signals or wireless systems. Retractable whistles are utilized at one facility.*
13. *Clinics should be given uniform guidelines to use in alerting staff to clients who have been identified as potentially assaultive.*
14. *Each clinic should maintain an incident reporting log to document unusual information or client behavior to be reviewed daily by all clinicians.*
15. *Case management conferences to discuss problem cases should be held on a regular basis with the frequency set at the departmental level.*
16. *Clients should be escorted to and from interview rooms by clinicians.*

17. *Interviews of unknown or potentially assaultive clients should be conducted by two clinicians. An alternative would be for one person to stand outside the door.*
18. *Uniform guidelines should be given to each clinic about an accident prevention program. Staff should be instructed in general "safe-work" practices with specific instructions to each employee with respect to hazards unique to the employee's job assignment.*
19. *Each clinic should have at least one first aid kit with the contents and frequency of inspection set at the departmental level.*
20. *Each clinic should have a safety committee with the frequency of meetings set at the departmental level.*
21. *Clinic directors should be given discretion to request television sets in client waiting rooms based on their assessment of its calming influence on the clients being served. Another factor would be the average length of time each client waits to be interviewed.*
22. *As to programs to be contracted out, an opinion should be obtained from the County Counsel about possible liability of the county for harm to a referred client by another referred client at a contract facility. If there is potential liability, the security measures needed should be identified and requirements concerning them incorporated into the proposals for bids.*
23. *The following described measures should be incorporated into plans for new facilities or those scheduled for major renovation:*
 - *metal gratings on windows as appropriate*
 - *metal detectors as appropriate*
 - *locked waiting room for children of clients in facilities treating adult clients*
 - *public address systems*
 - *television monitor system*
 - *separate bathrooms for staff and clients*
 - *panic alarm buttons*
24. *As to other existing facilities scheduled to remain in operation indefinitely, a timetable for incorporation of the above described measures into each facility should be established and that timetable communicated to staff.*

E. COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CENTERS

The Committee made a number of site visits to comprehensive health centers throughout the county. At each location, deficiencies were noted and problems were identified which were particular to each facility. For example, dental treatment programs were not available at some health centers, while in other centers X-Ray equipment was unable to be utilized due to a lack of trained technicians to operate the equipment. Lack of sufficient space and equipment at certain facilities prevents those needing services from being accommodated.

Notwithstanding deficiencies noted, overall the comprehensive health centers operate adequately. Given the budgetary constraints which have impacted the delivery of health care services, the lack of state-of-the-art equipment, and an apparent shortage of professionals at various levels, the committee's observations of professionals and staff at the facilities indicate that they are well-trained, dedicated and efficient.

The Committee did not make an indepth study of the comprehensive health centers in Los Angeles County. Time and budgetary constraints did not enable the committee to do the type of study which would have elicited the factual data necessary to support recommendations which might be made to improve the delivery of health care to the community at large. The committee believes that an indepth study would be appropriate and of assistance to the Department of Health Services and the community, and encourages the 1990-91 Los Angeles County Grand Jury to consider initiating a study of the comprehensive health centers in Los Angeles County.

F. HOSPITALS

As with the comprehensive health centers, the committee was not able to engage in an indepth study of the conditions and needs of the county hospitals. During site visits made to the hospitals, observations were made which would appear to indicate that some patients should be treated in a convalescent setting rather than in a hospital setting; and that there is a need for more acute care beds at some of the hospitals to treat the chronically ill and those who are multi-handicapped. The committee was made aware that there appears to be a disparity in salaries paid to those employed at county facilities as opposed to those in the private sector. However, in order to formulate meaningful recommendations, a comprehensive study and analysis needs to be undertaken, either by the County, the Grand Jury, or other affected organizations, to examine not only this issue, but the larger issues involving delivery of health care services to the community on a long range basis in the future and the ability of the county to meet the demands of a growing metropolitan area.

