



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
87.		Oppose	V V Citizen	
		Other	Yolanda Arias	Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide public comment on Item 87, draft LA County ordinance to create an Office of County Hearing Officer. We would like clarification regarding what county department administrative hearings will be subject to this ordinance. For example, will this ordinance apply to General Relief hearings? Will it apply to Department of Health Care determinations? While the proposal to create an Office of County Hearing Officer may benefit claimants in some administrative hearing situations such as in LACDA disputes or actions, we have concerns about County Counsel serving as hearing officers in matter involving adverse county actions or determinations. We question whether County Counsel can be an impartial decision maker in such actions. What will happen when an administrative hearing decided by county counsel has to be appealed in court. Perhaps the ordinance should contain language such as : no one acting in this capacity (County Hearing Officer) will represent the county in a court proceeding. We are concerned about County Counsel rubber stamping county department determinations. In our view, the county should seriously consider creating an independent appeals section with decision makers having specific knowledge and expertise in the subject matter in which they are hearing cases. We are also concerned about potential backlogs in a centralized County Administrative Hearing Office. Will the county hire enough staffing to avoid hearing backlogs. In many situations, claimants cannot wait on hearing outcomes. Also, the proposal could undermine advocates efforts to create due process policies specific to administrative hearing processes within specific departments.
		Item Total	2	
Grand Total			2	

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide public comment on Item 87, draft LA County ordinance to create an Office of County Hearing Officer. We would like clarification regarding what county department administrative hearings will be subject to this ordinance. For example, will this ordinance apply to General Relief hearings? Will it apply to Department of Health Care determinations? While the proposal to create an Office of County Hearing Officer may benefit claimants in some administrative hearing situations such as in LACDA disputes or actions, we have concerns about County Counsel serving as hearing officers in matter involving adverse county actions or determinations. We question whether County Counsel can be an impartial decision maker in such actions. What will happen when an administrative hearing decided by county counsel has to be appealed in court. Perhaps the ordinance should contain language such as : no one acting in this capacity (County Hearing Officer) will represent the county in a court proceeding. We are concerned about County Counsel rubber stamping county department determinations. In our view, the county should seriously consider creating an independent appeals section with decision makers having specific knowledge and expertise in the subject matter in which they are hearing cases. We are also concerned about potential backlogs in a centralized County Administrative Hearing Office. Will the county hire enough staffing to avoid hearing backlogs. In many situations, claimants cannot wait on hearing outcomes. Also, the proposal could undermine advocates efforts to create due process policies specific to administrative hearing processes within specific departments.