

February 17, 2012

The Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) 2010-2011 issued its Final Report on June 30, 2011. Pursuant to Penal Section 933 and 933.05, all agencies and elected officials will respond to the final report of the CGJ if any recommendations are made for that particular agency or elected official within the following timeframes:

All agencies responses are due within 90 days of the issuance of the Final Report.

All elected officials responses are due within 60 days of the Final Report.

All agencies and elected officials responded to the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury's report dated June 30, 2011.

Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury
Continuity Committee 2011-2012

Rec'D 7/12/11



July 7, 2011

City of Arcadia

Police Department

Robert Guthrie
Chief of Police

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012-3210

RE: Response to the Civil Grand Jury Recommendations regarding High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age

To the Honorable Presiding Judge,

On behalf of the Arcadia Police Department, I have reviewed the Civil Grand Jury documents regarding High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age. Below you will find each specific Grand Jury recommendation along with our response:

Recommendation # 1: Establish a "High Tech Forensics Bureau."

Response: The recommendation has been implemented. Detective Scott Elenberger is permanently assigned as the High Tech Crimes Investigator and Detective Mike Hale has received training as the back-up for this assignment. Together, they comprise the required "High Tech Forensics Bureau" within the Detective Bureau.

Recommendation # 2: Update regular law enforcement recruit and detective training to include orientation, procedures, protocols and other training with respect to digital evidence.

Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation. Law Enforcement Recruit training is handled through the Department's Field Training Officer (FTO) program. Detectives Elenberger and Hale will work with the FTO manager to develop a block of instruction, which includes an orientation, procedures and protocols overview of digital evidence. This recommendation will be implemented no later than December 31st, 2011. Updates for detectives will be handled in the manner identified in our response to Recommendation # 3.

Honorable Presiding Judge
Page 2
July 7, 2011

Recommendation # 3: Include training in digital evidence collection, analysis and use in “roll call” training.


Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation. Detectives Elenberger and Hale have been tasked to develop “roll-call” training for field and investigative personnel on a yearly basis. This training will take place no later than December 31st, 2011, and will recur annually.

Recommendation # 4: Take steps to acquire the POST certification for High Tech training courses for forensic examiners and cyber investigators to allow for reimbursement of the costs.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented. Detectives Elenberger and Hale have received POST certification through Department of Justice sponsored training. Additionally, Detective Elenberger attends the annual High Tech Crime Investigators Association (HTCIA) conference when it is held in the western United States, which is biennially.

Thank you for the opportunity of participating in this vital report. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Lieutenant Larry Goodman
Detective Bureau Commander
Work Phone: (626) 575-5169

City of Alhambra

Police Department



*Gateway
to the
San Gabriel Valley*

Mark Yokoyama
Chief of Police

211
South First Street
Alhambra
California
91801-3704

626
570-5131

December 12, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Response to 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Final Report/Recommendations

The Honorable Presiding Judge:

I would like to thank you and the Los Angeles County Grand Jury for the investigative thoroughness of the 2010-2011 CGJ Report and for the findings and recommendations. The Alhambra Police Department is working toward implementing the recommended e-subpoena system in the future and currently evaluating funding and the implementation process for the system.

If you have any questions or if I may be of any assistance to you; please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Mark Yokoyama
Chief of Police

MY/la





BELL POLICE DEPARTMENT

6326 PINE AVENUE
BELL, CALIFORNIA 90201
323-585-1245

Anthony Miranda
Captain
Phone: 323-923-2627
tmiranda@cityofbell.org

Steven Finkelstein
Captain
Phone: 323-923-2666
sfinkelstein@cityofbell.org

Ty Henshaw
Lieutenant
Phone: 323-923-2670
thenshaw@cityofbell.org

James Corcoran
Sergeant
Phone: 323-923-2667
jcorcoran@cityofbell.org

Thomas Rodriguez
Sergeant
Phone: 323-585-1245
ext. 333
tdríguez@cityofbell.org

Albert Rusas
Sergeant
Phone: 323-585-1245
ext. 366
arusas@cityofbell.org

Art Jimenez
Sergeant
Phone: 323-585-1245
ext. 250
ajimenez@cityofbell.org

Paul Coulter
Sergeant
Phone: 323-585-1245
ext. 310
pcoulter@cityofbell.org

Jose Jimenez
Sergeant
Phone: 323-585-1245
ext. 362
jimenez@cityofbell.org

Esbeyda Pimentel
Records Manager
Phone: 323-923-2658
epimentel@cityofbell.org

June 30, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, Ca
90012

RE: Civil Grand Jury Report on E-Subpoena

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to verify that The Bell Police Department agrees with the report of the Civil Grand Jury in regards to their findings of the E-Subpoena system currently being explored by the County Courts of Los Angeles.

The Bell Police Department intends to fully cooperate in the implementation of E-Subpoena by the County of Los Angeles. We currently await further direction from the County in regards to the implementation.

If you have any questions please feel free to email me at sfinkelstein@cityofbell.org or call me at my office at 323-585-1245 (ext266).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven Finkelstein", written over a horizontal line.

Steven Finkelstein
Police Captain

Rec'd 9/27/11



David L. Snowden, Chief of Police
Beverly Hills Police Department

September 15, 2011

Presiding Judge Lee S. Edmon
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street,
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012-3210

Re: Implementation of the E-Subpoena program.

Dear Honorable Lee S. Edmon:

Please accept this letter as the official response of the Beverly Hills Police Department to the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury report related to *E-Subpoena: One Way to End the Paper Chase*, pursuant to California Penal code §933(c). According to the report, the Beverly Hills Police Department is required to respond only to Recommendation #1.

Recommendation #1: *Implement e-Subpoena as a cost saving and operational efficiency measure for local law enforcement agencies receiving at least one hundred fifty (150) DA subpoenas quarterly.*

Response: The recommendation requires further analysis by the Beverly Hills Police Department. We have initiated preliminary research efforts in order to better understand the e-Subpoena project and the affects an implementation would have on the Beverly Hills Police Department. As of this writing we have contacted both the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office and a third-party software vendor and received documentation from both entities. We have also entered into preliminary discussions with our Information Technology department to determine the feasibility of implementing this project. Within six months we expect to either, 1) have begun implementation or 2) have established sufficient grounds for non-implementation if it is determined unreasonable.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David L. Snowden", written over a horizontal line.

David L. Snowden
Chief of Police

Rec'd 9/27/11



September 15, 2011

Presiding Judge Lee S. Edmon
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple St.
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012-3210

RE: City of Beverly Hills High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age.

Dear Honorable Lee S. Edmon:

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05(b), the Beverly Hills Police Department hereby responds to the County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury recommendations with respect to High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age.

The Grand Jury made several recommendations, each of which will be separately discussed below:

- a. Establish a "High Tech Forensics Bureau." This will facilitate:
 - i. Promotions and career opportunities for those who are trained and skilled in this area without having to leave the discipline
 - ii. Succession planning and transfer of high tech expertise, preserving the investment made in creating the expertise

The Beverly Hills Police Department is the host for the West Side High Tech Task Force. Although the task force is not formally called a High Tech Bureau, the scope, size and capabilities are commensurate with the intent of creating a High Tech Bureau. This task force comprises investigators from the Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, Culver City Police Departments; as well as the Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department, the United States Secret Service and Immigrations and Customs Enforcement.

We also provide one Detective Supervisor to run and manage the task force. Working in conjunction with the task force, our investigator is able to facilitate all of our high tech investigative needs. We have a well developed succession plan and training program for High Tech Investigators which the department has already exercised successfully.

- b. Update regular law enforcement recruit and detective training to include orientation, procedures, protocol, and other training with respect to digital evidence
- c. Include training in digital evidence collection, analysis and use in "roll call" training

Our High Tech investigators from all participating agencies have in-house training materials that address all of the above recommendations. Roll call training and other High Tech issues are provided and addressed by our high tech investigators. We have access to High Tech training through the Internet Crimes against Children (ICAC) task force, Southern California High Tech Task Force (SCHTTF), and Electronic Crimes Task Force (ECTF) as needed. As a department, we regularly budget and send officers and investigators to formal High Tech training courses provided by POST and other training sources.

