



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CLAIMS BOARD
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Arlene Barrera
Auditor-Controller
Steve Robles
Chief Executive Office
Roger H. Granbo
Office of the County Counsel

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING

The County of Los Angeles Claims Board will hold a regular meeting on
Monday, June 18, 2018 at 9:30 a.m., in the Executive Conference Room, 648
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order.
2. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Claims Board on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Claims Board.
3. Closed Session – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9).

- a. Ariana Amore v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. CV 17-5207

This lawsuit alleges that a probationer was sexually assaulted and her civil rights violated by a Probation Department employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$1,000,000.

See Supporting Documents

- b. Devora Samet v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 636 898

This dangerous condition lawsuit against the Department of Public Works arises from injuries sustained while Plaintiff was riding her bicycle on the Marvin Braude Bike Path near Venice; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$75,000.

See Supporting Document

- c. Devin Dozier v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 626 447

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a motorcycle accident involving an on-duty Sheriff's Deputy; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$75,000.

See Supporting Document

- d. Carson Scott v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 645 794

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in an automobile accident involving an on-duty Sheriff's Deputy; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$26,000.

See Supporting Document

- e. Gracie Flores v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 642 363

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in an automobile accident involving an on-duty Sheriff's Deputy; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$46,250.

See Supporting Document

- f. The Estate of Johnny Martinez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 579 140

This lawsuit concerns allegations of State-law civil rights violations, battery, and negligence after Plaintiff's son was fatally shot by Sheriff's Deputies; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$2,500,000.

See Supporting Documents

- g. Omar Lopez v. v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 626 704

This lawsuit alleges the Sheriff's Department breached the terms of a Civil Service settlement agreement; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$50,000.

- h. Angel Marcucci v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Civil Service Commission Case No. 15-203

This is a Civil Service appeal filed by an employee from the Department of Public Social Services challenging his termination; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$36,174.73.

- i. Malika Shakoor v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 589 698

This lawsuit concerns allegations by an employee of the Department of Public Social Services for disability discrimination, retaliation, failure to make a reasonable accommodation, and engage in the interactive process; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$60,000.

- 4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.
- 5. Approval of the minutes of the May 21, 2018, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

See Supporting Document

- 6. Items not on the posted agenda, to be referred to staff or placed on the agenda for action at a further meeting of the Board, or matters requiring immediate action because of emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Board subsequent to the posting of the agenda.
- 7. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Ariana Amore v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	CV 17-5207
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	July 14, 2017
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Probation Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 1,000,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Erin Darling, Esq. Law Offices of Erin Darling Justin Sterling, Esq. Law Offices of Justin Sterling
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Jonathan McCaverty Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit, filed by Ariana Amore, a former probationer, against the County of Los Angeles, alleges federal civil rights violations and State-law torts based on a Deputy Probation Officer sexual assaults against her while she was incarcerated at a probation camp. The Deputy Probation Officer is no longer employed by the County. Given the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs; therefore, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 66,350
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 5,313

Case Name: Amore, Ariana vs. County of Los Angeles, et. al.



Summary Corrective Action Plan

The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary for attachment to the settlement documents developed for the Board of Supervisors and/or the County of Los Angeles Claims Board. The summary should be a specific overview of the claims/lawsuits identified root causes and corrective actions (status, time frame, and responsible party). This summary does not replace the Corrective Action Plan form. If there is a question related to confidentiality, please consult County Counsel.

Date of Incident/event:	November 2014- July 2015
Briefly provide a description of the Incident/event:	Plaintiff sued for violation of civil rights arising from her claim of sexual assault and related incidents occurring during the period from November 2014 to July 2015, while plaintiff was detained at Camp Kenyon Scudder in Santa Clarita, CA. The lawsuit claims that a Deputy Probation Officer I (DPO I), defendant, who was the probation officer assigned to the plaintiff at the time, sexually assaulted the plaintiff while she was in camp.

1. Briefly describe the root cause(s) of the claim/lawsuit:

Root Cause A:

Inadequate and objective Supervision and Communication to address warning signs and risk factors in interactions between probation officers and youth.

Root Cause B:

Inadequate measures exist to complete a preliminary review of complex and sensitive cases to review the need for any immediate action necessary concurrent with referring the matter for further investigation. The current process does not have a structure for making an assessment/preliminary finding for sensitive, high visibility incidents.

Root Cause C:

Improve existing training and compliance practices to accurately track and ensure case management compliance. There is a gap in existing policy to establish standards for effective supervision of probation officers.