APPENDIX

Evaluation of Drug Treatment Programs

Department of Health Services
Ernst & Young Consultants
City of Compton — Special Services Center, Drug/Alcohol Treatment Program
Pacifica House, Contractor
Behavioral Health Services, Contractor
Tarzana Treatment Center Drug Program Contractor

Evaluation of Security Measures in Place at County Outpatient Mental Health Facilities

Persons Interviewed

Roberto Quiroz, M.S.W., Director, Department of Mental Health
Francis Dowling, Chief Deputy Director, Department of Mental Health
Harold M. Johnson, Chief, Administrative Support Bureau, Department of Mental Health
Joyce Simonowitz, R.N., Cal/OSHA
N.C. Pappas, Industrial Hygienist, Cal/OSHA
Two representatives of unions representing mental health employees

Site Visits

Antelope Valley Mental Health Services
W.L. Wade, R.N., M.S., Chief, North County District
Arcadia Mental Health Center
Ralph Mitchell, District Chief
Compton Mental Health Center
Patricia L. Frazier, M.S.W., L.C.S.W., Program Director
Crisis Evaluation Unit, Metropolitan State Hospital
Phyllis M. Key, District Chief
Steven L. Fishman
El Camino Mental Health Center
Laura Span Bonitto, M.A., Acting District Chief
Northridge Continuing Care
Susan Thomas, L.C.S.W., Director Social Services
Rio Hondo Community Mental Health Center
Janet R. McLeod, Senior Secretary III
Roybal Family Mental Health Center
Herlinda Quintero Jackson, M.P.A., R.N., Mental Health Clinical Program Head
San Pedro Mental Health Services
N. Paul Schettler, M.S.W., Clinical Program Head

Documents Reviewed

Citations issued resulting from Cal/OSHA investigation at Santa Monica West Mental Health Service (P4852-030-89-7) which concluded August 8, 1989
Memorandum to staff at Oxnard Mental Health Clinic about safety measures, April 20, 1989
Article 165, Title 8, General Industry Safety Orders, State of California, titled "Employee Alarm Systems"
Article titled "Managing the Violent Patient in a Community Mental Health Center" by Stuart E. Edelman, M.D., published in Hospital and Community Psychiatry, July 7, 1978
Coalition of Mental Health Unions Health and Safety Questionnaire.

SECURITY MEASURES AT
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OUTPATIENT MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES
QUESTIONNAIRE

FACILITY NAME: _____

	YES	NO
PARKING LOT		
1. Proper lighting	<u>20</u>	<u>4</u>
2. Buddy system	<u>7</u>	<u>17</u>
3. Security person	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>
BUILDING EXTERIOR		
1. Locks on doors	<u>24</u>	<u>1</u>
2. Metal gratings on windows	<u>6</u>	<u>17</u>
RECEPTION AREA		
1. Metal detectors	<u>1</u>	<u>24</u>
2. Locked doors between reception & staff areas	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>
3. Client waiting area separated from receptionist by walls of unbreakable glass	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>
4. TV set for clients	<u>4</u>	<u>19</u>
5. Locked waiting room for children of clients	<u>3</u>	<u>18</u>
a. monitoring of children	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u>
6. Receptionist	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>
a. trained to talk down	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>
b. screen clients & alert clinicians by "code" of suspicious behavior	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>
HALLWAYS		
1. Security mirrors	<u>6</u>	<u>17</u>
2. Panic buttons	<u>7</u>	<u>19</u>
INTERVIEW ROOMS		
1. A designated room for potentially violent or unknown clients with interior visible to other staff members	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>
2. Furniture arranged for maximum employee safety	<u>14</u>	<u>8</u>
3. Are doors kept open	<u>16</u>	<u>5</u>
4. Decorative cushions to double as protective devices	<u>5</u>	<u>17</u>
5. Nothing in rooms which could be used as weapons	<u>6</u>	<u>14</u>
6. Rooms numbered	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>
SECURITY GUARDS		
1. Is one always present	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>
2. County employee	<u>5</u>	<u>19</u>
3. Trained to talk down	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>
4. Armed	<u>8</u>	<u>14</u>

COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS

1. Emergency alarm system in areas of potential contact with clients	<u>8</u>	<u>15</u>
a. type _____		
b. where does alarm sound _____		
c. response training	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>
2. Public address system	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>
3. TV monitor system	<u>0</u>	<u>24</u>

CLINICIAN-CLIENT CONTACT

1. Means of identifying clients known to be assault risks	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>
a. describe _____		
2. Incident reporting log to document unusual information or client behavior	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>
3. Case management conferences to discuss problem cases	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>
a. frequency		
4. Client escorted by clinician to & from interview rooms	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>
5. Interviews of unknown or potentially assaultive clients by two clinicians	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>

TRAINING

1. Type necessary to prevent or reduce potential for injury from assaultive clients	<u>24</u>	<u>0</u>
a. frequency		
2. Accident prevention program to instruct in general safe work practices and specific instructions to each employee with respect to hazards unique to each employee with respect to hazards unique to the employee's job assignment	<u>9</u>	<u>14</u>
a. frequency		

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Separate bathrooms for staff and clients	<u>16</u>	<u>8</u>
2. First aid kit	<u>23</u>	<u>2</u>
a. frequency of inspection		
3. Labeled smoking/non-smoking areas	<u>21</u>	<u>3</u>
4. Safety committee	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>
a. frequency of meetings		

STAFFING

1. Number: male _____ female _____
2. Number full time: male _____ female _____
Number part time: male _____ female _____
3. Number of staff in clinic on daily basis _____
4. Number of clients in clinic on daily basis _____

JAILS COMMITTEE



JAILS COMMITTEE

Seated left to right: Al Podell, Lewis Diamond, Chair, Karen Weiss

Standing left to right: Paula Cook, Sallee Crookston, Leo George, Albert Penalber, Rodger Thisdell, Anne Finn

JAILS COMMITTEE

Purpose

The Grand Jury is mandated by Penal Code Section 919(b) to inquire into the condition and management of the jails within the county. The Grand Jury delegated this responsibility to the Jails Committee.

Method of Investigation

The Jails Committee was divided into teams to expedite inspections of all adult detention facilities. To standardize the inspection procedure, the committee revised the 1986-87 Jails Committee form to be used while inspecting each facility. This form focuses on the health and safety of staff and inmates. Included are sanitation, security, food service, emergency preparedness, provision for interview, visitation of prisoners, and recordkeeping. Additional data was obtained through interviews with staff personnel at each facility.

Areas of Concern

- A. Los Angeles Police Department
- B. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
- C. Court Security
- D. Jail Inspections

A. LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

The Grand Jury commends the Los Angeles Police Department for implementing its Drug Abatement Unit. We encourage the Los Angeles Police Department to continue in their active pursuit of means to rid our neighborhoods of drug sellers.

B. LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

COMMENDATIONS

The Grand Jury commends the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department on the implementation of the new direct supervision dormitories and recommends the

expansion of this program. The direct supervision dormitories at Peter J. Pitchess Honor Ranch were observed to be quiet, clean and helpful in promoting prisoner self-esteem.

The Grand Jury commends the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department on its conversion to the Percent Release Program. The Grand Jury was concerned about the many prisoners that were being released who had served no time due to the overcrowding in the county jails. This new percent release program will ensure that all inmates serve some time and keeps the jail population under the mandated cap.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

Cashless Society

- 1. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors provide the necessary resources to permit the Sheriff's Department to continue research to develop this identification system.***

During one of the first inspections of the Men's Central Jail, deputies of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department spoke to the Jails Committee briefly on the topic of a cashless society within the jail system. As a follow-up on this subject, members of the committee met with Sheriff's Department personnel and discussed revisions under consideration in the computerized recordkeeping system.

In conjunction with other law enforcement agencies, the Sheriff's Department has a systems planning team researching the statistical program. The basic idea is to establish a procedure for handling money in the jail system.