- d. Take steps to acquire POST certification for High Tech training courses for forensic examiners and cyber investigators to allow for reimbursement of the costs

Although our department has hosted POST approved high tech training, we do not have any POST approved trainers or training courses. This is an area that the West Side High Tech Task Force can leverage and help improve training in nearby jurisdictions. We will work to use our current experts for future regional training.

Sincerely,



David L. Snowden

Chief of Police



BELL GARDENS
POLICE DEPARTMENT

7100 So. Garfield Avenue
Bell Gardens, California 90201-3293
Telephone (562) 806-7600

February 22, 2012

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street,
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Presiding Judge of the Superior Court:

Please accept my sincere apology for the lateness of this response to the recommendations in the Grand Jury Report released on June 30, 2011.

The Bell Gardens Police Department did in fact receive and review the Grand Jury Report regarding the recommendation for the police department to implement the Los Angeles County e-Subpoena system. Prior to receiving the report we were actively researching the feasibility of implementing the e-Subpoena system and continued to do so after receiving the Grand Jury Report.

Although I strongly support this program, our research revealed that the initial start-up costs associated with implementing the e-Subpoena system at the Bell Gardens Police Department would be in excess of \$10,000.00, and the yearly maintenance costs would be nearly \$1,500.00. Given the current fiscal crisis, the City of Bell Gardens has been forced to make drastic cuts to programs and services. Unfortunately we do not have sufficient funds in our budget to cover the costs for this program and therefore are unable to implement the e-Subpoena system during this fiscal year. We will, however, continue to explore the possibility of setting aside appropriate funds in the future to implement the e-Subpoena system.

Please feel free to contact me at (562) 806-7691 with any questions or concerns that you may have about this response.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Barnes
Chief of Police

Rec'd 9/8/11



POLICE DEPARTMENT
200 North Third Street, Burbank, California 91510
www.burbankusa.com

September 8, 2011

Lee Smalley Edmon, Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Re: RESPONSE TO 2010-2011 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT'S
RECOMMENDATION TO IMPLEMENT E-SUBPOENA SYSTEM

Dear Judge Edmon:

This letter is to acknowledge that the Burbank Police Department has received a copy of the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury's 2010/2011 Final Report. We have reviewed the Report's recommendation to implement the e-Subpoena system and agree its implementation may be beneficial.

The Burbank Police Department has conducted a preliminary review of the system, including an on-site demonstration by the vendor. Although the system will require local oversight and administration, we agree that it may benefit both the District Attorney's Office and the Burbank Police Department. We will also encourage the Burbank City Attorney's Office to consider using the system for their cases.

We are in the process of securing funding and anticipate implementing the e-Subpoena system during the first quarter of 2012. We foresee a few challenges: (1) ensuring timely notifications in a compressed work schedule environment, (2) changing a paper-based culture, and (3) dealing with last minute subpoenas and cancellations.

Despite the challenges, the Burbank Police Department recognizes the need to keep abreast of technology and hopes that the e-Subpoena system will achieve operational efficiency and reduce court overtime costs.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Scott LaChasse'.

Scott LaChasse
Chief of Police

THE CELEBRATION OF A CENTURY

ad

rec'd 11/28/11



CITY OF COVINA

444 North Citrus Avenue • Covina, California 91723-2065 • (626) 331-3391

POLICE DEPARTMENT
Kim J. Raney
Chief of Police

November 17, 2011

Joe Safier, Foreperson
2010-2011 Los Angeles County
Civil Grand Jury
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Safier:

The Covina Police Department agrees with the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury findings related to the benefits of the e-Subpoena system.

The City of Covina Police Department has recently implemented a new automated system provided by Webiplex LLC named DocuPeak. This system is being used to automate review of parking citation administrative review requests and includes import of online requests from the public. This same system can be configured to add an application for Subpoena Management that includes e-delivery of subpoenas from the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office. We are in the process of reviewing our business processes and discussing with other Police Departments their experience with this system and converting to a paperless process. We anticipate replacing our manual, paper-based subpoena process with an electronic image-based workflow system during the 4th quarter of 2011.

Sincerely,

Kim J. Raney
Chief of Police

JC:dq

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
November 17, 2011
Page 2


In a letter of November 1, 2011, this Office indicated that it would keep the Court and the Grand Jury advised of the progress of this matter until the response of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners was filed.

We can report that the Board considered a preliminary draft prepared by staff at its regular meeting on November 15, 2011. While it had been anticipated that all Board members would be present, only three (but still a quorum) were present. The draft response was discussed by the members present, but no action was taken at that time to approve a response.

The Board will require additional time to consider its response and have the matter before the Board when more members are present. In consideration of the Holidays, the Board meets only once in December. The Board deferred consideration until a meeting in January.

This Office will continue to keep the Court and the Grand Jury advised of the progress of this matter until the Board's response is filed.

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD M. BROWN
General Counsel
Department of Water and Power

cc: Thomas S. Sayles
President
Board of Water and Power Commissioners

Ronald O. Nichols
General Manager
Department of Water and Power



**POLICE DEPARTMENT
CITY OF CULVER CITY**

INVESTIGATIONS
BUREAU

(310) 253-6300
FAX (310) 253-6115

DONALD PEDERSEN
Chief of Police

August 9, 2011

Presiding Judge Lance Ito
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple St.,
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012-3210

RE: City of Culver City High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the
Digital Age

Dear Honorable Lance Ito:

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05(b), the Culver City Police Department hereby responds to the County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury recommendations with respect to High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age.

The Grand Jury made several recommendations, each of which will be separately discussed below:

- a. Establish a "High Tech Forensics Bureau." This will facilitate:
 - i. Promotions and career opportunities for those who are trained and skilled in this area without having to leave the discipline
 - ii. Succession planning and transfer of high tech expertise, preserving the investment made in creating the expertise

The Culver City Police Department is a participating agency in the West Side Regional High Tech Task Force. This task force is hosted by the Beverly Hills Police Department



DONALD PEDERSEN
Chief of Police

POLICE DEPARTMENT
CITY OF CULVER CITY

INVESTIGATIONS
BUREAU

(310) 253-6300
FAX (310) 253-6115

and is made up of investigators from the Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, and Culver City Police Departments; as well as the Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department and the United States Secret Service. We provide one Culver City investigator to the task force who works in such capacity on a part-time basis. Working in conjunction with the task force, our investigator is able to facilitate all of our high tech investigative needs. Because of this, and in light of our current fiscal situation, the establishment of a High Tech Forensics Bureau would be neither reasonable nor responsible.

- b. Update regular law enforcement recruit and detective training to include orientation, procedures, protocol, and other training with respect to digital evidence
- c. Include training in digital evidence collection, analysis and use in "roll call" training

Our High Tech investigator is currently creating in-house training materials that, when completed, will address all of the above recommendations. Roll call training and other High Tech issues are provided and addressed by our investigator. We also have access to High Tech training through the West Side Regional High Tech Task Force as needed. As a department, we regularly send officers and investigators to formal High Tech training courses provided by POST and other training sources.

- d. Take steps to acquire POST certification for High Tech training courses for forensic examiners and cyber investigators to allow for reimbursement of the costs

Being as we have accesses to the aforementioned training opportunities, the Culver City Police Department does not provide formal High Tech training.

Feel free to contact the undersigned if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Scott Pixby
FOR Scott Pixby

Assistant Chief of Police

SB/JW/js



CITY OF CULVER CITY CULVER CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT



FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

Date: **01/31/12**

To:

Name **Natalie**

Organization **Civil Grand Jury**

Location.....