--

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:
(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

A: Standardize and enhance case planning, case management, and MDT review processes to identify service needs and flag any deficiencies in services or treatment. The case plan and the MDT meeting are to be reviewed by supervisors and documented in the Probation Case Management System (PCMS). While in camp, the probation officer is required to monitor the youth's compliance with the case plan. The probation officer shall also adjust the case plan as necessary, documenting any changes in a revised case plan and in PCMS.

The department recognizes the need to explore additional assessments of service needs for girls and related case planning tools. The Department partnered with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) to assess the needs and risk level of approximately 50 girls who were at Camp Scott and the Dorothy Kirby Center at the time of the assessment utilizing NCCD's Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System™ (JAIS). This study will aid the Probation Department in better understanding the risks, needs and appropriate supervision strategies for female youth that are ordered to be placed in Probation facilities which will inform the department's exploration of case planning and assessment options for girls in the future.

1. Enhance communication amongst partner agencies.

Revise existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with partner agencies to clearly describe expectations to communicate concerns about the treatment of youth. Delineate a review process to ensure that concerns rise to an appropriate level and are handled effectively.

2. Establish effective reporting and feedback mechanisms or communication strategies for youth and families to express concerns in a confidential manner.

Expand all the avenues available for concerns to be highlighted by youth and families, including an enhanced grievance reporting and tracking system, revised orientation packet, creation of a parent handbook, establishing youth and parent councils, and revision of the phone call confidentiality protocol.

B: Develop a Critical Response Team (CRT) to do preliminary findings and make early determinations on the status of high profile investigations. Delineate the process for investigations that defines the roles of the onsite manager, Internal Affairs, Critical Incident Response (CIR) Team and law enforcement

C: The Department is working towards ensuring that all facilities are Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Compliant with training, staffing ratios, night supervisors, privacy glass, cross-gender accommodations for supervision and upgraded cameras. Our managers received a PREA orientation training in April 2018 and we plan to complete line staff training by December 2018. Currently, the Department is in Phase 1 of the camera upgrades including installation at Central Juvenile Hall and Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall, which is projected to begin in 2018. Phase 2 is projected to begin in 2019 and includes Camp Rockey and the Dorothy Kirby Center. Phase 3 includes Camps Afflerbaugh, Paige and Scott/Scudder. In addition, the Department plans to train all contractors, Community Based Organizations and volunteers on PREA mandates.

County of Los Angeles
Summary Corrective Action Plan

--


3. Are the corrective actions addressing department-wide system issues?

☐ Yes – The corrective actions address department-wide system issues.

☒ No – The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Vicky Santana	
Signature: 	Date: 5/2/18

Name: (Department Head) TERRI McDONALD	
Signature:  (on behalf of T. McDonald)	Date: 5.3.18

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY	
Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?	
☐ Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability.	
☒ No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.	
Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) Destiny Castro	
Signature: 	Date: 5/4/2018

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Devora Samet v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC 636898
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	October 12, 2016
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 75,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Neil S. Steiner, Esq. Steiner & Libo, Professional Corporation
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Adrian G. Gragas, Esq. Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit arises from a solo bicycle accident that occurred on August 24, 2015, in which Plaintiff was injured when she fell from her bicycle due to a pot hole adjacent to the Marvin Braude Bike Path near Navy Street and Ozone Avenue in the City of Venice, California. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warrented.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 82,064
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 6,521

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Devin Dozier v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC 623447
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	June 10, 2016
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 75,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Patrick Phillips, Esq., Phillips & Associates
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Adrian G. Gragas, Esq. Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit arises from a vehicle versus motorcycle collision that occurred on January 22, 2016. Plaintiff Devin Dozier alleges that a County vehicle made an unsafe lane change and sideswiped his motorcycle on northbound La Brea Avenue near Manchester Boulevard in the City of Inglewood, California. Mr. Dozier claims injuries and damages as a result of the collision. Due to the uncertainty and risks of litigation, a full and final settlement of \$75,000 is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 27,165
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 6,801

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Carson Scott v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC 645794
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	01/05/2017
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 26,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Matthew J. Whibley, Esq. The Vartazarian Law Firm
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Adrian G. Gragas Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on June 13, 2016, in which the Plaintiff, an Uber driver, was injured when a Sheriff's vehicle rear-ended Plaintiff's 2014 Toyota Prius on the northbound 110 Freeway, just south of Olympic Boulevard, in the City of Los Angeles, California.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 10,727
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 160

