



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

September 7, 2010

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

ADOPTED

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

9 September 7, 2010

Sachi A. Hamai
SACHI A. HAMAI
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Dear Supervisors:

**RESPONSES TO THE 2009-2010 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT
(ALL DISTRICTS -- 3 VOTES)**

SUBJECT

This letter recommends that your Board: approve the responses to the findings and recommendations of the 2009-2010 Civil Grand Jury Final Report; instruct the Executive Officer of the Board of Supervisors to transmit copies of this report to the Grand Jury upon approval by your Board; and instruct the Executive Officer of the Board of Supervisors to file a copy of this report with the Superior Court upon approval by your Board.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Approve the responses to the 2009-2010 findings and recommendations of the Grand Jury that pertain to County government matters under the control of your Board.
2. Instruct the Executive Officer of the Board of Supervisors to transmit copies of this report to the Grand Jury upon approval by your Board.
3. Instruct the Executive Officer of the Board of Supervisors to file a copy of this report with the Superior Court upon approval by your Board.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Section 933 (b) of the California Penal Code establishes that the County boards of supervisors shall comment on Grand Jury findings and recommendations which pertain to County government matters under control of those boards.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

In June 2010, the 2009-2010 County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury released its Final Report containing findings and recommendations directed to various County and non-County agencies. County department heads have reported back on the Grand Jury recommendations; these responses are attached as the County's official response to the 2009-2010 Civil Grand Jury Final Report.

The recommendations directed to all future Grand Juries have been forwarded to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury for consideration. Recommendations that make reference to non-County agencies have been referred directly by the Grand Jury to the Los Angeles Unified School District, and cities of Los Angeles, Glendale, Long Beach, Pasadena, and Santa Monica.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

These recommendations impact and are consistent with all five of the Countywide Strategic Plan Goals:

- **Goal No. 1 - Operational Effectiveness:**
 - Maximize the effectiveness of the County's processes, structure, and operations to support timely delivery of customer-oriented and efficient public services.

- **Goal No. 2 – Children, Family and Adult Well-Being:**
 - Enrich lives through integrated, cost-effective and client-centered supportive services

- **Goal No. 3 – Community and Municipal Services:**
 - Enrich the lives of Los Angeles County's residents and visitors by providing access to cultural, recreational and lifelong learning facilities programs; ensure quality regional open space, recreational and public works infrastructure services for County residents; and deliver customer-oriented municipal services to the County's diverse unincorporated communities.

- **Goal No. 4 – Health and Mental Health Services:**
 - Improve health and mental health outcomes and efficient use of scarce resources, by promoting proven service models and prevention principles that are population-based, client-centered and family-focused.

- Goal No. 5 – Public Safety:
 - Ensure that the committed efforts of the public safety partners continue to maintain and improve the safety and security of the people of Los Angeles County.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINDINGS

Certain Grand Jury recommendations require additional financing resources. As an example, the Grand Jury recommends that your Board take steps to assure that there will be adequate continuing funding to maintain the systems integrity of the E-SCAR process. As another example, the Grand Jury recommends that this Office allocate the funds required to maintain the level of budgetary support needed for the Coroner’s optimum operations. In some cases, financing has been approved by your Board in the current fiscal year’s budget. Departments will assess the need for additional funding to implement other recommendations and submit requests for Board consideration during the 2011-12 budget cycle, as appropriate.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with California Penal Code Section 933 (b), the following departments have submitted responses to the 2009-10 County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury Final Report:

ATTACHMENT	DEPARTMENT
A	Chief Executive Office
B	Auditor-Controller
C	Children and Family Services
D	Coroner
E	District Attorney
F	Health Services
G	Mental Health
H	Parks and Recreation
I	Probation
J	Public Defender
K	Public Works
L	Sheriff

Please note that responses for recommendations involving multiple departments are reflected in one or more of the impacted departments’ responses.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Not applicable.

Respectfully submitted,



WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

WTF:BC:MKZ
FC:KLG:ib

Attachments

- c: Sheriff
- District Attorney
- Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
- Auditor-Controller
- County Counsel
- Director of Children and Family Services
- Director of Coroner
- Interim Director of Health Services
- Director of Mental Health
- Director of Parks and Recreation
- Chief Probation Officer
- Public Defender
- Director of Public Works

Attachment A

Chief Executive Office



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors

GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

August 19, 2010

To: Supervisor Gloria Molina, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

2009-2010 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are this Office's responses to the 2009-2010 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following applicable sections:

- Child Abuse Reporting and Response
- Drug-Free Work Environment
- Video-Conferencing Technology
- Audit Committee
- Department of Coroner

If you have questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Martin Zimmerman of this Office at 213.974.1326, or mzimmerman@ceo.lacounty.gov

WTF:BC:MKZ
FC:KLG:ib

Attachment

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: CHILD ABUSE REPORTING AND RESPONSE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors should take steps to assure that there will be adequate continuing funding to maintain the systems integrity of the E-SCAR process. Any complex system requires ongoing maintenance to make minor improvements and changes as the system matures. It has been estimated that one to two full-time systems analysts, plus support for a cost of \$100,000 to \$250,000 per year, would be adequate.

RESPONSE

Given the critical issues with the State budget, a decline in County revenues and cost increases for various mandated programs, each County department was required to reduce its operating budget by up to 9 percent during the Fiscal Year 2010-11 budget process. Therefore, an official request to fund the E-SCARS effort was not presented to the Chief Executive Office (CEO) for consideration. While this Office believes this project has merit, we have not identified funding for this project in the 2010-11 budget.

SECTION: DRUG-FREE WORK ENVIRONMENT

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Pre-employment positive test results should preclude an applicant from applying for any County position for at least one year. An applicant's positive test result should be available to other Los Angeles County departments for reference.

RESPONSE

The recommendation has not yet been implemented. The CEO will consult with the County's Department of Human Resources, County Counsel, and CEO Employee Relations to develop procedures. These procedures will identify safety-sensitive applicants who had a positive drug test, flag them should they reapply for any County position within the year of their test, and preclude them from reapplying. Procedures will also be developed for other County departments to reference this information prior to hiring an applicant.

The CEO expects to implement these procedures by December 31, 2010.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Los Angeles County Department of Occupational Health and Safety should collaborate with Los Angeles City Department of Personnel regarding joint contracts for Drug Testing clinics.

RESPONSE

Los Angeles County currently has a contract for Employee Drug and Alcohol Testing Program Services with American Substance Abuse Professional Drug Solutions, Inc. (ASAP). The contract with ASAP is for the period of January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2011, with a provision for two, one-year renewal options in 2012 and 2013.

The CEO contacted the Los Angeles City Department of Personnel (City) to obtain the City's pricing structure. An evaluation of this data shows that laboratory costs would be comparable, but the County would incur additional expense to administer the CEO's Department of Transportation driver database and handle all of the Medical Review Officer duties.

The CEO has suggested the City evaluate the issue from their perspective and has offered to work collaboratively if requested.

The CEO has completed this recommendation. No additional work remains to be completed unless assistance is requested by the City.

SECTION: VIDEO-CONFERENCING TECHNOLOGY

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the County of Los Angeles, The Los Angeles County Public Defender, Los Angeles Police Department, and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department should draft/complete a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a countywide video-conferencing technology hub system. The MOU should include:

- A consensus of each participant's involvement with its role clearly defined and stated
- A well defined dispute resolution process
- A detailed workflow statement
- The cost agreement between the participants, allocated in a shared pool
- The establishment of an Oversight Committee with representatives from each participating department, agency, or individual.

RESPONSE

The CEO agrees with the recommendation. The CEO is a member of the existing Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee/Information Systems Advisory Body (CCJCC/ISAB) Video Conferencing Committee and has worked with the committee to deploy Lifer Hearing video conference technology and to develop the Video Arraignment processes. The Lifer Hearings project has been successful for many years and the Video Arraignment pilot will begin in the current fiscal year.

The CEO will work within the existing CCJCC/ISAB Video Conferencing Committee to memorialize these commitments in the recommended MOU.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The Oversight Committee for the countywide video-conferencing technology hub system should include:

- A representative from the District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, the CEO of the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Public Defender, LAPD, and LASD with authority to negotiate and make decisions that are involved in the entire process:
- Meetings scheduled on a monthly basis
- Quarterly meetings with public attendance
- Published minutes
- Authority to interact with state and federal agencies
- Ability to expand video-conferencing technology on a countywide basis

RESPONSE

The CEO agrees with the use of a committee to guide the work and will accomplish the goals via the existing CCJCC/ISAB Video Conferencing Committee, beginning in September 2010.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, the CEO of the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Public Defender, Los Angeles Police Department, and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department should draft a Five Year Strategic Plan for a countywide video-conferencing technology hub system that includes the following:

- Visitations
- Interviews
- Conferencing

RESPONSE

The CEO agrees with the recommendation. Working in conjunction with the other justice agencies, ISAB and CCJCC, this Office will participate in the development of a Five Year Strategic Plan. The plan's target completion date will require mutual agreement of the committee members and will be an immediate priority of the committee. Departmental priorities will include expansion and update of Lifer Hearings, consideration of interdepartmental and interagency conferencing (such as Consumer Protection case conferences), and use of this technology for training purposes.