Fax #..... **(213) 229-2595**

From:

Name **Sgt. J. Sims #836**

Organization **Culver City Police Department**

Location..... **Culver City, California 90232**

Fax #..... **(310) 253-6115 Detectives**

Return Phone # **(310) 253-6306**

Number of pages: (including cover sheet)

Special Instructions

Culver City Police Department
 4040 Duquesne Avenue
 Culver City, CA 90232
 Telephone (310) 837-1221
 Fax (310) 253-6115 - Detectives
 Fax (310) 253-6117 - Records



City of Downey

MAILED
9-13-11
FUTURE UNLIMITED

July 20, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street,
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Your Honor,


In June, 2011, The Downey Police Department received a copy of the County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury report detailing their investigation into the "High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age" within Los Angeles County. Per California Penal Code section 933, The City of Downey and The Downey Police Department are responding to the report.

Upon reviewing the grand jury's investigation, we conclude the following sections applied directly to The Downey Police Department; 2a, 2b, 2c, and section 2d. We concur with the findings of the Grand Jury in these specific sections.

Sincerely,

Rick Esteves, Chief of Police
Downey Police Department
562-904-2301

Luis H. Marquez, Mayor
City of Downey
562-904-7274



GARDENA POLICE DEPARTMENT

1718 W. 162nd Street • Gardena, CA 90247

Phone (310) 217-9600 • Fax (310) 217-9638

Rec'd 9/8/11

Edward Medrano, Chief of Police

August 31, 2011

REF: 11-176

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Presiding Judge:

The Gardena Police Department has reviewed the e-Subpoena material provided to the Department by the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury. As the respondent, we agree with the Grand Jury Reports and will establish a timeline for e-Subpoena implementation. A study of our current procedures showed execution of the system would be both feasible and beneficial to the Department.

Currently, the District Attorney's Office and the Public Defender use paper printed subpoenas. The subpoenas are picked up at the Torrance Court and brought back to the Department for logging, and distribution to our personnel and witnesses. There are some instances where we receive subpoenas via FAX or U.S. mail. These subpoenas are also logged in by our subpoena control police assistant, and then physically distributed to our personnel and civil witnesses.

The use of the e-Subpoena system would greatly enhance our ability to get our personnel served in a timelier manner. The system also provides a greater amount of accountability in the proof of service, by complete logging of delivery and receipt.

Once in use, the e-Subpoena system would eliminate the need for our subpoena control police assistant to track and deliver court summons to our officers. The subpoena control police assistant would still be needed for the tracking and the delivery of printed subpoenas to civilian witnesses and victims.

The system does require some interfacing with current IT systems. We spoke with representatives of the Inglewood Police Department and the Culver City Police Department; both agencies are currently using the system. In both instances they spoke very highly of the system and the ease of implementation through an outside vendor, WEBIPLEX in Newport Beach, CA.


"Service with Pride and Professionalism."

Should you require further information, please contact Sergeant Russ Temple, Gardena Police Department Detective Bureau, at (310) 217-9636.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Edward Medrano". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Edward" being more prominent than the last name "Medrano".

Edward Medrano
Chief of Police



CITY OF GLENDORA

150 SOUTH GLENDORA AVE.,
GLENDORA, CALIFORNIA 91741-3498
ROBERT M. CASTRO, CHIEF OF POLICE

POLICE DEPARTMENT

(626) 914-8250
FAX # (626) 963-2154

June 27, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as the Glendora Police Department's response to the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury report for "eSubpoena".


As to recommendation #1, "Implement e-Subpoena as a cost-saving and operational efficiency measure for local law enforcement agencies receiving at least one hundred fifty (150) DA subpoenas quarterly."

We agree with the finding. The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. Since the Glendora Police Department is a small department without dedicated subpoena control officers on staff, we will coordinate with the LA DA office to develop an e-subpoena application in-house, rather than incurring the additional software purchase and maintenance costs associated with a third-party solution which may offset the benefit of the recommendation. Our timeframe for implementation is within 1 year from the date of this mailing.

Please contact me at 626-914-8262 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Castro
Chief of Police



CITY OF GLENDORA

150 SOUTH GLENDORA AVE.,
GLENDORA, CALIFORNIA 91741-3498
ROBERT M. CASTRO, CHIEF OF POLICE

POLICE DEPARTMENT

(626) 914-8250
FAX # (626) 963-2154

June 27, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as the Glendora Police Department's response to the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury report for "eSubpoena".

As to recommendation #1, "Implement e-Subpoena as a cost-saving and operational efficiency measure for local law enforcement agencies receiving at least one hundred fifty (150) DA subpoenas quarterly."

We agree with the finding. The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. Since the Glendora Police Department is a small department without dedicated subpoena control officers on staff, we will coordinate with the LA DA office to develop an e-subpoena application in-house, rather than incurring the additional software purchase and maintenance costs associated with a third-party solution which may offset the benefit of the recommendation. Our timeframe for implementation is within 1 year from the date of this mailing.

Please contact me at 626-914-8262 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Castro
Chief of Police

Rec'd 12/2/11



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
Police Department
Office of the Chief of Police

131 North Isabel Street
Glendale, California 91206-4382
(818) 548-3140
www.ci.glendale.ca.us

November 23, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street,
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Recommendations

Dear Presiding Judge,

On June 23, 2011, the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury made the following recommendations to the Glendale Police Department: 1) Implement e-Subpoena as a cost saving and operational efficiency measure, and 2) Establish a High Tech Forensics Bureau. I have considered these recommendations. I understand the need in law enforcement to provide prosecutorial and defense agencies with an automated means to serve law enforcement officers and I also recognize the value to crime fighting of training our personnel in high tech forensics.

Presently, our ability to implement e-Subpoena and create a High Tech Forensics Bureau is hampered by dramatic cuts over the last three years in the City of Glendale Police Department's budget, along with a significant reduction in our staffing of sworn positions. As a result, we are fiscally unable to consider implementing these recommendations at this time absent a funding source.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. DePompa
Chief of Police

RLD: rsb

C: Mr. Bob Cremer, Chairperson, Continuity Committee
2011-2012 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

Rec'd 12/2/11



CITY OF INGLEWOOD

One W. Manchester Boulevard, Suite 860, Inglewood, CA 90301-1750

Office of the City Attorney

Cal P. Saunders
City Attorney

Tel: (310) 412-8672
Fax: (310) 412-8865
www.cityofinglewood.org

November 29, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street,
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: E-Subpoena

Dear Presiding Judge:

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05(b), the City of Inglewood, City Attorney's Office hereby responds to the County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury's recommendation with respect to the use of e-subpoenas.

The Grand Jury was encouraging the City Attorney/City Prosecutor to use the system (e-subpoena) where the Police Department is using e-subpoena.

The Inglewood City Attorney's Office is committed to using e-subpoena within the confines of the City's current budgetary constraints. The City Attorney's Office expects to be able to use e-subpoena in the early part of 2012.

Sincerely,

Kenneth R. Campos
Chief Assistant City Attorney

Rec'd 8/11/11

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

P. O. Box 30158
Los Angeles, CA 90030
Telephone: (213) 486-0150
TDD: (877) 275-5273
Ref #: 1.14

ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
Mayor

August 5, 2011

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Presiding Judge, Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012-3210

Dear Judge Edmon:

In the County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury final report dated June 30, 2011, the Civil Grand Jury provided three recommendations for the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD or Department) to implement E-Subpoenas, Hi-Tech Forensics and Jails. The following is LAPD's response to the recommendations:

E-Subpoenas

Recommendation 3. LASD and LAPD evaluate electronically transmitting other documents such as police reports and probable cause determinations among law enforcement agencies, prosecutors and the Court.

LAPD's Response: The Department agrees with the finding. The recommendation has not yet been implemented. The recommendation requires changes in the long standing procedures at the courts, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and LAPD. The Department is presently investigating the possibility of providing more services in six to twelve months to the public and other law enforcement agencies electronically. These include electronic filing and requesting of police reports, electronic case filing with the Offices of the District Attorney and City Attorney and systems to notify detectives of results from fingerprint and other forensic investigations. These projects are in the early stages of development and in many cases will require cooperation or joint development with various agencies and municipalities. Documents such as Probable Cause Determinations cannot be electronically distributed since the Courts require the original report.