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Gracie Flores v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC642363
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	December 1, 2016
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 46,250
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Michael Karns Karns & Karns, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Michael J. Gordon Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	On April 28, 2016, a Deputy Sheriff was involved in a vehicle collision with Plaintiff Gracie Flores, when he was driving eastbound on Artesia Boulevard near the City of Compton. Plaintiff claims she sustained injuries to her head, neck, shoulders, back, and right hip. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$46,250 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 41,091
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 3,226

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Estate of Johnny Martinez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC 579140
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	October 5, 2014
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 2,500,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Panish Shea & Boyle, LLP Maas & Marinovich, PLC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Millicent Rolon Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$2.5 million, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a State-law civil rights and wrongful death lawsuit filed by the minor child and parents of Johnny Martinez alleging that Sheriff's Deputies used excessive force against Mr. Martinez and caused his death. The Deputies deny the allegations and contend their actions were reasonable. Given the high risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. Therefore, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$2.5 million is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 169,625
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 14,409

Case Name: H.M., a minor, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.



Summary Corrective Action Plan

The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary for attachment to the settlement documents developed for the Board of Supervisors and/or the County of Los Angeles Claims Board. The summary should be a specific overview of the claims/lawsuits' identified root causes and corrective actions (status, time frame, and responsible party). This summary does not replace the Corrective Action Plan form. If there is a question related to confidentiality, please consult County Counsel.

Date of incident/event:	October 4, 2014
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<u>H.M., a minor, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u> Summary Corrective Action Plan 2018-004 On October 4, 2014, at approximately 6:45 p.m., four uniformed Los Angeles County deputy sheriffs, assigned to Century Station, responded to an assault with a deadly weapon call at the location. Upon arrival, the deputy sheriffs contacted the victim who had been stabbed in the head by the decedent (his neighbor). The victim claimed the decedent had stabbed him with a knife in an unprovoked attack. The decedent had last been seen near the back of the duplex at the location. The decedent's father contacted the deputy sheriffs and advised them the decedent no longer had a knife. The deputy sheriffs formulated a plan of contact with the decedent including "hands-on," Taser/less-lethal, lethal, and radio designated assignments. The deputy sheriffs instructed the victim to wait for the responding emergency medical services personnel at the curb in front of the location, which he did. With their plan in place, the four deputy sheriffs walked towards the rear of the location and encountered the decedent as he sat on the steps of a residence at the duplex. The decedent's mother was standing next to him and was cooperative when she was asked to stand aside. The deputy sheriffs approached the decedent and gave him orders to place his hands behind his back. The decedent refused the deputy sheriffs' orders by yelling, "No, no, no!" The first deputy sheriff grabbed the decedent's left arm in order to handcuff and detain him pending an assault with a deadly weapon investigation. The decedent protested to the contact by yelling at the deputy sheriffs, as he continued to sit on the steps. The decedent used his right hand to grab a seven-inch knife he had concealed under his right leg. The decedent then held the knife out in front of him. Identifying the knife threat, the first deputy sheriff released his hold of the decedent and moved away. Simultaneously, from a seated position on the steps, the decedent slashed his knife at the first deputy sheriff, narrowly missing his face. The decedent's mother attempted to intervene, but complied when she was ordered to move away. The second deputy sheriff activated his Taser, striking the decedent in the upper torso with both darts. Although the Taser appeared to deploy

	properly, it did not appear to have any effect on the decedent. The decedent stood up and pulled the Taser darts out, while still holding the knife in his hand. The deputy sheriffs gave the decedent several orders to drop the knife, but he refused. The first deputy sheriff sprayed the decedent in the face with a four-second burst of oleoresin capsicum spray¹, which also appeared to have no effect. Based on the decedent's aggressive demeanor and actions, the deputy sheriffs feared they were about to be attacked with a deadly weapon. All four deputy sheriffs pulled out their duty weapons and pointed them at the decedent. The third deputy sheriff gave the decedent several more orders to drop the knife, but he continued to refuse. The deputy sheriffs maintained a distance of about eight feet away from the decedent in a semi-circle type position. Without warning, the decedent held out his knife and charged directly at the second and fourth deputy sheriffs. Fearing for their safety and the safety of each other, all four deputy sheriffs fired at the decedent. A total of 36 rounds were fired and the decedent was struck 36 times. The first deputy sheriff fired eight rounds, the second deputy sheriff fired seven rounds, the third deputy sheriff fired six rounds, and the fourth deputy sheriff fired fifteen rounds. Emergency medical services were summoned to the location to provide the decedent with medical care. The decedent succumbed to his injuries and was pronounced dead at the scene. While the Los Angeles County Fire Department was at the scene treating the victim for his injuries caused by the decedent, they observed the victim had an apparent gunshot wound to his upper left leg. The victim was transported to the hospital where he was treated for his injuries. During the crime scene investigation, it was determined one of the bullets, fired by one of the deputy sheriffs, struck a metal guide rail for a sliding vehicle gate on the ground near the victim. A fragment of the bullet ricocheted off of the guide rail, was re-directed upward, and struck the victim in the leg.
--	---