A machine readable bar code would be inscribed on the inmate's wristband for cash control. The bar could be used to control and document all prisoner identification, movement, cell location, or court appearances. Any other required identification would be tied in with the Automated Jail Information System (AJIS) and available at all AJIS terminals and booking locations.

The county jail system is presently planning a cashless society pilot program for the Mira Loma jail facility at Lancaster. This planning will require considerable time, but it is a concept that could offer a high level of cost effectiveness. The most significant benefit would be the curtailment of the sale of drugs and contraband within the prison system.

Work Furlough Program — Scapular House

- 2. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department expand the work furlough pilot program at Scapular House.***

There are many innovative developments taking place to alleviate jail overcrowding nationwide. Among these are work release, work furlough, early release and a new plan wherein the prisoner serves a percentage of his sentence.

Scapular House is a program that allows sentenced prisoners to be housed in a low security facility under the supervision of probation personnel. The prisoners are allowed to continue working at their present jobs and support themselves while serving their sentence. The new pilot program appears to be very successful in its early stages.

Short Term Sentences

- 3. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department refer all five-day or less sentenced prisoners to pay-your-own-way programs at participating municipal jails.***

The committee found available space in municipal jails during the week. Many of these facilities expressed the willingness to house paying prisoners during non-peak days. This would allow sentences to be served at no expense to the county with better utilization of jail facilities.

County Jail Shoe Replacement

- 4. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department accept no shoes for prisoners from the public.***
- 5. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department provide scanning devices at all county jail facilities to restrict the introduction of unwanted or dangerous items to the premises.***

During inspections of the Men's Central Jail, the Grand Jury was informed that drugs and other contraband, including material with which to fabricate weapons, is often secreted in shoes delivered to prisoners by the visiting public. There are countless ways these articles can be secreted in shoes. Therefore, to prevent this situation, no replacement shoes should be accepted from any outside source.

Regimented Inmate Diversion Boot Camp for Adult Offenders

- 6. The Board of Supervisors provide funding to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department for the implementation of the Regimented Inmate Diversion Boot Camp for Adult Offenders planned at the Peter J. Pitchess Honor Ranch. The Grand Jury also recommends that funding include replacement costs for several bungalows.***

The committee visited the Peter J. Pitchess Honor Ranch, which is the proposed site of the boot camp and reviewed the proposal for the program. The committee found this proposal to directly address the needs of the prisoners while moving them through

their sentences more rapidly. This would allow more prisoners to be housed during the calendar year.

C. COURT SECURITY

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

- 1. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department screen court assigned cases to eliminate custody cases from modular courtrooms.***
- 2. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department review prisoner movement security procedures at all courthouses to protect deputies, the public and prisoners.***

In many courthouses, movement of prisoners was observed to be hazardous and unsafe. Some areas are totally unsecured and often contain items which could be used as weapons.

Antelope Valley Court Lockup

- 3. The Board of Supervisors allocate funds to provide adequate prisoner holding space to meet current fast growing future requirements at this facility.***
- 4. The Board of Supervisors immediately investigate the needs at this court lockup as previously addressed in correspondence to Mr. Richard B. Dixon on March 7, 1990 by the Jails Committee.***

The main lockup is inadequate to hold the total daily prisoner population 60-75 percent of the time. State and federal guidelines governing these conditions are not maintained and the addition of a proposed fifth municipal court will unquestionably require more prisoner holding space. At the present time there are no approved isolation holding cells for prisoners who must be kept separated from the general prisoner population for their own safety and the safety of others.

A proposed revision with detailed drawings and documentation has been supplied to the Los Angeles County Internal Services Department by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

A follow-up visit by the committee revealed severe overcrowding in both holding cells, with prisoners sitting and lying on the floor. There was inadequate space to confine K-9, K-10 and other types of dangerous inmates. Female and juvenile prisoners were housed in unsatisfactory conditions off the marshal's office.