Hi-Tech Forensics

Recommendation 2a. Establish a "High Tech Forensics Bureau." This will facilitate:

- i. Promotions and career opportunities for those who are trained and skilled in this area without having to leave the discipline.*
- ii. Succession planning and transfer of high tech expertise, preserving the investment made in creating the expertise.*

LAPD's Response: The Department agrees with the finding that a "High Tech Forensics Bureau" should be established to facilitate the aforementioned advantages. The Department already has a Scientific Investigation Division (SID) whose areas of responsibility include the collection and analysis of forensic evidence, staffed by highly trained civilian employees. Therefore, the recommendation to establish a bureau will be considered as implemented.

Recommendation 2b. Update regular law enforcement recruit and detective training to include orientation, procedures, protocols and other training with respect to digital evidence.

LAPD's Response: The Department agrees with the finding and has implemented the recommendation. In November 2010, the Recruit Lesson Plan was updated to include orientation, procedures, protocols and other training with respect to digital evidence. In December 2010, Special Order No. 34 was published, delineating the procedures for the retrieval and booking of audio and video evidence. This order was issued to all LAPD employees via the Learning Management System.

Recommendation 2c. Include training in digital evidence collection, analysis and use in "roll call" training.

LAPD's Response: The Department partially agrees with the finding and has implemented part of the recommendation. From January 2011 through June 2011, SID provided roll call training to employees assigned to Office of Operations and Detective Bureau on the digital multimedia evidence retrieval. The analysis of digital evidence remains the responsibility of SID and therefore the analysis of digital training was not provided.

Recommendation 2d. Take steps to acquire the POST certification for High Tech training courses for forensic examiners and cyber investigators to allow for reimbursement of the costs.

LAPD's Response: The Department does not agree with the finding and will not implement the recommendation. Scientific Investigation Division staff requires significant technical training and continuing education to develop and maintain their expertise. To fulfill this need, the Narcotics Analysis Laboratory Trust Fund (NALTF) was created in the late 1990's to fund narcotics related analysis and equipment, in addition to training opportunities for all members of SID. Approximately \$150,000 is available through NALTF for training each fiscal year. Furthermore, SID staff also attends training and continuing education events funded through State and federal grants.

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon

Page 3

1.14

Technical training is also available through the California Criminalistic Institute, State of California Department of Justice, and Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Robert Presley Institute of Criminal Investigations at no cost to POST supported or State of California based law enforcement agencies. Since there are sufficient funding available for SID personnel and non-SID personnel to attend high technology courses, the recommendation will not be implemented.

Jails Committee

Recommendation 3a. West Los Angeles Police Department – To establish continuous training for the staff:

- i. To ensure they are informed of the results of the previous Correctional Standards Report*
- ii. To ensure that staff adhere to the recommendations made in the previous Correctional Standards Report*


Recommendation 3b. Establish a central location for safety gear.

LAPD's Response: The Department does not agree with the finding and Recommendations 3a and 3b. The Civil Grand Jury visited West Los Angeles Area Community Police Station (WLA CPS) to inspect their jail for housing conditions, medical needs, food, staff training, safety and fire procedures, administrative processes and guidelines, as well as inmate living needs. West Los Angeles Area Community Police Station did not have a jail and had informed the Civil Grand Jury accordingly. However, the Civil Grand Jury continued their inspection and found WLA CPS staff not well versed in the existing jail policies and procedures. Since WLA CPS did not have a jail, the employees were neither expected to know nor responsible for knowing jail policies and procedures such as housing conditions, medical needs, food, staff training, safety and fire procedures, administrative processes and guidelines, as well as inmate living needs. Therefore, LAPD will not implement Recommendations 3a and 3b.

Note: The report referred to WLA CPS as West Los Angeles Police Department. West Los Angeles Area Community Police Station personnel confirmed that an inspection was conducted by the Civil Grand Jury. There is no West Los Angeles Police Department.

Should you have any questions or require further information, please have a member of your staff contact Police Administrator Gerald L. Chaleff, Special Assistant for Constitutional Policing, at (213) 486-8730.

Very truly yours,


CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Rec'd 8/5/11



POLICE DEPARTMENT
City of Manhattan Beach

420 15th Street
MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90266
(310) 802-5103 FAX (310) 802-5101

EVE R. IRVINE
CHIEF OF POLICE



August 4, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012

Dear Presiding Judge:

We recently received the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report. The report makes the recommendation that the City of Manhattan Beach Police Department implement e-Subpoena as a cost saving and operational efficiency measure. In addition, the report recommends the City Attorney / City Prosecutor utilize the e-Subpoena system in locations wherein the police department is using the system.

I have reviewed the report and agree that the e-Subpoena system could benefit our Department in the area of cost savings and improved efficiency.

As a result of the Grand Jury recommendation, I have instructed my staff to begin an analysis of the e-Subpoena program to determine whether we should implement the program here at the Manhattan Beach Police Department. I have asked that the review be completed within six months of the date of the Grand Jury report. This analysis and implementation review is to be completed by December 30, 2011.


I want to thank you for bringing this new e-Subpoena program to my attention and I will be anxiously awaiting the results of our analysis of this program.

Thank you,

EVE R. IRVINE
CHIEF OF POLICE

"Policing through Partnerships"

rec'd 8/5/11



City of
HUNTINGTON PARK California
POLICE DEPARTMENT

6542 MILES AVENUE, HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIFORNIA 90255-4386
TEL. (323) 826-6629 • FAX (323) 826-6680

JORGE CISNEROS
CHIEF OF POLICE

August 3, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortage Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012-3210

**Re: Response to Recommendations by the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil
Grand Jury**

To Whom it May Concern:

On June 30, 2010, the Huntington Park Police Department received a portion of the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report that affects this agency.

The Huntington Park Police Department is responding to recommendation number one; *Implement e-subpoena as a cost saving and operational efficiency measure for local law enforcement agencies receiving at least one hundred fifty (150) DA subpoenas quarterly.*

The Huntington Park Police Department agrees with the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury recommendations in regards to recommendation number one, in fact we were in the process of evaluating the e-subpoena system prior to the recommendations and are supportive of this efficiency measure.

The Huntington Park Police Department is currently working with a third party vendor to implement the e-subpoena system. We anticipate this system to be fully functional within the next 90 days and will notify you once the program has been fully implemented.

If we can be of any further assistance please contact Lieutenant Anthony Porter at (323)826-6641

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jorge Cisneros', written over a horizontal line.

Jorge Cisneros
Chief of Police

JC/AP
laccgjresp

RECEIVED
9/16/2011

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

Jaime de la Vega
GENERAL MANAGER



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
100 S. Main St., 10th Floor
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

(213) 972-8480
FAX (866) 530-3154

ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
MAYOR

September 28, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Court
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012-3210

Subject: **Response to "Final Report, 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury, County of Los Angeles", June 30, 2011 re: Preferential Parking**

Your Honor:

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation's response to the Civil Grand Jury's (CGJ) findings and recommendations are attached.

Feel free to contact me at (213) 972-8448 or jaime.delavega@lacity.org or Assistant General Manager Amir Sedadi at (213) 972-8422 or amir.sedadi@lacity.org if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,



Jaime de la Vega
General Manager

Enclosure

cc: Amir Sedadi, Assistant General Manager
Tamara Martin, Parking Permits Division

Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) Response to "Final Report, 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury, County of Los Angeles", June 30, 2011 re: Preferential Parking

For purposes of the following responses, LADOT assumed that the term "PPD" refers to temporary preferential parking district 130 and petition activity surrounding sign posting on the 1600 block of Hi-Point Street.

Finding 1

LADOT agrees with the finding.

Note that the issue reviewed by the CGJ focused on whether or not signs should be posted in an existing temporary preferential parking district.

Finding 2a

LADOT agrees with the finding, as it relates to the department received an incomplete petition in 2008.

Finding 2b

LADOT agrees with the finding, as it relates to a request to post signs, not "installation of a PPD".

Finding 2c

LADOT agrees with the finding, as it relates to sign posting, not "establishment of a PPD".

Finding 3

LADOT has no position on the finding. LADOT has no record of the stated "attempts by residents to get the reasons for rescindment [of the request for sign posting]".