¹ Commonly known as OC spray or pepper spray.

1. Briefly describe the root cause(s) of the claim/lawsuit:

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the lack of investigation regarding the decedent's alleged mental illness prior to making contact with him.

Another **Department** root cause in this incident was the unintentional injury to the victim caused by a bullet fragment that ricocheted off a metal guide rail near the victim, as four members of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department employed deadly force against the decedent, who had actively attacked them with a knife.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the decedent's failure to comply with the lawful orders of Los Angeles County deputy sheriffs. Instead of obeying orders, the decedent armed himself with a weapon and charged at the deputy sheriffs. The decedent's actions caused the deputy sheriffs to fear for their lives, resulting in a deputy involved shooting.

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:

(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

Criminal Investigation

The incident was investigated by the Sheriff's Department's Homicide Bureau to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred. On July 18, 2016, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office concluded the deputy sheriffs acted lawfully in self-defense and the defense of others when they used deadly force against the decedent. They closed the file and will take no further action in this matter.

Administrative Investigation

This incident was investigated by representatives of the Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs Bureau to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after this incident. The results of the investigation were presented to the Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) for adjudication. On February 9, 2017, the EFRC determined the tactics and use of deadly force were within Department policy. No further action was taken.

Mental Illness - Station Desk Training

It was discovered when the victim advised the station desk personnel the decedent was "acting crazy," the desk personnel could have better clarified what that meant. If the decedent's mental illness had been identified earlier in this incident, the involved deputy sheriffs could have made informed decisions based on that information.

Since this incident, Century Station training staff have conducted several in-service training sessions with Century Station desk and field personnel during shift briefings to discuss the specific issues identified in this case. Desk personnel were trained on how to identify key words and behaviors that could assist responding personnel regarding possible mental illness issues. Desk and field personnel were trained on interacting with mentally ill persons and taking necessary steps to safeguard victims and/or witnesses during tactical responses or operations.

Mental Illness Training

The "Investment in Mental Health" Task Force has collaborated with the DMH to improve patrol response to mental illness related contacts and incidents. As a result, the Department has implemented several programs to educate personnel. Several layers of training have been implemented with further expansion expected in the future.

A mandated Peace Officer Standards and Training Mental Illness update training video has been produced and distributed. As of this report, the Department has had 3,582 sworn patrol personnel (94.4%) complete the training. Century Station has trained 174 of their 224 sworn personnel and is currently 77.68% compliant with the training. Century Station expects that by the end of May 2018, 100% of their current personnel will be trained on this training video.

A non-mandated eight-hour "Law Enforcement and Effective Interaction with Mentally Ill" training course is available. As of this report, 856 Department personnel have attended this training for a total of 22.57% of patrol personnel. Century Station has sent 24 of their personnel to this training course.

The Mental Health Evaluation Team (MET) has developed a non-mandated eight-hour "Mental Health Update & Interactions with the Developmentally Disabled" training course. The course combines classroom lecture, training videos, and a responsive role playing critical incident MILO simulator (currently fixed at Industry Sheriff Station). MET is in the process of constructing a portable MILO simulator trailer which could be moved anywhere. The goal is to provide in-service mental health training to all sheriff station personnel.

The autism portion of the training course teaches the identification and challenges of interacting with people that have Aspergers or Autism. This portion of the course ends with interaction between the class and families with autistic children. This course helps employees recognize subject behavior and emphasizes de-escalation techniques. As of this report, 342 Department personnel have attended this course.

A non-mandated 32-hour mental illness "Crisis Intervention Training" (CIT) course was started in December of 2016. As of this report, 189 sworn deputy sheriffs (in addition to DMH clinicians) have completed this course, 20 of which are personnel from Century Station.

