CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CLAIMS BOARD

500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

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

NOTICE OF MEETING

The County of Los Angeles Claims Board will hold its regular meeting on **Monday, December 19, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.**, in the Executive Conference Room, 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

AGENDA

- Call to Order.
- Opportunity for members of the public to address the Claims Board on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Claims Board.
- 3. Closed Session Conference with Legal Counsel Existing Litigation (Subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9).
 - a. 1957 Delamo, LLC aka 1957 Del Amo, LLC v. County of Los Angeles, et al
 Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 588 817

This lawsuit alleges that the Treasurer and Tax Collector wrongly cancelled Plaintiff's existing County business licenses resulting in the closing of Plaintiff's business and loss of income; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$99,999.

See Supporting Document

b. <u>Veronica Barragan v. County of Los Angeles</u>
 Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. MC 020 485

This dangerous condition lawsuit against the Department of Public Works arises from injuries sustained in a single-vehicle accident in the unincorporated area of the County; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$3,000,000.

See Supporting Documents

Chedmond Lee v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
 Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 533 093

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Fire Department utility truck; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$400,000.

See Supporting Document

d. <u>Lorae Bermudez and Thomas Kim v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u> Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 564 012

This lawsuit arises from damages and injuries sustained when Plaintiff was run over by a Fire Department Lifeguard's vehicle; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$1,700,000.

See Supporting Documents

e. <u>Kathryn Stocks v. County of Los Angeles</u>
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 585 399

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Fire Department was subjected to disability discrimination, retaliation, and failure to reasonable accommodation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$300,000.

- 4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.
- 5. Approval of the minutes of the December 5, 2016, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

See Supporting Document

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

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME 1957 Delamo, LLC aka 1957 Del Amo, LLC v.

County of Los Angeles

CASE NUMBER BC588817

COURT Los Angeles Superior Court - Central District

DATE FILED July 29, 2015

COUNTY DEPARTMENT Treasurer and Tax Collector

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT \$ 99,999

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF John J. Gulino

COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY Sayuj Panicker

Deputy County Counsel

NATURE OF CASE Plaintiff, 1957 Delamo, LLC aka 1957 Del Amo, LLC

("Plaintiff"), alleges that in November 2014, the Treasurer and Tax Collector wrongly cancelled Plaintiff's existing County business licenses for public eating and adult entertainment. As a result, Plaintiff claims that it was unable to operate its business for close to three months. Plaintiff filed a complaint against the County seeking damages for loss of income for the three months it did not operate, and for loss of clientele after Plaintiff

resumed its business in January 2015.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE \$ 65,569.72

PAID COSTS, TO DATE \$ 16,725.51

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME

Veronica Barragan v. County of Los Angeles

CASE NUMBER

MC020485

COURT

Los Angeles Superior Court

DATE FILED

May 29, 2009

COUNTY DEPARTMENT

Department of Public Works

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT

\$ 3,000,000

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

Donald G. Liddy, Esq.

COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY

Michael J. Gordon Senior Associate County Counsel

NATURE OF CASE

On the evening of April 12, 2007, Veronica Barragan was driving eastbound on Palmdale Avenue, west of 230th Street East, in the unincorporated County area, when she realized she was driving in the wrong direction. She then made a U-turn and returned in the westbound direction. For an unknown reason, Ms. Barragan lost control of her vehicle and ran off the road, causing her vehicle to roll and land on the road's dirt shoulder. She received significant injuries resulting in paralysis. She contends that the road existed as a dangerous condition and the County denies that there were any deficiencies in the road.

Due to the inherent risks and uncertainties involved in a trial, and the potential liability and exposure to an adverse verdict, the County proceeded with settlement negotiations and eventually developed this recommended settlement.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE

\$ 542,552

PAID COSTS, TO DATE

\$ 154,004

Summary Corrective Action Plan



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

Date of incident/event:	April 12, 2007
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	On April 12, 2007, at approximately 9:00 p.m., Ms. Veronica Barragan was severely injured (quadriplegia) in a vehicle collision near a curved segment of Palmdale Boulevard, 3,037 feet west of 230th Street East.

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

Ms. Barragan admitted to being distraught and consumed two alcoholic beverages in the hour before the incident. She made an unsafe turning movement, which resulted in the incident collision.

At the time of the incident, standard curve warning and advisory speed signs were in place in advance of both directions through the incident curves. Traffic & Lighting Division performed a Traffic Study that found 14 collisions in the prior five-year period. The collision patterns at the incident curves indicated that additional roadway signage would enhance traffic safety.

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

Traffic & Lighting Division recommended installing chevrons through the incident curves to provide additional emphasis and guidance for the change in horizontal alignment. In December 2010, Operational Services Division Installed 20 chevron signs for east and west traffic directions.

In 2013, based on a subsequent review of the incident curve:

- The existing curve warning signs and advisory speed signs were relocated to be 325 feet in advance of the subject curve in both directions.
- Recessed pavement markers were installed along the centerline of the subject curve.
- Four additional chevron signs were installed for eastbound traffic.

It was alleged that the shoulder slope was too steep. The two foot wide paved shoulders were designed to have the same 2 percent slope as the adjacent twelve foot paved traffic lanes. Therefore the paved shoulders are well within the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) recommended 5 percent maximum slope.

The pavement edge drop off is rolled and not excessive in accordance with standards.

The graded dirt embankment next to the paved shoulder is not part of the roadway and is <u>not</u> a shoulder. The measured embankment slopes along Palmdale Boulevard are less than 25 percent and therefore compliant with AASHTO's Roadside Design Guidelines (RDG) for road-side embankments.