Finding 4

LADOT agrees with the finding, as it relates to canceling the July 29, 2010 approval of sign posting. LADOT notified all the affected residents in writing that the sign posting was imminent, but did not notify the affected residents when a counter-petition opposing sign posting was verified and the sign posting canceled. LADOT agrees that residents should have been informed.

Recommendation 1

LADOT agrees with the conclusion, but the reason for the waiting period is explained below. The particular case reviewed by the CGJ involved a dormant file, originally submitted (albeit incomplete) in 2008. One of the two blocks was verified in 2009 after a complete application was received and LADOT delayed implementation of both blocks pending verification of the second block. When the second block could not be verified, sign installation for the first block was approved in 2010 and all affected residents were notified. A counter-petition was received and verified before signs were installed, therefore the installation was cancelled.

Recommendation 2

LADOT agrees with the recommendation, but will not implement in the foreseeable future due to budgetary and staff constraints.

#

**BOARD OF FIRE
COMMISSIONERS**

GENETHIA HUDLEY-HAYES
PRESIDENT

CASIMIRO U. TOLENTINO
VICE PRESIDENT

DIANA M. BONTA
ANDREW FRIEDMAN
JILL FURILLO

LETICIA GOMEZ
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT I

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
MAYOR

Rec'd 10/4/11
FIRE DEPARTMENT

BRIAN L. CUMMINGS
FIRE CHIEF

200 NORTH MAIN STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

(213) 978-3800
FAX: (213) 978-3815

[HTTP://WWW.LAFD.ORG](http://www.lafd.org)

September 27, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street,
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Subject: RESPONSE TO THE FINAL 2010-2011 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT
RECOMMENDATIONS (e-Subpoena)**

The Final Report of the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Report puts forth a number of recommendations related to the implementation of a computerized automated system (e-Subpoena) to manage the issuance and tracking of subpoenas issued by the Los Angeles County District Attorney's office to law enforcement agencies throughout the county of Los Angeles.

The Final Report of the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Report identifies the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) as one of the agencies required to provide a written response to Recommendation number one (1) of the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Report.

Recommendation number one (1) reads as follows:

"Implement e-Subpoena as a cost saving and operational efficiency measure for local law enforcement agencies receiving at least one hundred fifty (150) DA subpoenas quarterly."

The finding of an internal LAFD assessment of the implementation of the e-Subpoena program suggest that the implementation of the e-Subpoena program is not feasible at this time due to limited financial resources and additional staffing requirements.

The LAFD estimated the following financial expenditures in order to implement e-Subpoena:

1. Roughly \$75,000 to \$100,000 is required to procure new hardware, software and network equipment to operate an in-house e-Subpoena application.
2. Approximately \$80,000 to \$90,000 would also be required to procure the additional Microsoft Active Directory (AD) licenses to provide e-mail licenses to LAFD members who do not have a department issued e-mail account.
3. Two to three additional positions would be needed to meet the minimum staffing needs required to manage and support the e-Subpoena program.

Although the LAFD cannot implement the e-Subpoena program at this time due to the current fiscal constraints, it recognizes the value and efficiencies derived from the use of a program such as e-Subpoena and will look into the implementation and deployment of e-Subpoena in the near future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "BRIAN L. CUMMINGS", written over a circular stamp or mark.

BRIAN L. CUMMINGS
Fire Chief

Rec'd 10/11/11



LEROY D. BACA, SHERIFF

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



September 30, 2011

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmond
Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012-3210

Dear Judge Edmond:

2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ELECTRONIC LEGAL SERVICE AND LEGAL DOCUMENT DELIVERY

This is in response to your memorandum dated July 18, 2011, directing a written response to Recommendations 3 and 4 of the 2010-2011 Grand Jury report entitled "E-Subpoena One Way to End the Paper Chase." These recommendations pertain to the utilization of electronic means to accomplish legal service transactions and delivery of legal documents between justice agencies and the courts.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and Los Angeles Police Department evaluate electronically transmitting documents such as police reports and probable cause determinations among law enforcement agencies, prosecutors and the Court.

RESPONSE

The Information Systems Advisory Body (ISAB) of the Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee, which represents a number of County agencies including the Sheriff, Judges, District Attorney and Public Defender, is in the process of implementing this recommendation. ISAB has identified several electronic Probable Cause Determination (ePCD) service and delivery system implementation options including development of a system utilizing a private vendor; development of a system utilizing in-house LASD information technology; or, adoption of an existing system. ISAB solicited and received an estimate from an existing County IT vendor (Global 360) for the cost of developing a custom ePCD solution, and is also closely evaluating an existing ePCD system developed by the Los Angeles County Superior Court,

A Tradition of Service

ISAB estimates that a best option will be selected and an ePCD solution will be implemented within one to two years.

Regarding the electronic delivery of police reports, LASD currently has a small scale, ad-hoc implementation with expansion efforts underway. LASD crime/incident reports are usually completed manually, on paper forms and then partially converted into digital form at the station level. Some report information is inputted into the Los Angeles Regional Crime Information System (LARCIS) during processing. The paper form is also converted to a digital image capable of being electronically transmitted, but this process can take as long as six months.

Technical obstacles to full implementation of digital police report delivery are in the process of being addressed. The Sheriff's Integrated Records Retrieval and Assembly System (SIRRAS) is being replaced by the Sheriff's Electronic Criminal Documents Archive (SECDA) which uses a universal imaging format. LASD is also replacing equipment in its patrol vehicles to more capable mobile data computers. In conjunction with this replacement effort, is the development of a Field Based Incident Reporting System (FIBRS). Upon completion of these two technology upgrade initiatives, LASD will have the infrastructure in place to create, archive and transmit police reports in electronic form. LASD also intends to replace its obsolete records management system (LARCIS) with a more modern system (iNets) that will give LASD the capability to implement a completely electronic, "paperless" records system.

In conclusion, planning and implementation are underway, by ISAB and LASD, to electronically create, store and transmit Probable Cause Determination and police reports internally and externally to other criminal justice agencies.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

LASD to expand implementation of filing Pitchess motions electronically. A Pitchess motion defines those portions of a deputy's personnel file which may be made available to defense counsel.

RESPONSE

Electronic filing of Pitchess motions has been implemented among LASD, Public Defender's Office and Office of the County Counsel. The system will soon be utilized by more justice agencies within the County. A plan to add additional functions and capabilities has also been established.

The idea of electronic delivery of Pitchess motions was conceived and brought to fruition by the LASD Risk Management Bureau's Discovery Unit in collaboration with the Public Defender's Office, Office of the County Counsel, Alternate Public Defender's Office, and the Civil Service Commission. Following a successful pilot program in 2009 at the Compton Courthouse, the Sheriff and Public Defender applied for and were awarded a \$75,000 grant from the County's Quality and Productivity Commission. This grant provided funding for the hardware and

software resources needed to put the system, named ePitchess, into production at the fourteen busiest courthouses throughout the County. Since the initial deployment, this innovative system has achieved significant operating efficiencies among all participating entities in the form of time and resource savings and much better accountability and tracking.

The ePitchess system was expanded to include the Alternate Public Defender and the county Civil Service Commission. Justice agencies outside county government are also adopting ePitchess; the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles City Attorney currently have a pre-production pilot program in progress.

A four-phase program plan has been established to guide the ePitchess system to a future "build-out" state: Phase I implements Pitchess motion document creation, filing and receipt acknowledgement capabilities; Phase II adds opposition document creation and filing; Phase III adds compliance report creation and filing; Phase IV adds scheduling information and services. Current production systems encompass Phases I and II. Future expansion, which will occur as organization sponsors emerge and resources become available, will successively add Phases III and IV capabilities.

In conclusion, the electronic filing of Pitchess Motions has been implemented among the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Public Defender's Office and Office of the County Counsel. The inclusion of the Alternate Public Defender, Los Angeles Police Department and Los Angeles City Attorney's office is imminent. A program plan has been established to enhance the impressive efficiencies of ePitchess by adding further capabilities and functions in the future.