SECTION: AUDIT COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION (Not numbered, page 131)

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors maintain an operating budget which includes monies to be appropriated to future Civil Grand Juries that allows for the engagement of independent consultants and/or auditors.

RESPONSE

The Grand Jury Fiscal Year 2010-11 adopted budget includes funding to cover the costs of auditing. These funds have not been reduced and remain at their FY 2009-10 funding level.

SECTION: DEPARTMENT OF THE CORONER

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The Los Angeles County Chief Executive Officer should allocate the funds required to maintain the level of budgetary support needed for the Coroner's optimum operations.

RESPONSE

During the FY 2010-11 final changes budget process, the CEO recommended the restoration of \$1.5 million in funding, including 11 budgeted positions for the Department of the Coroner. This funding increase was used to maintain and address current workload levels identified in a recent management audit and helped to preserve the Department's accreditation.

Attachment B

Auditor-Controller



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-3873
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

WENDY L. WATANABE
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

MARIA M. OMS
CHIEF DEPUTY

ASST. AUDITOR-CONTROLLERS

ROBERT A. DAVIS
JOHN NAIMO
JUDI E. THOMAS

August 2, 2010

TO: Supervisor Gloria Molina, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

FROM:

Wendy L. Watanabe
Auditor-Controller

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO 2009-2010 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND
JURY FINAL REPORT**

This is in response to the recommendation made by the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury on their 2009-2010 Final Report. Attached is our response to the finding and recommendation pertaining to the operations of the Auditor-Controller.

If you have any questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Guy Zelenski at (213) 893-0243.

WLW:MMO:JET:GZ:ilm

Attachment

c: William T Fujioka, Chief Executive Officer

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY 2009-2010 FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
DRUG FREE WORK ENVIRONMENT

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

The Office of Auditor-Controller (A-C) should develop a policy/procedure manual to categorize and maintain statistical records of complaints, communicate to all agencies the availability of the Hotline, publicize the Hotline number and stress the assurance of confidentiality.

RESPONSE

The A-C should develop a policy/procedure manual to categorize and maintain statistical records of complaints.

The A-C agrees with the intent of this finding and believes that our internal electronic Information Tracking and Management System (ITMS) meets the objective of the recommendation. The ITMS electronic database is a paperless system which enables investigative staff to categorize and compile allegations of fraud and misconduct received via an internet-based County Fraud Hotline (Hotline). ITMS contains an online User Guide that serves as a procedure and leads investigative staff through a structured electronic process in managing reported fraud cases.

In addition, the A-C has an established process to classify and track every complaint that is received through the Hotline, and ITMS can be used to generate ad hoc reports on variety of statistical and chronological criteria. One example of the ad hoc capability in ITMS is the ability to generate reports by allegation category, such as substance abuse. Also, the A-C issues a semi-annual Fraud Hotline Status Report to the Board of Supervisors which contains summary statistical information (i.e., number of open, closed and carryover Hotline cases, etc.). This report, which is public and is posted to the County Fraud Hotline website (lacountyfraud.org), also includes summaries of substantiated cases which describe the type of allegation, the department involved and the disciplinary and/or corrective actions taken (if known).

The A-C should communicate to all agencies the availability of the Hotline and publicize the Hotline number.

The A-C agrees with the intent of this finding and believes that our current Hotline publicity program meets the objective of the recommendation. The Hotline and the 800 number are well known by County employees. During Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10, the County Fraud Hotline received 3,355 calls through the 800 number and 733 complaints

via the County Fraud Hotline website. The 800 number is listed on the A-C website and in the County telephone directory and is publicized as follows:

- The 800 number is highlighted on all County Fraud Hotline posters. The posters are distributed throughout County departments and placed in easily accessible areas for maximum exposure to County employees.
- The 800 number is emphasized and distributed during our Fraud Awareness classes, which are provided on a year-round basis to County managers and supervisors. During FY 2009-10, 17 fraud awareness classes were presented to 431 managers and supervisors from four County departments.

In addition, while there is no specific emphasis on reporting drug/alcohol abuse to the County Fraud Hotline, one of the categories used on the Hotline to track allegations of employee misconduct is “substance abuse.” During FY 2009-10, the Hotline received 15 substance abuse allegations.

We will also incorporate the language ‘*report substance abuse*’ on future editions of the County Fraud Hotline posters.

The A-C should stress the assurance of confidentiality.

The A-C agrees with the intent of this finding and believes that our current Hotline publicity program meets the objective of the recommendation. The A-C advocates and stresses the importance of informant confidentiality. Examples of how we stress confidentiality can be seen throughout the County Fraud Hotline website and Fraud Hotline posters.

In addition, informants who file an allegation electronically through our website are provided with the choice to remain anonymous. There is also a privacy statement on the Fraud Hotline website for electronic filing which states: “Please note that personal information identifying the informant is not captured or recorded by the Office of County Investigations through the website. Additionally, you may choose to remain anonymous when completing the online form.”

Fraud Hotline staff also provide assurance of confidentiality to informants who call the 800 number and wish to remain anonymous.

In summary, the objectives of the recommendation have been previously implemented. The A-C has a process to categorize and maintain statistical records of complaints, communicates to all agencies the availability of the Hotline, adequately publicizes the Hotline number and stresses the assurance of confidentiality.

Attachment C

Children and Family Services



PATRICIA S. PLOEHN, LCSW
Director

**County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES**

425 Shatto Place, Los Angeles, California 90020
(213) 351-5602

July 29, 2010

To: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

From: Patricia S. Ploehn, LCSW
Director

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Patricia S. Ploehn".

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District
MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District
ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District
DON KNABE
Fourth District
MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

**RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORT OF THE 2009-2010 LOS ANGELES
COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY**

This is to provide you with the Department of Children and Family Services' response to the recommendations contained in the Final Report of the 2009-2010 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury.

If you have any questions, please contact me, or your staff may contact Executive Assistant Norma Dreger at (213) 351-5527.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: CHILD ABUSE REPORTING AND RESPONSE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The Office of the District Attorney, Department of Child and Family Services and LASD should lead an effort to develop a Memorandum of Understanding or Operational Agreement, as appropriate, among all of the parties within Los Angeles County involved in the E-SCAR system for communicating cases of suspected child abuse.

RESPONSE

The Department agrees and will work with LASD, District Attorney (DA), and all other agencies involved in the E-SCAR system (E-SCARS) to develop the MOU. Target completion date is February 2011.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The E-SCAR Memorandum of Understanding/Operational Agreement should define the roles of the participants as to the communication and transmission of data and information among themselves and their coordination of responses. Time-to-respond and best practices standards should be established by DA, DCFS, LASD and the other parties to the Memorandum of Understanding/Operational Agreement for use as benchmarks by the participants. The Memorandum/Agreement should not, however, attempt to define or dictate the operations of the various groups as to their internal processes and protocols used in investigating, prosecuting or resolving reported child abuse allegations.

RESPONSE

The Department agrees that an E-SCARS Memorandum of Understanding/Operational Agreement should attempt to establish best practices relative to cross reporting of child abuse and neglect and initial response to child abuse and/or neglect among all signatories of the MOU. The Department will work with the District Attorney's office, the Sheriff and other law enforcement agencies in the County to develop mutually agreed upon best practices, recognizing that individual agencies, as noted in Recommendation 2, will ultimately define their own processes and protocols.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

DA'S Office, DCFS and LASD should lead an effort to establish an expanded, permanent Steering Committee composed of representatives of the various agencies that participate in the E-SCAR process to oversee the system from the standpoint of enhancements, user friendliness and effectiveness of the various stakeholders.