A 40-hour "Mental Health Crisis Intervention for Patrol" training class was launched in 2016. At the time of this report, 50 Department personnel have attended the 40-hour training class.

Several additional mental illness training classes are scheduled to be completed through 2018.

MET Deployment at the Time of this Incident

During October 2014, the Department had five countywide Mental Health Evaluation Teams (MET) scheduled to cover seven days a week:

- 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. - Two teams
- 3:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. - Three teams

On the night of the incident, two MET teams were deployed. A MET team was not requested to respond to the location before, during, or after the incident.

Current and Future MET Deployment

The current MET team deployment has increased to 23 teams deployed between 6:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m., seven days a week (with three additional teams currently training for deployment).

The MET team triage desk is now staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The triage desk can assist patrol stations with after-hours mental health issues. If an immediate response is needed, the triage desk can call a team to come in early.

The current growth model is to deploy 45 MET teams, with adequate supervision and support staff with Department of Mental Health (DMH) to match. This deployment will provide 24/7 coverage.


Utilizing a Risk Assessment Management Program (RAMP) MET monitors their recurrent and high need service users. This process allows MET to better identify and address critical cases which need immediate attention. RAMP cases are monitored closely by a panel of mental health experts. Each case is reviewed and a plan of action is created based on the service users threat to the public, danger to self or others, health (both mental and physical), and other risks imposed by the patients continued environmental conditions.

County of Los Angeles
Summary Corrective Action Plan

3. Are the corrective actions addressing Department-wide system issues?

- ☐ Yes – The corrective actions address Department-wide system issues.
☒ No – The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department



Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Scott E. Johnson, Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature: 	Date: 5-10-18

Name: (Department Head) Alicia E. Ault, Chief Professional Standards and Training Division	
Signature: 	Date: 5/14/18

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY

Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?

- ☐ Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability.
☒ No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this Department.

Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) 	
Signature: 	Date: 5/14/2018

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

May 21, 2018

1. Call to Order.

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:31 a.m. The meeting was held in the Executive Conference Room, 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

Claims Board Members present at the meeting were: Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo.

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Richard Kudo, Millicent Rolon, Timothy Kral, Catherine Mathers, and Rick Brouwer; Public Works: Michael Hays; Sheriff's Department: Larry Waldie, Holly Perez, Scott Gale, Kevin Percy, Dominic Dannan, Kerry Carter, Mark Allen, and Ken McWaid; Department of Health Services: Edgar Soto; Los Angeles County Library: Crystal Dovalina and Susan Fowler; and Outside Counsel: Harold Becks and Doug Day.

2. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Claims Board on items of interest within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Claims Board.

No members of the public addressed the Claims Board.

3. Closed Session – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Subdivision (a) of Government Code section 54956.9)

At 9:33 a.m., the Chairperson adjourned the meeting into Closed Session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(g) below.

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

At 10:34 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

a. The Estate of Donald Markley v. County of Los Angeles, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. MC 022 275

This Department of Public Works dangerous condition and wrongful death lawsuit arises from an automobile accident at an intersection near Palmdale.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$130,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

**b. Jose Campos Sepulveda v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 644 497**

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Sheriff's Deputy and a pedestrian in a wheelchair.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$25,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

**c. Patricia Retana v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 603 830**

This lawsuit alleges sexual battery by a Sheriff's Deputy during a traffic stop.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$30,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

**d. Brian O'Neal Pickett v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. TC 028 173**

This wrongful death lawsuit concerns allegations of excessive force by Sheriff's Deputies during an attempted apprehension.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$1,750,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

**e. Human Rights Defense Center v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. CV 17-04883**

This lawsuit alleges violations of federal and State-law civil rights by the County and Sheriff's Department personnel.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$253,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

f. **Adel Said v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 581 290

This lawsuit alleges that an employee from the Health Services Department was subjected to harassment, discrimination, and retaliation based on national origin.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$42,500.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

g. **Service Employees International Union, Local 721 v. County of Los Angeles**
Library Department
UFC 024-14

This lawsuit alleges an unfair labor charge for wrongful termination of an employee from the Los Angeles County Library.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$80,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

5. **Approval of the minutes of the May 7, 2018, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo


6. **Items not on the posted agenda, to be referred to staff or placed on the agenda for action at a further meeting of the Board, or matters requiring immediate action because of emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Board subsequent to the posting of the agenda.**

No such matters were discussed.

7. **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By 
Sandra C. Ruiz