Sincerely,



LEROY D. BACA
SHERIFF

LDB:DB:JG:ES:llr

c: DSB
DSB File
(2011GJRecommendation092211)



425 S. Palos Verdes Street Post Office Box 151 San Pedro, CA 90733-0151 TEL/TDD 310 SEA-PORT www.portoflosangeles.org

Antonio R. Villaraigosa

Mayor, City of Los Angeles

Board of Harbor
Commissioners

Cindy Miskowski
President

David Arian
Vice President

Robin M. Kramer

Douglas P. Krause

Sung Won Sohn, Ph.D.

Geraldine Knatz, Ph.D.

Executive Director

September 12, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Dear Judge:


We have received the audit report from the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury (LACCGJ) related to the Harbor Department and appreciate the efforts undertaken in your review of the Port of Los Angeles. We would like to respond to the recommendations therein.

Recommendation 1 – Board of Harbor Commission (BOHC) to restructure the Port Community Advisory Committee (PCAC), improving its efficiency and effectiveness, and refocusing its mission.

We agree that the organization and governance over the Port by the Board of Harbor Commissioners (BOHC) can be improved. With regard to the specific PCAC recommendations, we will consider these as part of our review and initiate discussions with the members of PCAC in a collaborative manner to help us achieve the goal set forth in this recommendation.

Recommendation 2 – Revisit the Plan to ensure that all particulate matter, not just DPM, is being tracked and those reduction goals are included for PM2.5 and PM10.

First, we disagree with the associated Grand Jury findings that suggest the CAAP “is not analytically sound.” Quite the contrary, the CAAP received detailed technical review from the Ports, industry, and key regulatory agencies, including the USEPA, SCAQMD, and the CARB. All reviewers offered comments and participated in development and refinement of the document. The result is a CAAP that is well documented, and certainly technically and analytically sound as validated by these partner and regulatory authorities. Second, regarding the recommendation that the CAAP “ensure that all



particulate matter, not just DPM, is being tracked and those reduction goals are included for PM2.5 and PM10", our annual emissions inventory and our port air quality monitoring stations currently track PM2.5 and PM10. This information can be found on the Port's website. As indicated, our PM2.5 and PM10 tracking data shows a general decline in these values since 2005, and starting in 2008 the California PM2.5 standard has been met at all four of our air monitoring stations. Further, our tracking data has also shown steady declines in PM10, and we are happy to report that in 2010 the Wilmington air monitoring station for the first time showed compliance with the California annual PM10 standard. It should be noted that our CAAP control measures are designed to produce reductions in PM emissions, not just DPM, though DPM makes up a significant proportion of the PM produced by port-related sources. Given the substantial reductions seen for DPM, PM2.5 and PM10 based on our tracking data, we see no reason to alter CAAP goals and standards at this time. We have included an attachment that provides further explanation of this topic.


Recommendation 3– BOHC to propose to the City of Long Beach an independent study of the costs and benefits of a consolidated Port Authority in San Pedro Bay.

We will forward this recommendation to the appropriate authorities in both the City of Los Angeles and City of Long Beach for their consideration. An initiation of this recommendation is not within the Port's authority to undertake. Notwithstanding this comment, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach have initiated a number of efforts to have the two ports act in concert as one San Pedro Bay Port complex to achieve consistency, economy and regional competitiveness on the national and global scale. These efforts are demonstrated in the areas of air quality, water quality, and mutual aid in security. We will continue to pursue such progress in a mutually beneficial and cooperative collaboration.

The Port of Los Angeles and its security team particularly appreciate the validation by this audit of its efforts to provide the highest level of security at the Port both by our own forces and collaborating with multiple other agencies to assure the safety at our Port complex to our customers, our community and the general public.

We support the efforts of the LACCGJ. Should you have any further questions or concerns, you may contact me at 310-571-2980 or by email to cindy@theringgroup.com. Another point of contact is Jim Olds, the Port's Audit Manager, who may be reached at 310-732-3562 or by email to jolds@portla.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cindy Miscikowski". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

CINDY MISCIKOWSKI
President, Board of Harbor Commissioners

Attachment

cc: G. Knatz, Executive Director, Harbor Department
M. Campbell, Deputy Executive Director, Harbor Department
K. Pan, Chief Financial Officer, Harbor Department
Board of Harbor Commissioners

Rec'd 9/20/11



OF LOS ANGELES
ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
Mayor

BOARD OF
ADMINISTRATION

ROBERTA CONROY
President

RICK ROGERS
Vice-President

JERRY BARDWELL

ROBERT A. CHICK

ELIZABETH L. GREENWOOD

JEFFREY PENICHER

KEN SPIKER

EXECUTIVE STAFF

THOMAS MOUTES
General Manager

LI HSI
Assistant General Manager

LITA PAYNE
Assistant General Manager

360 East Second Street
2nd Floor
Los Angeles, CA
90012-4207

www.LACERS.org

(800) 779-8328
(888) 349-3996 TDD
(213) 687-4174 Fax

September 20, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury's Report Recommendations Regarding
the Los Angeles Department of Water & Power Employee Retirement Plan

Honorable Presiding Judge:

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the recommendations regarding
Los Angeles Department of Water & Power Employee Retirement Plan
(WPERP) as requested in the 2010-11 Civil Grand Jury Report. In that
report, the Board of Administration of the Los Angeles City Employees'
Retirement System (LACERS) was requested to respond to three
recommendations. Following are the recommendations provided and our
responses.

Recommendation #2:

*The DWP Board of Commissioners advise the new Ratepayer Advocate
and the City Council of the decision by DWP management to accelerate
payment of the Retiree Health Benefit Fund ARC in each of the past three
fiscal years to ensure that the prepayments are fully considered when the
DWP seeks future rate increases or indicates that it is unable to make
revenue transfers to the General Fund.*

LACERS Response:

This recommendation is not relevant to LACERS and would be more
appropriately addressed by the City, as the sponsor of LACERS retirement
plan.

Recommendation #3:

*Los Angeles City Council, the DWP Board of Commissioners and the
LACERS Board of Administrators (sic) need to expedite reaching an
agreement regarding transferring funds to WPERP to cover the cost of an
increased UAAL imposed on DWP, estimated by actuaries to equal as
much as \$183 million for the 6-year period between 2004 and 2010, due to
Los Angeles City employees who have moved from City departments to
DWP so that the burden is not imposed on ratepayers.*

LACERS Response:

Pursuant to California Constitution [Article 16, Section 17(a)] and Los Angeles City Charter [Section 1106(a)], LACERS Board is charged with having the "sole and exclusive responsibility to **administer** (emphasis added)" its system. As system administrator, the LACERS Board has no authority to negotiate retirement benefits, including, but not limited to reciprocity benefits with WPERP.

The California Constitution further states, "The assets of a public pension or retirement system are trust funds and shall be held for the exclusive purposes of providing benefits to participants in the pension or retirement system and their beneficiaries and defraying reasonable expenses of administering the system." Any use of LACERS trust fund other than for the purposes provided for in the Constitution (including transferring additional funds to DWP not required under the existing reciprocity agreement) would be a breach of LACERS Board's legally-mandated fiduciary duties.

Recommendation #4


Los Angeles City Council, the DWP Board of Commissioners and LACERS Board of Administrators need to amend the reciprocity agreement between LACERS and WPERP with regard to the transfer of employer pension contributions in order to prevent such inequity in the future.

LACERS Response:

As stated in the answer to Recommendation #3, as system administrator, the LACERS Board has no authority to negotiate retirement benefits, including but not limited to reciprocity benefits with WPERP.

If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact Tom Moutes, LACERS General Manager at 213-473-7280.

Sincerely,


Roberta Conroy, President
Board of Administration

RC:TM:bc
2011-0902-072

C: Eric Garcetti, City Council President
Gerry F. Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst
Miguel A. Santana, City Administrative Officer
Matthew Rudnick, Mayor's Office
LACERS Board of Administration



Rec'd 9/14/11

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA

September 12, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Dear Judge:

We have received the audit report from the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury (LACCGJ) related to the Harbor Department and appreciate the efforts undertaken in your review of the Port of Los Angeles. Our office concurs with Board of Harbor Commission President Cindy Miscikowski's responses to the recommendations in the report. We would like to respond additionally to recommendation 3.