RESPONSE

The Department agrees and plans to implement this recommendation in the future. The timeframe to full implementation will be within six months. The current E-SCARS Steering Committee, comprised of staff representing the original agencies (DCFS, DA and LASD) which applied for and received the E-SCARS grant, will be expanded to include representatives from the Los Angeles Police Department, the Los Angeles County Police Chief's Association, the County Prosecutor's Association, and perhaps other agencies as deemed appropriate by the Steering Committee. The expanded E-SCARS Steering Committee will be a permanent body and will meet regularly to address E-SCARS issues and concerns. Target completion date is February 2011.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Steering Committee as a body should assure that the system receives optimal use and is enhanced periodically with such items as:

- Clarifying documentation of the procedures for rerouting E-SCARS that have been sent to the incorrect LEA
- Establishing and maintaining a list of the critical contact individuals in the various groups involved. This list should be part of the system and should be available to all who have access to it
- Expanding the search capabilities of the system to the extent possible within statutory privacy concerns to include responding officer's name, victim's mother's name and other relevant criteria
- Incorporating a list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) into the system as a ready reference for users to assure that the system is receiving optimal use
- Establishing a formal process to seek suggested enhancements or modifications to the system among its various users
- Incorporating a list of recent enhancements or changes to the system for ready reference
- Monitoring the consistency and speed of handling of E-SCARS by the various law enforcement agencies
- Encouraging training of Mandated Reporters as to their reporting role
- Maintaining, updating and communicating a chart of information flows and action responsibilities for all of the participants in the child abuse

reporting and response effort in Los Angeles County (An abbreviated flowchart of DCFS's recently updated version is attached as Appendix A.)

RESPONSE

The Department agrees with this recommendation. The bulleted recommendations above have not all been fully implemented, but progress has been made, and all will be implemented in the future. Specifically:

- The E-SCARS Steering Committee has convened a sub-committee comprised of members of several law enforcement agencies to address re-route issues and procedures. The programming to implement the agreed upon changes/updated procedures will be completed within six months.
- A list of primary E-SCARS contacts for all law enforcement agencies, the District Attorney's Office and the Department is currently available in E-SCARS and the list will be maintained and updated as needed.
- Enhancement of search capabilities of E-SCARS is a primary development goal of the E-SCARS Steering Committee and is currently underway.
- While the system currently has a 'Procedures' page which has served to answer frequent procedural questions, a 'Frequently Asked Questions' page will be added to the system and all users will be alerted to its presence.
- A 'Comments' page is available on the E-SCARS site to enable user comments and suggestions. Reminders to users of this feature will be disseminated and comments/suggestions will be discussed at Steering Committee meetings.
- Users are informed of system enhancements and updates via e-mail upon implementation of the update(s). This practice will continue.
- Monitoring of the consistency and speed of handling of E-SCARS by law enforcement agencies is by statute a District Attorney oversight function. The Department's E-SCARS project staff will continue to assist law enforcement agencies as needed with training, user support, etc.
- The Department offers Mandated Reporter training and will continue to do so.
- The Department will maintain and update a child abuse reporting and response flow chart which clarifies information flow, roles and responsibilities.

Target completion date is February 2011.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

The DA's office and DCFS should amend the SCAR/E-SCAR process to improve the identification of the sources of SCARs to the maximum extent possible under privacy law concerns. This will help to better monitor the compliance with Mandated Reporter rules at the institution level e.g., schools, hospitals, and law

enforcement. This can be accomplished by requiring the use of the existing fields in the SCAR input process. Results should be monitored and followed up with the appropriate training and education.

RESPONSE

The Department's Child Protection Hotline (CPH) E-SCARS training curriculum for staff includes the importance of capturing the reporting parties 'relationship' to the child/family and the 'category' of the reporter in Child Welfare Service/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) database.

To ensure 'Reporting Party' details are captured in CWS/CMS, CPH will work with our Bureau of Information Services to develop any needed compliance reports.

In addition, the Department will approach the State to advocate for improving the referral process by making 'relationship' and 'category' fields mandatory.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

The DA's office, DCFS, and LASD should expand the awareness of all law enforcement personnel as to their roles as Mandated Reporters especially as the requirements to cross-report suspected child abuse or endangerment cases encountered in the field.

RESPONSE

The Department agrees. The E-SCAR training should be provided in the following law enforcement child abuse courses and patrol trainings:

- The Peace Officers Standard Training (POST) Child Abuse Course in LA County;
- The Los Angeles Police Department's (LAPD) Juvenile Procedures School; and
- All law enforcement agencies patrol schools including traffic school training.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

DCFS should consider the employment of additional Human Services Aides to alleviate some of the less critical work performed by the social workers.

RESPONSE

The Department employs 200 Human Services Aides (HSAs) to assist Social Workers with less critical duties, including but not limited to the following:

- Monitoring and documenting court ordered visitations as directed by the social worker;

- Transporting children and/or adult clients to medical, psychological, court, visitation, etc., appointments;
- Assisting clients in completing applications for program participation and obtaining needed services;
- Conducting investigations of inquiries, issues or problems relating to a case and providing collected information to social work staff; and
- Inputting detailed summary of client/staff interactions into the CWS/CMS database.

The Department currently has 200 budgeted HSA items:

Currently, one (1) HSA is assigned to every two (2) Children's Social Worker (CSW) units. Ideally, DCFS would like to assign one HSA per CSW unit. The Department will look into the feasibility of adding additional HSA items.

RECOMMENDATION 9

As demonstrated at the Palmdale Sheriff's station, co-location of DCFS social workers at law enforcement facilities has helped foster better cooperation and more effective communication between the two groups. LASD and DCFS should make a thorough evaluation of this approach and expand the concept wherever practical.

RESPONSE

The Department's Law Enforcement Liaison is capable of ensuring and overseeing the county-wide co-location of staff at law enforcement agencies, coordinating joint activities, work, policies, training, and ensuring timely response to requests for assistance to our law enforcement partners.

In January, 2005, the Department approached the law enforcement agencies LAPD, LASD and the independent police agencies to request collaboration and space at their respective police stations. Currently the Department has co-located the following stations:

- The Department has co-located staff at the following six Los Angeles Police Department stations: Harbor, Mission, Newton, Southeast, Southwest, and the Police Administration Building.
- The Department has co-located staff at the following five Los Angeles Sheriff's Department stations: Century, Compton, Norwalk, Palmdale and Pico Rivera.
- The Department has co-located staff at the following six independent law enforcement agencies: Azusa Police Department, Baldwin Park Police

Department, El Monte Police Department, Long Beach Police Department, Pomona Police Department, and Whittier Police Department.

In March 2010, the Department began to revise and update with LASD, LAPD, independent police agencies and Internal Services Department the "co-location" Memorandum of Understanding and Operational Agreement to ensure uniformed best practice in handling joint child abuse and Multi-Agency Response Team investigations. In addition, coordinate joint activities, work, policies, trainings, requests for specific assistance, etc.

The Department and law enforcement are awaiting the co-location of more of our CSWs with other Los Angeles Police divisions, Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and independent police agencies.

The Department and law enforcement recognize one of the successes of the program is the participation of the co-located CSWs at roll call at their assigned law enforcement agency, where information regarding E-SCARS, current cases and issues is shared. Roll calls also offer an opportunity to distribute current personnel rosters, which provide officers contact information for the regional offices.

Attachment D

Coroner



"Enriching Lives"

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF CORONER

1104 N. MISSION RD., LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90033



Anthony T. Hernandez
Director

August 3, 2010

Lakshmanan Sathyavagiswaran, MD
Chief Medical Examiner-Coroner

TO: William T. Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Anthony Hernandez, Director

SUBJECT: RESPONSES TO THE 2009-10 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

RECEIVED
2010 AUG - 4 PM 5: 14
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

The following are the 2009-10 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury responses:

Accreditations:

*National Association of Medical Examiners
California Medical Association-Continuing Medical Education
Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education*

*American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/LAB
Peace Officer Standards and Training Certified*

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CORONER

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
DEPARTMENT OF THE CORONER

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The Coroner should implement a bar-code system for tracking specimen and evidence storage which will reduce manual labor and decrease identification errors.

RESPONSE

The Coroner has recently applied for Coverdale grants for a bar-coding/labeling system. The bar-coding/labeling system will be utilized to initially track property, specimens, and evidence storage. Usage will expand based on needs of the Department. The implementation date is 8/1/11.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Coroner should establish a priority of converting to an updated internet based CME case management system.

RESPONSE

The Coroner's current case tracking system is not web-based which prevents communication from the field to the Coroner's central data base, and has an identified number of security vulnerabilities. The Department has acquired an Information Technology Fund grant which has been utilized to install the "Documentum Platform" which includes the paperless Electronic Case Filing System (ECFS) as the initial component. In the next few months the Coroner will incorporate user acceptance, training, and "going live" for the ECFS phase. Establishing Documentum and ECFS will provide the platform necessary to begin the needs assessment phase for the Coroner's replacement of its antiquated case tracking system. Additional system costs and ongoing maintenance costs are being requested in the Department's 2010-11 budget requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

The Coroner should maintain an employee succession plan and monitor planned retirements so that all vacant positions can be filled quickly.

RESPONSE

The Department is currently working with the Department of Human Resources to implement the "New Workforce and Succession Planning Program." The enhanced program was kicked off in late April 2010.