A conference was held with the Honorable William H. Seelicke wherein he supplied the committee with figures showing caseload increases for the past decade. In the period 1979-80, a total of approximately 35,000 cases were acted on; in 1984-85, 48,000, an increase of 38.5 percent; in 1989-90, the caseload grew to 74,000, an increase of 53.7 percent. This total growth is well over 100 percent in the past decade. To quote Judge Seelicke (and with his assurance of confirmation), "This is a time bomb waiting to explode!"

The original budget requests made by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department would make good use of the sally port's currently wasted space because it cannot accommodate the large new buses of the Sheriff's Department.

Calabasas Court

- 5. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department close the Calabasas lockup. This facility should never be used for custody cases.***

This facility is a modular unit that does not meet security standards. There is no safe way to unload prisoners and reach the lockup.

CNA Building

- 6. The Los Angeles Superior Court re-evaluate the security plan of the CNA Building and work with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department to meet security requirements.***

The committee observed holding cells that were not designed for prisoner security. As a result, the facility is unsafe for law enforcement personnel and inadequate for cases involving persons in custody.

Santa Monica Municipal Court Lockup and Santa Monica Police Department

- 7. The Los Angeles County Marshal work with the Santa Monica Police Department for a more secure delivery of prisoners to the courthouse prior to the installation of a planned security fence.***
- 8. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department admit no more prisoners than can be accommodated safely in the entry area of the marshal's lockup.***
- 9. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department provide the installation of an alarm door.***

10. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department:

- a. Supervise the unloading of prisoners within the proposed security fence.**
- b. Provide transportation of prisoners to the court lockup.**
- c. Provide an armed deputy to transfer prisoners to the court lockup.**

There is a plan for the installation of a new security fence. Prisoners are delivered to the marshal's lockup in an unsafe manner. Prisoners are often escorted in numbers too large, which results in overcrowded conditions in the marshal's lockup. It was also observed that one door was not monitored.

D. JAIL INSPECTIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

The Grand Jury recommends that:

Culver City Police Department — Prisoner Monitoring

- 1. The Culver City Police Department assign a 24-hour jailer or install an audio/video system to monitor prisoners.**

The jailer has additional duties to deliver prisoners to court or pick up prisoners from other agencies. When no jailer is on duty, prisoners are monitored by personnel outside the jail area. It is not possible to monitor disturbances within the jail in this manner. Unfortunately, there was a suicide at this facility a few days after the committee's visit.

Long Beach Police Department

- 2. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department continue to research the feasibility of housing county prisoners in Long Beach.**
- 3. The Long Beach Police Department remove the juvenile booking area from the main jail so the cells can be used to house adult prisoners.**

Long Beach has a large number of cells that are not being used to house prisoners. This facility has its own kitchen and a roof area that could meet the exercise needs of prisoners. These cells could be reopened to house prisoners that currently are bused in daily from other areas for court appearance. This would provide up to 200 beds to relieve crowding at other county jails.

Los Angeles County/USC Medical Center Jail Ward

4. *The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department install a sally port in the entry area of the jail ward.*

5. *The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department provide installation of more "collect calls only" telephones for prisoner use.*

There is only a single door into the jail ward which opens off a public elevator.

There is only one pay telephone available for a facility with a capacity for up to 56 bed patients.

The following list represents facilities that were inspected and no problems found:

Municipal Police Departments

Airport	Irwindale
Alhambra	La Verne
Arcadia	Montebello
Baldwin Park	Monterey Park
*Beverly Hills	Palos Verdes Estates
Burbank	*Pasadena
Claremont	Pomona
West Covina	Redondo Beach
Downey	San Fernando
El Monte	San Gabriel
El Segundo	San Marino
Glendale	Sierra Madre
Glendora	Signal Hill
Hawthorne	South Pasadena
Huntington Park	Torrance
Inglewood	Vernon
	Whittier

*New station under construction

Municipal Court Lockups

Alhambra
Avalon Justice Court
Beverly Hills
Burbank
Citrus
Compton
East Los Angeles
Glendale
Los Cerritos
Pasadena
Pomona
Rio Hondo
Whittier