- 3. Are the corrective actions addressing Department-wide system issues?
 - ☐ Yes The corrective actions address Department-wide system issues.
 - ☑ No The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Name: (Department Head) Gail Farber	Signature:	Date:
	Name' (Denadment Head)	9/8/19

1719 6/01/6 W. W.

Chief Execut	tive Office Risk Management Inspecto	or General USE ONLY
Are the correct	ctive actions applicable to other departm	ents within the County?
☐ Yes	s, the corrective actions potentially have	County-wide applicability.
No,	the corrective actions are applicable on	ly to this department.
Name: (Risk Ma	anagement Inspector General)	
Desti	iny Castro	
Signature:	5	Date:
Les	they Castr	6/9/2016
MH:psr p4:\Barragan scal	P (04132016)	1 1

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME

Chedmond Lee v. County of

Los Angeles, et al.

CASE NUMBER

BC 533093

COURT

Los Angeles Superior Court

DATE FILED

January 13, 2014

COUNTY DEPARTMENT

Fire Department

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT

400,000

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

David Olan, Esq. Olan Law Firm

COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY

Adrian G. Gragas

Principal Deputy County Counsel

NATURE OF CASE

This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on December 28, 2012, on Palos Verdes Drive North in the City of Rancho Palos Verdes, when Plaintiff Chedmond Lee was rear-ended by a utiliy truck driven by a Fire Department employee. Mr. Lee claims injuries as a result of the accident.

Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE

\$ 76,790

PAID COSTS, TO DATE

\$ 43,213

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME Lorae Bermudez and Thomas Kim v. County of

Los Angeles, et al.

CASE NUMBER BC 564012

COURT Los Angeles Superior Court

DATE FILED November 17, 2014

COUNTY DEPARTMENT Fire Department Special District - Lifeguard Services

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT \$ 1,700,000

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF Kevin Boyle, Esq.

COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY Richard K. Kudo

Principal Deputy County Counsel

NATURE OF CASE

On September 15, 2014, an on-duty Ocean
Lifeguard Specialist assigned to Venice Beach,

driving a Fire Department-owned light sport utility vehicle, ran over Lorae Bermudez, who was sunbathing on the beach. As a result, she sustained injuries and damages. Her husband, Thomas Kim,

claims loss of consortium damages.

Due to the risks and uncertainties of a trial, a full and

final settlement of the case for the amount of

\$1,700,000 is recommended.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE \$ 86,535

PAID COSTS, TO DATE \$ 26,740

Case Name: Bermudez v. County of Los Angeles

Summary Corrective Action Plan



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

Date of incident/event:	September 15, 2014	
	τς <u>το</u> επ	81
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	An individual was run over by a Lifeguard ve the beach.	hicle while lying on

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

The OLS did not see the plaintiff lying on the sand when she drove the Department vehicle up over a berm onto a flat area of the beach.

- Briefly describe recommended corrective actions: (Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)
 - Replacement of Lifeguard Vehicles January 2016 Lifeguard Chief Steve Mosely
 - Review actions of OLS for possible discipline July 2015 Fire Chief Daryl L. Osby 15 day suspension
 - 3. Daily Vehicle Checks May 2015 Lifeguard Chief Steve Mosely
 - Driver training New vehicles and recurring safety training July 2016 & Recurring Lifeguard Chief Steve Mosely
 - 5. Alternative vehicles for beach driving FY 2016-2017 Lifeguard Chief Steve Mosely
 - Changes to Lifeguard Division Policies and Procedures regarding beach driving September 12, 2016 – Lifeguard Chief Steve Mosely

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Michael Kranther, Division Chief	
Signature: Westwal Hart	Date: 11/21/16
Name: (Cepartment Head) Fire: Chief Daryl L. Osby	
Signature:	Date: 11/21/19
Chilef Executive Office Risk Management Inspector G	
Are the conjective actions applicable to other department	
Mes, the corrective actions potentially have Gore (IV) actions are applicable only it	
Name: (Risk Mariagement Inspector General)	Secretary and the second of the second secon
Dasha Coope	
. 1637// 605//0	

Are the corrective actions addressing department-wide system issues?

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

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

DECEMBER 5, 2016

1. Call to Order.

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

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

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Jonathan McCaverty, Richard Kudo, and Talin Halabi; Sheriff Department: Matthew Burson, Dominic Dannan, and Kevin Pearcy; Department of Public Works: Niall Moynihan, Dòminic Osmena, and David Gonzalez; and Chief Executive Office: David Howard.

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

No members of the public addressed the Claims Board.

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

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

Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

At 10:08 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

a. <u>Micaela Cortez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al</u>
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 532 848

This lawsuit seeks compensation for four minor children and mother for their decedent's alleged wrongful death and federal civil rights violations caused by a Sheriff's Deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$650,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

b. <u>Diana Zepeda v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u>
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 584 329

This dangerous condition lawsuit arises from an alleged trip and fall on a County-maintained sidewalk.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$70,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

c. Claim of County of Los Angeles Against HMC Architects

This matter concerns the recovery of money from HMC Architects arising from their performance of architectural and engineering design services in connection with the refurbishment project at the Department of Medical Examiner-Coroner's Facility.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the acceptance of payment in settlement of this matter in the amount of \$600,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

 Approval of the minutes of the November 21, 2016, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

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

No such matters were discussed.

7. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:09 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

Michelle Ramelot