Attachment E

District Attorney



STEVE COOLEY
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

18000 CLARA SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER
210 WEST TEMPLE STREET LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3210 (213) 974-3501

July 28, 2010

TO: Supervisor Gloria Molina, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

FROM:  Steve Cooley
District Attorney

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2009-10 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND
JURY FINAL REPORT**

Attached is my Department's response to the recommendations contained in the following sections of the 2009-10 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report:

Child Abuse Reporting and Response
Video-Conferencing Technology

Your staff may contact Lynn Vodden, Director of the Bureau of Management and Budget, at (213) 202-7616, if they have any questions or require additional information.

lv

Attachment

c: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DISTRICT ATTORNEY

SUBJECT: 2009-10 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: CHILD ABUSE REPORTING AND RESPONSE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The Office of the District Attorney, Department of Child and Family Services, and LASD should lead an effort to develop a Memorandum of Understanding or Operational Agreement, as appropriate, among all of the parties within Los Angeles County involved in the E-SCAR system for communicating cases of suspected child abuse.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's (DA's) Office and partners in the creation of E-SCARS recognize the need for a governing document and intend to implement this recommendation within the next three months.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The E-SCAR Memorandum of Understanding/Operational Agreement (Memorandum/Agreement) should define the roles of the participants as to the communication and transmission of data and information among themselves and their coordination of responses. Time-to-respond and best practices standards should be established by the DA, DCFS, LASD, and the other parties to the Memorandum of Understanding/Operational Agreement for use as benchmarks by the participants. The Memorandum/Agreement should not, however, attempt to define or dictate the operations of the various groups as to their internal processes and protocols used in investigating, prosecuting, or resolving reported child abuse allegations.

RESPONSE

The DA's Office agrees that any Memorandum of Understanding/Operational Agreement should strive to achieve a best practices standard among and across all agencies. The DA's Office, DCFS, LASD, and other interested parties will be responsible for detailing their processes and protocols for the Memorandum/Agreement. The DA's Office role in the Memorandum/ Agreement would be limited to encouraging participation in E-SCARS and compliance with the governing document. As noted above, agencies and groups are independent and define their own processes and protocols.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The DA's Office, DCFS and LASD should lead an effort to establish an expanded, permanent Steering Committee composed of representatives of the various agencies

that participate in the E-SCAR process to oversee the system from the standpoint of enhancements, user friendliness, and effectiveness of the various stakeholders.

RESPONSE

The current members of the E-SCARS Steering Committee, comprised of representatives of the DA's Office, DCFS, and LASD, agree that additional partners should be added to the committee. It is anticipated that the Steering Committee will be permanent and that the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), the Los Angeles County Police Chief's Association, and the County Prosecutors Association will appoint representatives to serve as members of the committee.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Steering Committee as a body should assure that the system receives optimal use and is enhanced periodically with such items as:

- Clarifying documentation of the procedures for rerouting E-SCARs that have been sent to the incorrect LEA
- Establishing and maintaining a list of the critical contact individuals in the various groups involved. This list should be part of the system and should be available to all who have access to it
- Expanding the search capabilities of the system to the extent possible within statutory privacy concerns to include responding officer's name, victim's mother's name, and other relevant criteria
- Incorporating a list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) into the system as a ready reference for users to assure that the system is receiving optimal use
- Establishing a formal process to seek suggested enhancements or modifications to the system among its various users
- Incorporating a list of recent enhancements or changes to the system for ready reference
- Monitoring the consistency and speed of handling of E-SCARS by the various law enforcement agencies
- Encouraging training of Mandated Reporters as to their reporting role
- Maintaining, updating, and communicating a chart of information flows and action responsibilities for all of the participants in the child abuse reporting and response effort in Los Angeles County (An abbreviated flowchart of DCFS's recently updated version is attached as Appendix A.)

RESPONSE

The E-SCARS Steering Committee agrees and intends to implement all of the above recommendations, to the extent possible, within one year from the date of this response. Some of the recommendations are currently being explored or have been completed. Specifically:

- The Steering Committee created a Sub-Committee comprised of members of several police departments including Pasadena, Santa Monica, Downey, and the

LAPD. The Sub-Committee reviewed the existing re-route procedures and developed new procedures. These new actions require programming changes after which training for all E-SCARS users will be conducted.

- A critical contact list has been developed and is available on the first screen in E-SCARS when users log in to the system.
- Expanded search capabilities are being explored. Adding the victim's mother's name is possible. Adding the responding officer's name may not be possible due to technical limitations.
- A section entitled "Procedures" is available to all users and serves as the system's FAQs section. This section will be re-named and reviewed to ensure all appropriate FAQs are included.
- There is a location in E-SCARS to submit suggestions for enhancements and/or modifications. It is entitled "Comments". Additional training to ensure all users are aware of this ability to contribute suggestions will be completed.
- E-SCARS will have the capability of publicizing a list of recently made and pending enhancements within three months.
- The DA's Office has assigned a full-time paralegal to, among other responsibilities, monitor the consistency and speed of handling E-SCARS by law enforcement agencies throughout Los Angeles County.
- The DA's Office has been and will continue to train mandated reporters in Los Angeles County.
- The E-SCARS Steering Committee will continue to maintain and update the child abuse reporting and response flow chart.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

The DA's Office and DCFS should amend the SCAR/E-SCAR process to improve the identification of the sources of SCARs to the maximum extent possible under privacy law concerns. This will help to better monitor the compliance with Mandated Reporter rules at the institution level e.g., schools, hospitals, and law enforcement. This can be accomplished by requiring the use of the existing procedures in the SCAR input process. Results should be monitored and followed up with the appropriate training and education.

RESPONSE

The E-SCARS Steering Committee intends to implement this recommendation in approximately six months. The source data (institutional level) of the reporter in question can be captured; however, this action requires programming. The programming for this recommendation will be scheduled and completed along with the other recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury as well as the suggestions of the Steering Committee and E-SCARS users.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors should take steps to assure that there will be adequate continuing funding to maintain the systems integrity of the E-SCAR process. Any complex system requires ongoing maintenance to make minor improvements and changes as the system matures. It has been estimated that one to

two full time systems analysts plus support for a cost of \$100,000 to \$250,000 per year would be adequate.

RESPONSE

The DA's Office strongly supports this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

The DA's Office, DCFS and LASD should expand the awareness of all law enforcement personnel as to their roles as Mandated Reporters especially as the requirement to cross-report suspected child abuse or endangerment cases encountered in the field.

RESPONSE

As part of their auditing and oversight responsibilities, the DA's Office continues to outreach to law enforcement and frequently reiterates and emphasizes law enforcement agencies' responsibilities as mandated reporters to cross-report ANY potential child abuse/endangerment allegation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

As demonstrated at the Palmdale Sheriff's station, co-location of DCFS social workers at law enforcement facilities has helped foster better cooperation and more effective communication between the two groups. LASD and DCFS should make a thorough evaluation of this approach and expand the concept wherever practical.

RESPONSE

The DA's Office fully supports the concept of co-location of social workers and law enforcement in the fight against child abuse. The DA's Office firmly believes that cooperative, parallel investigations serve to reduce trauma to the victim and increase accountability of the suspect. To the extent this goal can be achieved, the DA's Office strongly advocates for its implementation.

SECTION: VIDEO-CONFERENCING TECHNOLOGY

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Public Defender, Los Angeles Police Department, and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department should draft/complete a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a countywide video-conferencing technology hub system.

- A consensus of each participant's involvement with its role clearly defined and stated
- A well defined dispute resolution process
- A detailed workflow statement

- The cost agreement between the participants, allocated in a shared pool
- The establishment of an Oversight Committee with representatives from each participating department, agency, or individual

RESPONSE

The DA's Office agrees with this recommendation. The DA's Office is a member of the existing Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee/Information Systems Advisory Body (CCJCC/ISAB) Video Conferencing Committee and has worked with the committee to deploy Lifer Hearing video conference technology and to develop the Video Arraignment processes. The Lifer Hearings project has been successful for many years and the Video Arraignment pilot will begin in the current fiscal year.

The DA's Office will work within the existing CCJCC/ISAB Video Conferencing committee to memorialize these commitments in the recommended MOU.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The Oversight Committee for the countywide video-conferencing technology hub system should include:

- A representative from the District of Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, the CEO of the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Public Defender, LAPD, and LASD with authority to negotiate and make decisions that are involved in the entire process:
- Meetings scheduled on a monthly basis
- Quarterly meetings with public attendance
- Published minutes
- Authority to interact with state and federal agencies
- Ability to expand video-conferencing technology on a countywide basis

RESPONSE

The DA's Office agrees with the use of a committee to guide the work and will accomplish the goals via the existing CCJCC/ISAB Video Conferencing Committee, beginning in September 2010.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, the CEO of the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Public Defender, Los Angeles Police Department, and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department should draft a Five Year Strategic Plan for a countywide video-conferencing technology hub system that includes the following:

- Visitations
- Interviews
- Conferencing

RESPONSE

The DA's Office agrees with the recommendation. Working in conjunction with the other justice agencies, ISAB and CCJCC, the DA's Office will participate in the development of a Five Year Strategic Plan. The plan's target completion date will require mutual agreement of the committee members and will be an immediate priority of the committee. Departmental priorities will include expansion and update of Lifer Hearings, consideration of interdepartmental and interagency conferencing (such as Consumer Protection case conferences) and use as a training tool.