Recommendation 3 – BOHC to propose to the City of Long Beach an independent study of the costs and benefits of a consolidated Port Authority in San Pedro Bay.

A decision by the Cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles to combine port operations would require a long political process with an uncertain outcome. At a minimum it would necessitate City charter amendments and either state legislation or appropriate consents from the State Lands Commission. The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are already coordinating closely to maintain regional competitiveness, improve security, and mitigate effects on the environment. We are confident that we will continue to work well together to maintain the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach as the premier trade gateway in North America.

Sincerely,

Matthew Karatz



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA

Deputy Mayor for Economic and Business Policy
Office of the Mayor Antonio R. Villaraigosa


MK:dr

Attachment

cc: G. Knatz, Executive Director, Harbor Department
M. Campbell, Deputy Executive Director, Harbor Department
K. Pan, Chief Financial Officer, Harbor Department
Board of Harbor Commissioners



Rec'd 9/22/11



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

September 21, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple St., 11th Fl., Rm. 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Your Honor:

The City of Pasadena is now able to provide responses to the recommendations that were received from the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury in its 2010-2011 Annual Report. We appreciate the attention that has been given to the programs that are the subject of these recommendations, and we believe that our responses are helpful and in the public interest.

The Grand Jury made three recommendations, as set forth below. Our response to each is set forth below, following each respective recommendation, as follows:

Grand Jury Recommendation 1 – The City Council endorse the recommendations being made by management staff regarding actuarial assumptions, cost stabilization, administrative restructuring and funding for the FPRS.

Response: The City of Pasadena agrees with the recommendation. On March 28th the City Council unanimously approved the recommendation of City staff and the FPRS Task Force regarding actuarial assumptions, cost stabilization, administrative restructuring and funding for the FPRS. Specifically, the Council directed staff to:

- 1) Initiate the issuance of not to exceed \$65 million in pension obligation bonds to fund the Fire and Police Retirement System at 85% of its Actuarially Accrued Liability provided such issuance can be achieved at a maximum “all in” interest rate on the bonds not to exceed 7.5%;
- 2) Approve in concept the future refinancing of approximately \$81 million of existing pension obligation bonds, 1999 and 2004 issues;

- 3) Negotiate changes to Contribution Agreement 16,900 and Settlement and Release Agreement 18,550 between the City of Pasadena and the Fire and Police Retirement System including:
 - a. removing references to other pension systems operating under the County Employees Retirement Law of 1937;
 - b. providing for annual investment return and inflation rate assumptions for the Fire and Police Retirement System to be set annually by mutual agreement between the City and the System's Board.

It is anticipated that items 1 and 3 will be completed prior to the end of calendar year, however, it must be recognized that this action is contingent upon approval of the FPRS Board, which pursuant to Article XVI, Section 17 of the California Constitution, has authority and fiduciary responsibility for the administration of the Fire and Police Retirement System. Item 2 will be completed prior to the mandatory tender associated with the 1999 and 2004 Pension Obligation Bonds, in 2015.

Grand Jury Recommendation 2 - The City Council direct the City Manager to negotiate reductions in the amount of employee contribution picked up by the City for its CalPERS pension plans, up to the full amount of 8% for Miscellaneous and 9% for Safety employees.

Response: The City of Pasadena agrees with the recommendation. Currently all non-safety personnel reimburse the City at least 3.6% towards the employee portion of CalPERS retirement rates. Recent amendments to two bargaining units covering more than 1/3 of full-time employees increases this amount to the full 8% during the term of their current contract terms. This trend is expected to continue for other bargaining units as contracts come up for renewal and renegotiation.

Additionally, the City Council has explored various options in regard to pension reform. However, it should be noted that over the course of the past few years the City's efforts have focused on controlling overall personnel costs including salary and benefit costs, as opposed to just the pension component, and has reached agreement with labor groups to forgo salary increases, in some cases, for multiple years in a row, as well as restructuring benefits, resulting in actual cost reductions for personnel. In addition to easing current budgetary pressure, by controlling salary growth, Pasadena is reducing future pension liabilities as well.

Grand Jury Recommendation 3 - The City Council adopt a policy to fully fund the OPEB (Other Post-Employment Benefits) actuarially determined Annual Required Contribution


(ARC) each year, to build reserves toward future benefit obligations and earn investment income that can reduce the amount of the ARC in future years.

Response: The City of Pasadena agrees with the recommendation. The issue of OPEB liability has been monitored closely by the City as well as its outside auditors and the City has been in compliance with all applicable standards issued by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. The Civil Grand Jury's inquiry did not reveal any new information.

On August 15, 2011 the City Council adopted a Fund Reserve Policy which addresses the OPEB issue raised by the Grand Jury. The Policy sets forth City Council intentions to begin funding the actuarially determined Annual Required Contribution (ARC) each year over a period of time and to build reserves toward future benefit obligations as well as reducing the existing OPEB obligation per requirements of GASB 43 and GASB 45.

If any questions are raised by the foregoing responses, please do not hesitate to communicate with Assistant City Manager Steve Mermell at smermell@cityofpasadena.net, or myself at bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net.

Sincerely,



BILL BOGAARD
Mayor

BB:jls



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

August 19, 2011

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

FROM:  Steve Cooley
District Attorney

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2010-11 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND
JURY FINAL REPORT**

Attached is my Department's response to the recommendations contained in the following sections of the 2010-11 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report:

E-Subpoena – One Way to End the Paper Chase
High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security - Crime Fighting in the Digital Age

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

lv

Attachments

c: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
E-SUBPOENA PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5: The DA staff is encouraged to conduct an E-Subpoena training class for court liaison/subpoena control officers and encourage departments still receiving paper subpoenas to implement E-Subpoena.

RESPONSE:

The District Attorney's Office has and will continue to actively encourage all Los Angeles County law enforcement agencies to participate in the E-Subpoena program. Since launching the E-Subpoena program with LAPD only three years ago, over 30 additional agencies have been provided with information regarding the District Attorney's E-Subpoena program. Currently over 75% of subpoenas are sent electronically to law enforcement agencies. Santa Monica Police Department began receiving electronic subpoenas on August 15, 2011 and several other agencies are close to implementation.

Additional training for law enforcement court liaison/subpoena control officers continues to be available. In June, 2011, a representative of the District Attorney's Office provided training in Alhambra to several law enforcement agencies regarding best practices for implementing an e-subpoena program. Additionally, representatives from the District Attorney's Office are available to provide technical and non-technical assistance post-implementation. The District Attorney's Office remains committed to providing assistance to all interested law enforcement agencies.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DISTRICT ATTORNEY

SUBJECT: 2010-11 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: HIGH TECH FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY CRIME FIGHTING IN THE DIGITAL AGE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. a.

The District Attorney should establish and keep up to date a list of all State, Federal, and private training related to high tech and forensics examination, and cyber investigation and security.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office currently receives notices of training opportunities from the following organizations: California District Attorney's Association; National Computer Forensics Institute; Peace Officers Standards and Training; High Tech Crime Investigator's Association; International Association of Financial Crime Investigators; National District Attorney's Association; and LA Clear. Though the office does not have the resources to monitor all training opportunities offered in the private sector, it continues to post all such training notices on the Criminal Justice Institute website, which serves as a central clearinghouse for this type of information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.b.

The District Attorney should provide outreach to all police departments and the sheriff on a regular basis regarding the value of training in high tech forensics in crime fighting in Los Angeles County through seminars for groups of law enforcement agencies and "roll-call" training for individual law enforcement agencies.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office currently provides the following training seminars, available to all law enforcement agencies in Los Angeles County: identity theft; access card fraud; high tech crimes; digital evidence; and cell phone forensics. The Office is in the process of creating and implementing "roll-call" training on the topic of cell phone forensics to these agencies as well.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. c.

