### STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD HELD IN ROOM 648 OF THE KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION, 500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

#### ON

#### MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2011, AT 9:30 AM

Present:	Chair John Naimo and John Krattli
Absent:	Laurie Milhiser

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

#### No members of the public addressed the Claims Board.

- 3. Closed Session Conference with Legal Counsel Existing Litigation (Subdivision (a) of Government Code section 54956.9).
  - a. <u>Teresita Ricardo v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u> Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 419 388

This lawsuit arises from personal injuries sustained in a pedestrian versus bus collision involving an employee of the Sheriff's Department.

#### Action Taken:

### The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$200,000.

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: Laurie Milhiser

See Supporting Documents

b. <u>Sonja Davis v. County of Los Angeles</u> Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. GC 045 623

This lawsuit arises from personal injuries sustained in a motor vehicle accident involving an employee of the Sheriff's Department.

#### Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of \$30,680.

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: Laurie Milhiser

#### See Supporting Documents

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

# The Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in closed session as indicated under Agenda Item No. 3 above.

5. Approval of the minutes of the April 4, 2011, meeting of the Claims Board.

#### Action Taken:

### The minutes of the April 4, 2011 meeting of the Claims Board were approved as follows:

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: Laurie Milhiser

#### 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.

#### No such matters were discussed.

7. Adjournment.

#### CASE SUMMARY

#### INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME

CASE NUMBER

COURT

DATE FILED

COUNTY DEPARTMENT

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY

NATURE OF CASE

Teresita Ricardo v. County of Los Angeles, et al.

BC419388

Los Angeles County Superior Court Central District

August 6, 2009

Sheriff

\$ 200,000.00

Levin & Hoffman, LLP

Vicki Kozikoujekian Principal Deputy County Counsel (213) 974-8208

On December 12, 2008, a Sheriff's Deputy, while in the course and scope of his employment, was driving a Sheriff's Transportation Sevices Bureau bus when it collided with Plaintiff, a pedestrian, while he was making a left turn from First Street onto Spring Street.

Plaintiff claims that the Sheriff's Deputy negligently made a left turn at the intersection, without yielding the right-of-way. The County claims that the Sheriff's Deputy was following an MTA bus which made the same left turn. Moreover, Plaintiff should have

seen the MTA bus and the Sheriff's bus. But for Plaintiff being inattentive, the incident could have been avoided.

Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, the Sheriff's Department proposes a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$200,000.

#### PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE

#### PAID COSTS, TO DATE

\$ 52,462.57

\$ 9,305.08

Case Name: Teresita Ricardo v. County of Los Angeles, et al.

#### **Summary Corrective Action Plan**



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

Date of incident/event:	Friday, December 12, 2008; 6:25 a.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event.	<u>Teresita Ricardo v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u> Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2011-005
	On Friday, December 12, 2008, at approximately 6:25 a.m., a Los Angeles County deputy sheriff was driving a County of Los Angeles- owned transportation bus east on First Street, west of Spring Street, Los Angeles. As the deputy sheriff turned north onto Spring Street, the bus he was driving struck a pedestrian walking east in the marked, east-west crosswalk.

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

A public entity is responsible for the negligent acts of its employees when the acts are committed in the course and scope of employment.

This traffic collision was investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles Police Department. Their investigation concluded that the deputy sheriff caused the traffic collision by violating California Vehicle Code section 21950(a), Right-of-Way at Crosswalks.

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:

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

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department had relevant policies and procedure/protocols in effect at the time of this incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's training curriculum addresses the circumstances which occurred in this incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's administrative review revealed employee misconduct. Appropriate administrative action was taken.

This section intentionally left blank.

#### CASE SUMMARY

#### **INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION**

CASE NAME

CASE NUMBER

COURT

DATE FILED

COUNTY DEPARTMENT

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY

NATURE OF CASE

Sonja Davis v. County of Los Angeles, et al.

GC045623

Los Angeles Superior Court

7/19/2010

Sheriff's Department

\$ 30,680

David Mamann, Esq.

Brian T. Chu

Principal Deputy County Counsel

On August 21, 2008, Sonja Davis alleges she was stopped in her vehicle in the northbound lane of Casitas Avenue on a red traffic signal at its intersection with Woodbury Road, in Altadena. When the traffic signal turned green she entered the intersection.

At the same time, a Sheriff's deputy driving a marked patrol unit was traveling westbound on Woodbury Road. The deputy was momentarily distracted when he glanced at the unit's mobile data terminal for information. Ms. Davis alleges that, by the time the patrol

unit reached the intersection, the traffic signal for westbound traffic had changed to red. The two vehicles collided within the intersection.

Ms. Davis contends that the deputy was negligent in the operation of the patrol unit and that the County is vicariously liable for the deputy's negligence.

As a result of the collision, Ms. Davis claims soft tissue injuries to her neck and back which required chiropractic treatment. She incurred medical expenses and loss of earnings in the total amount of \$14,717.05.

Due to the inherent risks and uncertainties involved in proceeding with a trial, the potential liability and potential exposure to an adverse verdict, the County entered into settlement negotiations and developed this recommended settlement with the Ms. Davis.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE

#### PAID COSTS, TO DATE

\$ 0

\$ 0

Case Name: Sonja Davis 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 <u>confidentiality</u>, please consult County Counsel.