Attachment F

Health Services



Health Services
LOS ANGELES COUNTY

July 30, 2010

Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors

Gloria Molina
First District

Mark Ridley-Thomas
Second District

Zev Yaroslavsky
Third District

Don Knabe
Fourth District

Michael D. Antonovich
Fifth District

TO: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: John F. Schunhoff, Ph.D.
Interim Director

SUBJECT: **DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES RESPONSE TO
THE 2009-2010 LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY
REPORT**

John F. Schunhoff, Ph.D.
Interim Director

Gail V. Anderson, Jr., M.D.
Interim Chief Medical Director

Attached are the Department of Health Services (DHS) responses to the 2009-2010 Los Angeles County Grand Jury Report. DHS was identified as one of the leads in two Grand Jury reports: 1) Inmate Healthcare; and 2) Department of Coroner. A separate response is included for each report.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please let me know or you may contact Sharon Ryzak, Audit and Compliance Division Chief, at (213) 240-7901.

313 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 912
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tel: (213) 240-8101
Fax: (213) 481-0503

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

JFS:eg

Attachments

c: Gregory Polk
Sharon Ryzak
Kary L. Golden

*To improve health
through leadership,
service and education*



www.dhs.lacounty.gov

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – HEALTH SERVICES

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: INMATE HEALTHCARE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The Executive Management of both the Sheriff's Department and LAC+USC should establish a task force to review all of the medical services which are currently out-sourced by Twin Towers with the goal of integrating those services into the LAC+USC operations. This would be particularly relevant to Laboratory and Pharmacy which could possibly be established as satellites of LAC+USC's services. Twin Towers could also possibly piggyback on the existing contracts that LAC+USC currently has for CT and MRI services if appropriate.

RESPONSE

The Department of Health Services (DHS) continues to work collaboratively with Sheriff's Department (LASD). At a July 30, 2010 Civil Grand Jury Taskforce Meeting with representation from DHS and LASD, the taskforce discussed opportunities to partner and/or integrate laboratory, pharmacy and radiology services. Additionally, LASD continues to evaluate opportunities to piggyback on DHS contracts.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The Executive Management of both the Sheriff's Department and LAC+USC should consider the possibility of integrating the computerized Medical Records systems of Twin Towers and LAC+USC as a pilot project for future integration of the medical records of all of the DHS medical facilities.

RESPONSE

DHS continues to work with LASD on this issue. DHS is currently investigating a department wide Electronic Medical Record system; however, there are privacy, security and licensing concerns for integrating Twin Towers and LAC+USC medical records to be addressed. LAC+USC and LASD have worked together to allow access to each other's computer systems to improve continuity of care and communication.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

LAC+USC Medical Center and Twin Towers should institute a program of informal observation visits for medical personnel from LAC+USC through the Twin Towers

medical facility to provide familiarity with the unique issues relating to medical services in an incarceration setting.

RESPONSE

DHS continues to work collaboratively with LASD. At a July 30, 2010 Civil Grand Jury Taskforce Meeting with representation from DHS and LASD, the taskforce discussed the feasibility of providing physicians with information of the unique issues to medical services in an incarceration setting. A follow-up meeting for further discussion and collaboration has been scheduled.

SECTION: DEPARTMENT OF THE CORONER

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Los Angeles County Department of Health Services should increase the capacity of the Los Angeles County Crematorium to meet the needs of the Coroner and revise the usage language schedule to avoid outsourcing any cremations.

RESPONSE

DHS supports the intent of this recommendation, which is to provide the most cost effective means of providing for cremation of decedents. As such, the DHS is working with the Coroner and the Chief Executive Office to re-evaluate the roles of each department in this area. A cost analysis was recently completed that indicates it would be more cost-effective and operationally efficient to outsource cremations. Therefore, DHS and the Coroner are evaluating the best way to use the scarce resources available in both departments to meet that need.

Attachment G

Mental Health

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

MARVIN J. SOUTHARD, D.S.W.
Director

ROBIN KAY, Ph.D.
Chief Deputy Director

RODERICK SHANER, M.D.
Medical Director



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
GLORIA MOLINA
MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
DON KNABE
MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH

DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

<http://dmh.lacounty.gov>

550 SOUTH VERMONT AVENUE, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90020

July 20, 2010

TO: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Marvin J. Southard, D.S.W.
Director of Mental Health

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2009-10 LOS ANGELES COUNTY
CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT**

During this year, the Civil Grand Jury investigation involving the Department of Mental Health was limited to a review of the Office of the Public Guardian. We are gratified by the positive remarks on the professional staff and high standards exhibited in the Office of the Public Guardian and concur with the recommendations made by the Civil Grand Jury.

There were two minor recommendations made by the Civil Grand Jury.

1. Communicate to all employees and new hires the Manual of Policy and Procedures and instruct them in using it. Emphasize the most pertinent changes. Use specially trained employees to assist fellow employees and new hires in understanding the manual and answering any questions.
2. Judiciously assign overtime to work to reduce any backlog of cases and to ensure timely responses to new cases.

The Office of the Public Guardian concurs with these recommendations and is moving forward to address these concerns. The Manual of Policy and Procedures is in the process of being updated. New employees do receive a copy of the current Manual and are trained in its use. Additionally, a newly created orientation and training manual for Deputy Public Conservator/Administrators is used in conjunction with the Manual of Policy and Procedures. As new or updated policies and procedures are approved for release, the Office of the Public Guardian will provide training to staff on the changes.

With regards to the judicious use of overtime, the Public Guardian has utilized a variety of strategies to manage caseloads and backlogs, including use of overtime, developing performance expectations and an augmentation of positions. The Office of the Public Guardian will continue to utilize these strategies to ensure timely and effective case management.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

MJS:CDD:ela

Attachment

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – MENTAL HEALTH

SUBJECT: 2009-10 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC GUARDIAN

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Communicate to all employees and new hires the Manual of Policy and Procedures and instruct them in using it. Emphasize the most pertinent changes. Use specially trained employees to assist fellow employees and new hires in understanding the manual and answering any questions.

RESPONSE:

The Department of Mental Health concurs. The Office of the Public Guardian is in the process of updating the Manual of Policy and Procedures. New employees do receive a copy of the current Manual and are trained in its use. Newly hired Deputy Public Conservators/Administrators are trained in conjunction with the recently developed New Deputy Employee Orientation and Training program. Additionally, as new or updated policies and procedures are approved for release, the Office of the Public Guardian will provide training to staff on the changes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Judiciously assign overtime work to reduce any backlog of cases and to ensure timely responses to new cases.

RESPONSE:

The Department of Mental Health concurs with the intent of this recommendation. The Office of the Public Guardian is utilizing a variety of strategies to address backlog and caseload management issues, including use of overtime, developing performance expectations and augmentation of positions. The Office of the Public Guardian will continue to utilize these strategies to ensure timely and effective case management.

Attachment H

Parks and Recreation



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
"Creating Community Through People, Parks and Programs"

Russ Guiney, Director

July 29, 2010

TO: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Russ Guiney
Director

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Russ Guiney', is written over the printed name and title.

SUBJECT: **RESPONSES TO THE 2009-10 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT**

As requested in your memo dated July 7, 2010, the Department of Parks and Recreation (Department) has responded to the Grand Jury recommendations pertaining to the Department. Attached is the completed Report Template – Attachment B.

If you have any questions, you may contact me at (213) 738-2951, or your staff may contact Veronica Castillo of Management Services at (213) 738-3008.

RG:EM:vc

Attachment

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – PARKS AND RECREATION

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: LOS ANGELES PARKS AND RECREATION

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation and The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks should ensure that the parks are adequately staffed.

RESPONSE

The Department of Parks and Recreation (Department) substantially reduced recurrent staff hours due to the budget climate. However, whenever possible and within budget, the Department will ensure that parks are adequately staffed.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Ensure that restrooms are regularly inspected and cleaned.

RESPONSE

The Department will ensure that the restrooms are regularly inspected and cleaned.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Coordinate with law enforcement which provides security; ensure existing security cameras are operable.

RESPONSE

The Department supports the concept of security cameras. However, the security cameras are not currently installed in the parks. The Sheriff's department received a grant which will be used to purchase and install security cameras at Castaic Lake and Watkins Park. In addition, the Department will coordinate with the Sheriff's department to ensure that there is sufficient security at the parks.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

Maintain equipment; blacktop and mark parking areas.