Superior Court Lockups

East-Pomona
North Central-Burbank
Glendale
Northeast-Pasadena
North Valley-San Fernando
South Central-Compton

Los Angeles Sheriff's Department

Antelope Valley
Avalon
Bell-Cudahy
Biscailuz
Carson
Inmate Reception Center
East Los Angeles
Firestone
Gorman
Industry
La Cresenta Valley
Lakewood
Lennox
Los Angeles Traffic
Lost Hills
Lynwood
Mira Loma (male/female)
Pico Rivera
Pitchess Honor Ranch-East
San Dimas
Santa Clarita
Scapular House (Work Furlough)

Sybil Brand Institute
Temple
Walnut
West Hollywood

Los Angeles Police Department

Central
Devonshire
Foothill
Hollenbeck
Hollywood
North Hollywood
Parker Center
Wilshire

The following facilities responded satisfactorily to letters that were sent listing problems:

Municipal Police Departments

Azusa
Bell Gardena
Burbank
Compton
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Maywood
South Gate

Municipal Court Lockups

Long Beach
Newhall
San Pedro
West Los Angeles

Los Angeles Sheriff's Department

Criminal Courts Building
Hall of Justice
Lomita
Malibu
Marina del Rey
Pitchess Honor Ranch-
North/South

Superior Court Lockups

Southeast-Norwalk

Los Angeles Police Department

Harbor
Pacific - LAX substation
77th
Southeast
Southwest
West Los Angeles
West Valley

The following facilities were inspected and sent correction letters, but problems still exist:

Municipal Police Departments

Covina
Culver City
Long Beach
Santa Monica

Superior Court Lockups

Southeast-Norwalk
Southwest-Torrance
West-Santa Monica

Los Angeles Sheriff's Department

Calabasas
County USC Jail Ward

The following facilities were inspected and sent correction letters, but have not responded:

Central Arraignment Court-Los Angeles Sheriff's Department
Mental Health Court-Los Angeles Sheriff's Department
Santa Anita Municipal Court-Los Angeles Sheriff's Department

AD HOC COMMITTEE

LL
LL as



AD HOC COMMITTEE — JAILHOUSE INFORMANT INVESTIGATION

Seated left to right: Homer Hopps, Max Van Doren
Standing left to right: Karen Weiss, Ann Cooper, Gilbert Wyland, Chair

AD HOC COMMITTEE

On December 13, 1988, the 1988-89 Los Angeles County Grand Jury received a complaint from the California Attorneys for Criminal Justice and the Los Angeles Criminal Courts Bar Association that an investigation be initiated in connection with the use of jail house informants within the Los Angeles County criminal justice system. The Los Angeles County District Attorney and the California Attorney General each declined to participate in the investigation, due to conflicts of interest.

The California Penal Code provides for the appointment of a special counsel to the grand jury when neither the district attorney nor the attorney general is able to undertake the investigation. Such request was made and the presiding judge of the superior court granted the petition. Thereafter, the attorney general appointed retired California Supreme Court Justice Otto Kaus to become special counsel to the grand jury to undertake the investigation.

Due to the lateness in the term of the 1988-89 Grand Jury, and the anticipated length of time within which to complete the assignment, the matter was turned over to the 1989-90 Los Angeles County Grand Jury, whose term began July 5, 1989. Research was commenced and brief hearings were held. When the agreement which had been entered into between special counsel and the grand jury expired, the grand jury determined not to renew the agreement but to seek the appointment of new special counsel to continue with and conclude the investigation.

In December, 1989, the attorney general appointed Douglas Dalton as special counsel. Hearings commenced soon thereafter and have continued through the month of May, 1990. The grand jury will have heard between 300 to 400 hours of testimony and reviewed hundreds of documents. A final report of its investigation, setting forth its factual findings and recommendations will be issued by the grand jury prior to the conclusion of its term and filed under separate cover.