Date of incident/event:	Thursday, August 21, 2008, at 12:05 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Sonia Davis vs. County of Los Angeles Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2011-001 On Thursday, August 21, 2008, at approximately 12:05 p.m., an on duty Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department employee was driving a Los Angeles County-owned marked black and white vehicle west on Woodbury Road, when the vehicle he was driving collided with a vehicle traveling north on Casitas Avenue, Altadena (Unincorporated Los Angeles County).

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

A public entity is responsible for the negligent acts of its employees when the acts are committed in the course and scope of employment.

As a result of this traffic collision, the plaintiff was transported to a local hospital for treatment of her injuries.

The vehicle in which the plaintiff was traveling, a 1999 Chevrolet Astro, California License Number 7E79466, sustained moderate damage.

The vehicle the Los Angeles County employee was driving, a 2002 Ford Crown Victoria, California License Number 1131042, sustained moderate damage.

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

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department had relevant policies and procedures/protocols in effect at the time of this incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's training curriculum addresses the circumstances which occurred in this incident.

This traffic collision was thoroughly investigated by representatives of the California Highway Patrol

and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. Their investigations concluded that the Los Angeles County employee caused the collision by violating California Vehicle Code Section 21453(a), Circular Red or Red Arrow.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's administrative review revealed employee misconduct. Appropriate administrative action was taken.

3. State if the corrective actions are applicable to only your department or other County departments: (If unsure, please contact the Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch for assistance)

Potentially has Countywide implications.

Potentially has an implication to other departments (i.e., all human services, all safety departments, or one or more other departments).

Does not appear to have Countywide or other department(s) implications.

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)	•
Shaun J. Mathers, Captain Risk Management Bureau	· ·
Signature:	Date:
J~J.@	1/26/11
Name: (Department Head)	
Roberta A. Abner, Chief Leadership and Training Division	
Signature: Rabertal. Abner	Date:

#### **Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch**

Name: COSTANTINO 150 Signature: Date: 7/11

3. State if the corrective actions are applicable to only your department or other County departments: (If unsure, please contact the Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch for assistance).

Potentially has Countywide implications.

Potentially has an implication to other departments (i.e., all human services, all safety departments, or one or more other departments).

Does not appear to have Countywide or other department(s) implications.

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)		
Shaun J. Mathers, Captain Risk Management Bureau		
Signature:	Date:	
5-7-D	3/14/11	
Name: (Department Head)		
Roberta A. Abner, Chief Leadership and Training Division		
Signature:	Date:	
Jahurta I. abren	3/15/11	

**Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch** 

Name: LEO COSTANTINO		
Signature:	Date: 3/31/2011	
I:Risk Mgt. Inspector General/CAP-SCAP-RECAP/Summary Corrective Action Plan Form 2-01-10 (Final).docx		

#### COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

#### MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

April 4, 2011

#### 1. Call to Order.

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:34 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: John Naimo, John Krattli and Laurie Milhiser.

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Jonathan McCaverty, Roger Granbo, Vicki Kozikoujekian, Grace Chang, Manuel Valenzuela, Jr., Narbeh Bagdasarian, Mary Wickham, and Stacey Lee; Sheriff's Department: Lt. Pat Hunter; Department of Public Works: Michael Hays; Chief Executive Office: Fern Taylor and Jacqueline White; Department of Health Services: Kim McKenzie and Rima Matevosian; Department of Children and Family Services: Wanda Hazel and Loreta Babakhanyan; Office of Affirmative Action: David Kim; Outside Counsel: Diana Ratcliff.

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

#### No members of the public addressed the Claims Board.

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

#### At 9:40 a.m., the Chairperson adjourned the meeting into Closed Session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(f) below.

4 Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

### At 11:25 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

a. <u>Catherine Nazarian v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u> Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 350 613

This lawsuit concerns allegations of false arrest and illegal seizure of property by Sheriff's Deputies.

#### Action Taken:

### The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of \$50,000.

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: None

b. <u>Linda Williams-Theule, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u> Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. PC 045 530

This lawsuit arises from injuries sustained in a traffic collision involving an employee of the Department of Public Works.

#### Action Taken:

### The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of \$82,000.

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: None

c. <u>Audit of Charter Communications Cable Franchise Agreements</u>

This matter concerns cable franchise payments owed to the County by Charter Communications, Inc.

#### Action Taken:

### The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter whereby the County will receive \$17,000.

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: None

d. <u>Ramiro Polanco and Ana Linares v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u> Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. PC 046 592

This lawsuit concerns the care provided to a patient at the Olive View Medical Center.

#### Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$198,000 plus assumption of the Medi-Cal lien in the amount of \$8,894.79.

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: None

e. <u>Rachel Alexander v. County of Los Angeles</u> Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 432 022

> This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to disability discrimination, failure to accommodate, and failure to engage in the interactive process. (Continued from the Special Meeting of February 10, 2011.)

#### Action Taken:

### The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of \$50,500.

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: None

f. Claim of Joel Gordon

This claim concerns allegations that an employee of the Office of Public Safety was subjected to sexual harassment.

#### Action Taken:

### The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$200,000.

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: None

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

The Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in closed session as indicated under Agenda Item No. 3 above.

5. Approval of the minutes of the March 21, 2011, meeting of the Claims Board.

#### Action Taken:

## The minutes of the March 21, 2011 meeting of the Claims Board were approved as follows:

Vote: Unanimously carried

Absent: None

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 11:30 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

Bv Renee F. Mendoza