RESPONSE

The Department will ensure that maintenance equipment is in working condition. When appropriate, the Department will work toward getting parking areas paved. However, some facilities have unpaved overflow parking areas because it contributes to the facility's natural environment.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Provide signs that clearly identify park offices.

RESPONSE

The Department will ensure that all park offices are clearly marked.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

Employees should wear employee identification nametags.

RESPONSE

The Department will remind employees to wear their County-issued identification badges during work hours.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

Enlist community businesses and residents to contribute resources and volunteers.

RESPONSE

The Department will seek to enlist community, businesses and residents to volunteer at the parks. In addition, the Department will seek resources from these targeted individuals and groups.

Attachment I

Probation



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROBATION DEPARTMENT

9150 EAST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY – DOWNEY, CALIFORNIA 90242
(562) 940-2501



DONALD H. BLEVINS
Chief Probation Officer

July 28, 2010

To: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

From: Donald H. Blevins *DH Blevins*
Chief Probation Officer

Subject: RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

In response to your July 7, 2010 request, attached is the Probation Department's response to the 2009-2010 Grand Jury Final Report.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact DeWitt Roberts, Deputy Director, Administrative Services at (562) 940-2516.

DHB:DR:dd

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – PROBATION

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: DRUG FREE WORK ENVIRONMENT

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

Department of Probation (DOP) key employees should be randomly tested. This would include Deputy Probation Officers who are considered safety officers and should be held responsible and accountable as are the Police, safety Police and Sheriff's Officers. In addition, permanent county employees of residential detention centers and services should be randomly tested.

RESPONSE

Although the Probation Department (Probation) supports a drug free work environment, specifically random drug testing of Probation employees would require negotiations with the employees unions. Under current agreements, only Transportation Deputies are randomly drug tested as required under the Department of Transportation regulations. If there is probable cause, then the Probation will require an employee to be tested.

In September 2006, Probation began pre-employment drug testing via the Occupational Health Program for the following department classifications:

- Detention Services Officer*
- Deputy Probation Officer I*
- Deputy Probation Officer II*
- Group Supervisor Nights, Probation*
- Group Supervisor II, Probation*
- Investigator Aid
- Investigator, Pretrial Services, Probation
- Transportation Deputy*
- Crew Instructor
- Senior Cook
- General Maintenance Worker
- Community Worker
- Student Professional Worker/Operation Read

These classifications are directly involved with the safety of the public and juvenile wards. Should Probation begin the practice of randomly drug testing its employees, this would need to be negotiated as part of the agreement through the labor unions.

*Positions hold Peace Officer status

Attachment J

Public Defender



MICHAEL P. JUDGE
PUBLIC DEFENDER

LAW OFFICES
LOS ANGELES COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

CLARA SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ
CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER
210 W. TEMPLE STREET, SUITE 19-513
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-2801 / FAX (213) 625-5031
TDD (800) 801-5551

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

July 9, 2010

Kary L. Golden
Office of Strategic Initiatives, Special Projects
Chief Executive Office
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 750
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Golden:

Enclosed please find a copy of my response to the Grand Jury together with the attachments that I sent.

Sincerely,



MICHAEL P. JUDGE
Public Defender

MPJ:dp

Enclosures

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – PUBLIC DEFENDER

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: VIDEO-CONFERENCING TECHNOLOGY

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the County of Los Angeles, The Los Angeles County Public Defender, Los Angeles Police Department, and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department should draft/complete a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a countywide video-conferencing technology hub system. The MOU should include:

- A consensus of each participant's involvement with its role clearly defined and stated
- A well defined dispute resolution process
- A detailed workflow statement
- The cost agreement between the participants, allocated in a shared pool
- The establishment of an Oversight Committee with representatives from each participating department, agency, or individual

RESPONSE

The Public Defender recommends that Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee members further study the hub system. Any video-conferencing hub system developed must require the opt-in consent of both Public Defender clients as well as their assigned Public Defender counsel. In addition, any video-conferencing hub system must ensure full compliance with discovery obligations pursuant to Penal Code section 1054, as well as confidentiality of attorney-client communications and privileges.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The Oversight Committee for the countywide video-conferencing technology hub system should include:

- A representative from the District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles. The CEO of the County of Los Angeles, The Los Angeles County Public Defender, LAPD, and LASD with authority to negotiate and make decisions that are involved in the entire process
- Meetings scheduled on a monthly basis
- Quarterly meetings with public attendance
- Published meetings

- Authority to interact with state and federal agencies
- Ability to expand video-conferencing technology on a countywide basis

RESPONSE

The Public Defender recommends initial exploration of a hub system on a regional rather than countywide basis. Arraignments via video conference technology on a smaller, regional basis could identify potential logistical issues and increased workload issues. While technically possible, there stands a strong possibility of considerable problematic issues, including the need for much longer work days (possibly even 24 hour/7 days a week) with myriad logistical issues including routing of all discovery to each location that would handle each part of the case proceedings on every matter.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, The CEO of the County of Los Angeles, The Los Angeles County Public Defender, Los Angeles Police Department, and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department should draft a Five Year Strategic Plan for a countywide video-conferencing technology hub system that includes the following:

- Visitations
- Interviews
- Conferencing

RESPONSE

The Public Defender recommends that the Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee be the entity that drafts the Five Year Strategic Plan. This committee is comprised of the courts, school districts, prosecuting agencies, law enforcement agencies, Public Defender, Alternate Public Defender, Probation, Mental Health, Public Health, and Health Services, and is led by the Chairperson of the Board of Supervisors for further action. This will permit the missing analysis to be accomplished and will identify funding sources. Additionally, this is how the existing video-conferencing interview system was developed and a variety of revenue streams from non-traditional sources were established.

Attachment K

Public Works



GAIL FARBER, Director

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
<http://dpw.lacounty.gov>

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460
IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE: **FI-7**

July 29, 2010

TO: Kary L. Golden
Office of Strategic Initiatives, Special Projects
Chief Executive Office

FROM: Gail Farber *Gail Farber*
Director of Public Works

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
2009-2010 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AUDIT OF
COUNTYWIDE WATER AND SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Attached is our response to the 2009-2010 Civil Grand Jury report regarding Water and Solid Waste Management for Los Angeles County.

If you have any questions, you may contact me or your staff may contact Diane Lee, Deputy Director, at (626) 458-4010 or dlee@dpw.lacounty.gov.

DL:dbm

P:\iapub\INTAUDIT\OUTSIDE AUDITS\GRAND JURY\FY 2009-10\2010 07-07-10 2009-10 GJ COMBINED Response.DOC

Attach.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works should support those Los Angeles County organizations working toward a zero-waste future and work with communities in Southern California to create demonstration conversion technology facilities.

RESPONSE

On April 20, 2010, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors gave the green light to the three demonstration projects listed in the Civil Grand Jury Report and authorized Public Works to work with partner cities in order to support the development of conversion technology projects within the County. The cities of Calabasas, Glendale, Lancaster, and Long Beach have already adopted resolutions of support for the County's conversion technology efforts, and others have expressed interest.

Development of a system of conversion technology facilities in the County of Los Angeles will aid significantly in moving toward a zero-waste future for the County.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works should evaluate and promote the development of the most promising conversion technology to recover energy, products and other benefits from waste.

RESPONSE

Public Works evaluated over 100 conversion technology suppliers from around the world during the process to select three demonstration projects. Beginning in early 2011, we will commence a second evaluation process of technology suppliers for our commercial development projects in the County.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works should educate the public about solid waste challenges.

RESPONSE

Public Works is proud to offer a number of award-winning programs to residents, businesses, and other agencies designed to educate them regarding our solid waste challenges, and how they can do their part to keep the County clean and sustainable.

From the 3 R's (reduce, reuse, and recycle) to household hazardous and electronic waste collection events and composting, our comprehensive website www.CleanLA.com offers information and links to answer environmental questions relating to solid waste. We also have a dedicated outreach contract to support our conversion technology project, which has been helpful in raising awareness regarding the County's efforts to advance the development of these technologies. Each month, we send conversion technology information to over 1,000 stakeholders who subscribe to our www.socalconversion.org e-newsletter. Our staff regularly makes educational presentations to local jurisdictions, environmental organizations, industry, and community groups on the solid waste challenges facing the County and what we are doing to resolve them.

SECTION: WATER FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors should lead an effort to obtain legislation to establish a Los Angeles County Water District.

RESPONSE

There are 16 members of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) in the County, six are wholesale non-municipal water distribution agencies and ten are municipal agencies. The Grand Jury's recommendation would consolidate these agencies with the municipal water supply agencies into one County Water District. The Grand Jury did not clearly state its reasoning for its recommendation other than its reference to the Municipal Water District of Orange County as being a leader in water management, thereby making it a model for this proposal.

The County, as represented by the Board of Supervisors (Board), has a limited governing role in water supply through local retail Waterworks Districts. The Board has no official influence over the major wholesale distributors, municipal or nonmunicipal. The prospect of a Board-led legislative effort to consolidate these agencies without their consent is highly unlikely. The existing non-municipal wholesale districts are governed by elected boards and the municipal agencies are mainly governed by their respective city councils. These agencies are accountable to the retail customers as their voting constituents. The Grand Jury's proposal for an all appointed membership of the Los Angeles County Water District Board does not resemble the structure of the wholesale water districts it would replace and, in all likelihood, would be politically difficult to pursue.

The proposed Los Angeles County Water District would presumably have purview over a wide range of water issues that would include, but not be limited to, imported water management, local surface water supply, groundwater management, recycled water supply, water conservation/demand reduction policy, and desalination. Each of these issues has corresponding management structures that have been established by voter initiative, legislative action, or adjudication in the courts. Accordingly, there are reasons,

both legal and practical, to have these management structures be independent of each other (adjudicated surface supply and groundwater rights being an example). A Los Angeles County Water District would eliminate these independent management structures that presently exist to protect their varied and respective legislated and adjudicated interests.

The Grand Jury cites water-conservation concerns and pricing disparities between various municipal water agencies as examples of issues that could be better addressed by the proposed Los Angeles County Water District. These concerns would not necessarily be better served by a single agency such as the proposed Los Angeles County Water District. Deconstructing 16 agencies and reconstructing a single-large agency may provide uniformity in policy, but may not necessarily improve responsiveness to local customer needs.

Although not clearly stated in the Grand Jury's report, a possible reason for proposing a Los Angeles County Water District may be an interest in creating a more comprehensive regional water planning authority. However, this issue has already been recognized and addressed by the State of California Department of Water Resources. The State of California Department of Water Resources has implemented the Integrated Regional Water Management approach to planning and funding water-supply needs throughout the State. In the southern, urbanized portion of the County of Los Angeles, various water-related agencies, and other stakeholders have organized themselves into a loose planning and funding structure known as the Greater Los Angeles County Integrated Water Management (GLAC-IRWM) Group. Since participation and cooperation within GLAC-IRWM is voluntary, its planning authority is limited. Other regional planning efforts have been undertaken by the MWD through its Integrated Resources Plan, which itself is informal and not authoritative guidance. One possible approach could be to formalize the regional planning authority of the GLAC-IRWM Group or the vesting of regional water supply planning authority with an agency such as MWD.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors would seek legislation that the Los Angeles County Water District would be the governing body over all major water issues for the entire county.

RESPONSE

Please see response to Recommendation 1.1.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors would seek legislation to establish a seven-member board to govern the Los Angeles County Water District. The board would consist of two members appointed by the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, two members appointed by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California members representing the County of Los Angeles, and three members selected by the four appointed members.

RESPONSE

Please see response to Recommendation 1.1.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4

Los Angeles County Water District should have authority to select the full-time General Manager.

RESPONSE

If a Los Angeles County Water District were formed, Public Works recommends that its General Manager be appointed in a manner similar to the appointing of at-will chief executives of County departments, in accordance with State law, and with full accountability to an entirely elected Board of Directors of the District.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5

Los Angeles County Water District should have authority to enact Countywide environmental programs, interact with Federal authorities on pollution issues and consolidate the various water district organizations into one authority.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Water District would be required to have these authorities since it would have assumed all the responsibilities of the various water district organizations it consolidated and replaced.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6

The legislation sought by Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors would include the consolidation of all the water districts into one central organization. A conservative estimate of the savings could be as much as \$30 million annually.

RESPONSE

The proposed Los Angeles County Water District would not necessarily result in operational costs savings. The Grand Jury did not provide an enumerated rationale for its estimate of a \$30 million annual savings in operating a Los Angeles County Water District. An altogether new organization with the size and mission envisioned by the Grand Jury could require a greater amount of resources than the cumulative total of those it would replace. This was the case when the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission was consolidated with the Southern California Rapid Transit District to form the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. The formation of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ultimately resulted in an organization with a greatly expanded mission and significantly greater operating resource needs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.15

The County Grand Jury (CGJ) understood that although the bond measure would be enormous, that continued State growth and prosperity was dependent on safe and reliable water supplies. The CGJ recommends that the bond measure be carefully evaluated by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and be supported to ensure future water supplies.

RESPONSE

Public Works concurs with this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.16

There were various issues facing water districts and agencies with political, environmental, regulatory and legal issues seemingly coming from all directions. The Grand Jury recommends the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors seek legislation to establish an organization with proper funding to direct the efforts to assist in obtaining funds, fight issues of concern and contact the proper person or agency for support. This would eliminate duplicated costs and efforts by 17 different County agencies.

RESPONSE

The 17 agencies referred to in this recommendation are member agencies of the MWD. MWD is largely effective in acting on behalf of its members to address many of these issues. The exception may be with regard to efforts in obtaining funds for which the respective agencies mainly act independently. Ultimately, the water agencies reserve their independence to address these issues.

Attachment L

Sheriff



LEROY D. BACA, SHERIFF

County of Los Angeles
Sheriff's Department Headquarters
4700 Ramona Boulevard
Monterey Park, California 91754-2169



August 4, 2010

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

Dear Members of the Civil Grand Jury:

**RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORT OF THE 2009-10
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY**

Attached is the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's (Department) response to the 2009-10 Civil Grand Jury Report recommendations (Attachment A). The Civil Grand Jury's areas of interest specific to the Department included our participation in the reporting of child abuse, random drug testing, staffing of the crime lab, inmate health care, and the use of video-conferencing technology.

Should you have questions regarding our response, please contact Division Director Victor Rampulla at (323) 526-5357.

Sincerely,


LEROY D. BACA
SHERIFF

A Tradition of Service

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF

SUBJECT: 2009-2010 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: CHILD ABUSE REPORTING AND RESPONSE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The Office of the District Attorney, Department of Child and Family Services and LASD should lead an effort to develop a Memorandum of Understanding or Operational Agreement, as appropriate, among all of the parties within Los Angeles County involved in the E-SCAR system for communicating cases of suspected child abuse.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) agrees with this recommendation. The recommendation will be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting and if approved, a plan to develop a Memorandum of Understanding will be started.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The E-SCAR Memorandum of Understanding/Operational Agreement should define the roles of the participants as to the communication and transmission of data and information among themselves and their coordination of responses. Time-to-respond and best practices standards should be established by the DA, DCFS, LASD and the other parties to the Memorandum of Understanding/Operational Agreement for use as benchmarks by the participants. The Memorandum/Agreement should not, however, attempt to define or dictate the operations of the various groups as to their internal processes and protocols used in investigating, prosecuting or resolving reported child abuse allegations.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD is currently communicating with the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and other law enforcement agencies with regard to best practices. Additionally, LASD recommends as standard practice that all Electronic Suspected Child Abuse Reporting System (E-SCARS) reports be handled as a "call for service" and each reporting be given the initial patrol response, appropriate for the given information on E-SCARS. LASD also recommends establishing protocols and training with all affected agencies/units with regard to cross-reporting to DCFS when it has been determined a crime has occurred or is suspected to have occurred.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The DA's Office, DCFS, and LASD should lead an effort to establish an expanded, permanent Steering Committee composed of representatives of the various agencies that participate in the E-SCAR process to oversee the system from the standpoint of enhancements, user friendliness and effectiveness of the various stakeholders.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation and is currently working within the above mentioned recommendation. The current Steering Committee is comprised of personnel from the District Attorney's Office (DA), DCFS, and LASD. The Steering Committee is currently holding periodic meetings with other law enforcement agencies to address the E-SCARS concerns.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Steering Committee as a body should assure that the system receives optimal use and is enhanced periodically.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. All of the listed enhancement items are in place and LASD continues to work toward a more productive and efficient system, which will benefit all concerned. Additionally, E-SCARS currently has a section of frequently asked questions for reference by E-SCARS users.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

The DA's Office, DCFS, and LASD should expand the awareness of all law enforcement personnel as to their roles as Mandated Reporters especially as the requirement to cross-report suspected child abuse or endangerment cases encountered in the field.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD's Special Victims Bureau (SVB) has included the mentioned training and information in its Intranet website. Additionally, LASD continually reinforces this information in Sergeant and Lieutenant Field Operations School. SVB also conducts training at patrol station briefings where this material is covered. Field Operations Support Services has committed to creating a LASD newsletter that will be used to communicate this type of information to employees.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

As demonstrated at the Palmdale Sheriff's Station, co-location of DCFS social workers at law enforcement facilities has helped foster better cooperation and more effective communication between the two groups. LASD and DCFS should make a thorough evaluation of this approach and expand the concept wherever practical.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation and will work with DCFS to determine the feasibility of expanding the co-location program.

SECTION: CITY OF PALMDALE SHERIFF'S STATION

RECOMMENDATION (Not numbered, page 27)

The 2009-10 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department review this program and act as the coordinator for implementation throughout the County of Los Angeles.

RESPONSE

LASD has reviewed the program and is very proud of the successes experienced by Palmdale's Partners Against Crime (PAC). Whenever practical, LASD will continue to implement or expand similar programs throughout the County. One example of an existing program is the Countywide Community Oriented Policing Team (COPS) Abatement Team which partners COPS deputies with members of other County agencies (such as the Fire Department and Department of Public Works' Building and Safety and Graffiti Abatement units) to address criminal activity and quality of life issues throughout our communities. One of the advantages PAC has utilized is the ability to co-locate with partnering agencies within Palmdale Sheriff Station's jurisdiction. This model has been studied by LASD's Facilities Planning Bureau and will be modeled in the construction of new stations to the extent the construction budget and site size allow.

SECTION: DRUG FREE WORK ENVIRONMENT

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

LASD Risk Management Department should resume random drug testing.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation and is in the process of hiring a contract employee to conduct the testing. It is anticipated that random testing will resume within the next two months.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

The Los Angeles County Office of Safety Police (OSP) public Hotline should be integrated into the Sheriff's Department and continue to function. Develop and maintain a categorized log of all calls. Initiate a county wide awareness program relative to the ability of the Hotline to anonymously report job related abuses.

RESPONSE

LASD discussed the "Hotline" with former Office of Public Safety (OPS) Acting Chief as part of the transition of OPS services to LASD. The OPS Acting Chief explained that OPS did not maintain a Hotline to specifically report drug use or other abuses by County employees. He believes the Grand Jury is referring to signs posted in the Civic Center, which now are inscribed with the phone number to LASD, for anyone to call if there is a need for police assistance. However, this is not an anonymous Hotline. If someone should call the dispatch center and report a problem involving drug abuse by a County employee, deputies from the LASD County Services Bureau will respond and appropriate police action will be taken, or the complainant will be referred to the appropriate department for investigation.

SECTION: FORENSICS, Section II

RECOMMENDATION (Not numbered, page 40)

Fill allocated positions for DNA technicians to effectively reduce laboratory backlog.

RESPONSE

Since the Civil Grand Jury's initial investigation, LASD has obtained permission through the Board of Supervisors to hire a supervisor and five technical positions for the DNA unit. Employees have been hired to fill all 47 positions allocated to the unit and personnel have either begun employment or are in the background process. Through these additions, the supervisory ratio will meet the recommended ratio of 1:8.

Eight individuals have recently completed DNA training for a total of 35 trained examiners. Six individuals are currently in training and the remaining six untrained individuals prepare sexual assault kits from the backlog for shipment to outsourced contractors. They will begin training within the next two months, once all sexual assault kits from the backlog have been outsourced to the contractors.

The addition of trained personnel along with the implementation of automated procedures will effectively reduce the laboratory backlog.

SECTION: INMATE HEALTHCARE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The Executive Management of both the Sheriff's Department and LAC+USC should establish a task force to review all of the medical services which are currently out-sourced by Twin Towers with the goal of integrating those services into the LAC+USC operations. This would be particularly relevant to Laboratory and Pharmacy which could possibly be established as satellites of LAC+USC's services. Twin Towers could also possibly piggyback on the existing contracts that LAC+USC currently has for CT and MRI services if appropriate.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation and will meet with LAC+USC medical staff to discuss the Grand Jury recommendations. Integration of services and piggyback on existing LAC+USC contracts will be discussed to determine if, and to what extent, these recommendations are feasible.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

To streamline the hiring process, the Sheriff's Department should speed up the background investigation process for physicians hired by Twin Towers.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation and has begun to streamline the background process. The requirement for applicants to provide various medical school records for the Medical Doctorate degree, residency and fellowship has been discontinued. Since registration with the State of California Medical Board and Board Certification with a specialty board is part of the minimum qualifications for all physician candidates, the request for school transcripts is unnecessary. Academic records can be requested during the privileging process, if necessary.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The Executive Management of both the Sheriff's Department and LAC+USC should consider the possibility of integrating the computerized Medical Records systems of Twin Towers and LAC+USC as a pilot project for future integration of the medical records of all the DHS medical facilities.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation, however, due to current configurations and age of the systems in use, integration is not feasible at this time. Although not

integrated, LASD and LAC+USC have access to each other's electronic medical record systems at their respective designated locations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

LAC+USC Medical Center and Twin Towers should institute a program of informal observation visits for medical personnel from LAC+USC through the Twin Towers medical facility to provide familiarity with the unique issues relating to medical services in an incarceration setting.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LAC+USC and LASD have agreed that touring each other's facilities would provide new staff the opportunity to understand, with clarity, the function and role of each department.

SECTION: VIDEO-CONFERENCING TECHNOLOGY

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, the Chief Executive Officer of the County of Los Angeles, the Public Defender of the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Police Department, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department should draft/complete a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a Countywide Video-Conferencing Technology Hub System. The MOU should include:

- A consensus of each participant's involvement with its role clearly defined and stated.
- A well defined dispute resolution process.
- A detailed workflow statement.
- The cost agreement between the participants allocated in a shared pool.
- The establishment of an Oversight Committee with representatives from each participating department, agency or individual.

RESPONSE:

LASD agrees with the goals of the recommendation. However, we would like to note that significant progress has been made toward increasing the use of video technology both within LASD and with other criminal justice organizations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The Oversight Committee for the Countywide Video-Conferencing Technology Hub System should include:

- A representative from the District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, the Chief Executive Officer of the County of Los Angeles, the Public Defender of the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Police Department, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department with authority to negotiate and make decisions that are involved in the entire process.
- Meetings scheduled on a monthly basis.
- Quarterly meetings with public attendance.
- Published minutes.
- Authority to interact with State and Federal agencies.
- Ability to expand Video-Conferencing Technology on a Countywide basis.

RESPONSE:

Please see response to Recommendation No. 1.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The District Attorney of the County of Los Angeles, the Chief Executive Officer of the County of Los Angeles, the Public Defender of the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Police Department, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department should draft a Five-Year Strategic Plan for a Countywide Video-Conferencing Technology Hub System that includes the following:

- Visitations
- Interviews
- Conferencing

RESPONSE:

Please see response to Recommendation No. 1.

Coordination Among County Criminal Justice Agencies

Recognizing the need for coordination among criminal justice agencies, the County created the Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee (CCJCC), which is chaired by a member of the Board of Supervisors. One of CCJCC's sub-committees is the Information Systems Advisory Body (ISAB), which is tasked with researching, coordinating, and implementing information systems of benefit to multiple criminal justice agencies. Among other areas, they regularly coordinate efforts in the use of video technology and e-documents.

ISAB, chaired by Sheriff Baca, currently coordinates monthly meetings to foster video use among County agencies. One of the shared efforts involved implementing video arraignment at the Glendale Court to provide for the arraignment of inmates without the need to physically transport them to court.

The group is also working toward coordinating efforts and developing standards. An oversight committee has been established, looking at mid-term strategic plans and a possible MOU. LASD is an integral part of these efforts.

LASD's Efforts

LASD is often at the forefront of implementing technology. Video usage has increased dramatically within LASD.

- Video-conferencing is available within LASD at over 40 sites, permitting video conferences to be held both within LASD and with other County entities. A video bridge and meeting place appliance will greatly improve the ability to host multiple, concurrent conferences. A solution has been identified and funding is being sought to procure it.
- The ability to video conference with outside entities is being developed. Once implemented, this will allow video conferences with entities outside of the County via the public telephone network.
- LASD is reviewing solutions to permit video to be streamed to the public through lasd.org.
- LASD's Data Systems Bureau is working with investigators and technical video evidence experts on a standard video implementation for use in interview rooms.

In addition, LASD is actively participating in other areas noted by the Civil Grand Jury.

- Implementation of e-Subpoena: The system currently allows the District Attorney's Office to send subpoenas electronically to LASD and have them distributed to the appropriate recipients. This will eventually expand to other agencies.
- Development of e-Document standards: LASD currently stores crime reports as electronic images. A project is underway to improve and expand the system.
- Electronic filing: LASD is working with the District Attorney's Office to move toward electronic filing of cases.
- E-Discovery: LASD is working with other criminal justice agencies to deliver discovery documents electronically.

OVERALL

The County is actively pursuing video and other technologies to reduce costs, improve effectiveness, and enhance safety. Many of these efforts are beneficial, but are currently available on a limited basis. We are working to expand our capabilities. As the systems expand, we are placing increasing emphasis on improving interactions with the public – ranging from private attorneys interviewing their clients in jail via video to public inmate visiting, from expanding video-conferencing to presenting large conferences to the public, and from increasing public awareness to providing live news feeds.