The District Attorney should keep a log of the use of digital evidence in the prosecution of all types of cases. This log should indicate the nature of the evidence and its significance in each case. The District Attorney should encourage municipal agencies to track this information on misdemeanors as well.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office currently keeps statistics on cases involving identity theft, access card fraud, network intrusion, intellectual property theft, and child exploitation. Unfortunately, the Office does not have adequate staffing to track all cases in which some form of digital evidence is used, given the increasing involvement of digital evidence in criminal investigations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. d.

The District Attorney should establish a program for all Deputy District Attorneys to acquire the basic knowledge and skills necessary to develop their cases using digital evidence in an effective manner.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office conducts ongoing training for deputies on a variety of legal topics, including those related to high tech crime and forensics. All deputies are encouraged to attend regularly held Saturday Seminars where such training is offered. In February 2010, the Office held a Saturday Seminar on high tech crime and forensics. Another Saturday Seminar on the same topic will be held in January 2010. The Office is also prepared to include basic training on the use of cell phone forensic evidence for the next class of newly hired deputies. For more experienced prosecutors, the Office will hold a two-day Digital Evidence College in March of 2012.

Recommendation NO. 1. e.

The District Attorney should develop and conduct seminars to educate judges in the use of digital evidence in the criminal justice system.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office has been in contact with Judge Beverly O'Connell, of the Los Angeles County Superior Court Office of Judicial Education's Planning and Research Department, regarding our assistance with an upcoming training on digital evidence for judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys. The Office is helping to identify pertinent topics and experts for use at the training.

Rec'd 12/13/11



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

December 7, 2011

Bob Cremer, Chairperson, Continuity Committee
Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
2011-2012 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury
210 West Temple Street, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Cremer and Mr. Schonbach:

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY RESPONSE TO THE
2010-11 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT**

This is in response to your November 18, 2011 letter regarding my department's response to the above-mentioned report.

In your letter you cite that Penal Code Section 933 requires elected officials to respond to the recommendations provided in the Final Report within sixty days and no longer than ninety days for public agencies. Heretofore, this Office has operated under instructions from the Chief Executive Office (CEO) to submit departmental responses directly to their office for inclusion in the County's consolidated response. Accordingly, our response to the recommendations contained in the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report (see attached) was submitted to the CEO on August 19, 2011.

We have informed CEO staff of this overlooked provision requiring a different deadline for elected officials. In the future, we will ensure that all responses to Final Reports are submitted based on the timeframe established pursuant to Penal Code §933.

We appreciate you bringing this to our attention. Any questions regarding this material may be directed to Lynn Vodden, Director of the Bureau of Administrative Services, at (213) 202-7616.

Very truly yours,


STEVE COOLEY
District Attorney

lv

Attachment

c: William T Fujioka



County of Los Angeles CIVIL GRAND JURY

CLARA SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER
210 WEST TEMPLE STREET • ELEVENTH FLOOR • ROOM 11-506 • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
TELEPHONE (213) 893-1047 • FAX (213) 229-2595
<http://www.grandjury.co.la.ca.us/>

November 18, 2011

Steve Cooley, District Attorney
Los Angeles County District Attorney Office
210 West Temple Street, 18-709
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Cooley:

Pursuant to Penal Code §933, all Agencies cited in the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report are required to respond to the recommendations provided in the Final Report within sixty days for elected officials and no longer than ninety days for public agencies.

Please note, as of today's date the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury has not received the required responses from your agency.

If you have already responded to the recommendation(s) in the Final Report, please disregard this notice.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Bob Cremer in cursive.

Bob Cremer, Chairperson, Continuity Committee
2011-2012 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

Handwritten signature of Alf Schonbach in cursive.

Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
2011-2012 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury



CITY OF LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER

333 WEST OCEAN BOULEVARD • LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802 • (562) 570-8711 • FAX (562) 570-6583

PATRICK H. WEST
CITY MANAGER

September 26, 2011

VIA U.S. MAIL

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012-3210

RE: City of Long Beach Response to County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury
Report 2010

Dear Presiding Judge:

Pursuant to California Penal Code section 933.05, the City of Long Beach hereby responds to the County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury's recommendation.

The Civil Grand Jury made nine findings. Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05(a), the City responds to each of the findings as follows:

- (1) In the Complainant's 2009-2010 CGJ filings, he was given an initial hearing date by the 2009-2010 CGJ of December 17, 2009. The meeting was scheduled to be held at the Long Beach 911 facility.

The City agrees.

- (2) Less than an hour before the meeting with the 2009-2010 CGJ, the LBPD arrived and served the Complainant with a REORGANIZATION memo. The CGJ found that this memo was inconsistent with the standard practice of LBPD, in that personnel affected by reassignment memos are normally afforded a two-week notice and do not include a threat of discipline.

The City disagrees. Mr. Mawn was not reassigned. Absent a reassignment, the City is not required to provide an employee with any notice.

- (3) After being removed from original duties, the LBDP met with the Complainant's staff and gave specific instructions to limit contact with him. The staff objected to these directions, and the LBDP rescinded some of them.

The City disagrees. The staff was directed to report to the Lieutenant based on the departmental reorganization.

- (4) Prior to the Complainant's 2009-2010 CGJ filing, there was never any discussion or planning relative to a REORGANIZATION of Police Communication. In addition, it is questionable that LBDP would consider a REORGANIZATION of a particular unit without the unit leader having knowledge of the effort in advance.

The City disagrees. Mr. Mawn is a classified employee, not a management employee. An employee working in Mr. Mawn's classification would not be involved in management's discussion or planning about department reorganization.

- (5) In the REORGANIZATION efforts, the CGJ found that the City had previously conducted three (3) CONSOLIDATION studies and never removed the Communication Center Coordinator from the position as head of Police Communications. In addition, CM published a long-term plan for CONSOLIDATING City services, but the dispatch CONSOLIDATION never appeared in this plan. It was also found that approximately seven (7) months were required for the Complainant to facilitate a meeting with the FD after repeated requests were made via his chain of command. Also, the first contact with the FD occurred after the initial project due date had passed.

The City disagrees. Mr. Mawn was not removed from his position. The City did not require Mr. Mawn spend seven months to facilitate a meeting with the Fire Department. Mr. Mawn failed to perform the duties assigned to him.

- (6) The CGJ then found that the REORGANIZATION efforts were inconsistent with the City's current budget efforts to reduce cost through civilianizing police-sworn positions with civilian positions. The current CONSOLIDATION effort was also noted to consist of Complainant and the FD only, whereas the previous efforts involved:

- a. A team of high-level experts specific to this field
- b. An outside consulting firm with CONSOLIDATION expertise
- c. Project Management provided by the CM's office

The City disagrees. The consolidation effort was consistent with the City's budgetary challenges. The study assigned to Mr. Mawn was the first step in the City's renewed effort to consolidate its police and fire dispatch centers. He was expected to use information from the existing studies and update the information, as he was the City's subject matter expert. Mr. Mawn was well connected with other dispatch centers and had worked on this type of project in the past. He had existing relationships with individuals in the field and a depth of knowledge about dispatch practices. The study was in the infancy stages and Mr. Mawn was tasked with analyzing best practices.

(7) In addition, it was noted that in the City's FY 2010 Plan, the associated Government Reform, FY 11 Proposed Budget, and the LBPD issuance of REORGANIZATION memo lacked:

- a. A budget item for the "special CONSOLIDATION project"
- b. A schedule with milestones for the project
- c. A staff (other than Complainant) to perform this project. This is reflected by the importance and high profile that the project was characterized to be by CM and the LBPD.

The City agrees. Notably, the City's budget does not utilize line item details as referenced in the findings. In addition, project milestones are not included in budget documents.

(8) It was also found that after the Complainant's 2009-2010 CGJ filing, the City of Long Beach assigned the LBPD to investigate the Complainant's concerns. This was found to be the same person whom the Complainant alleged was involved in the 2009-2010 CGJ filing.

The City disagrees. The Department reviewed Mr. Mawn's allegations and the City hired an outside investigator to investigate Mr. Mawn's complaints.

(9) The Complainant alleges that the HR Department met with him and offered to broker a meeting with the LBPD to discuss the possibility of returning the Complainant to his normal duties as the Head of Police Communication. The Complainant states that HR specifically asked, "... if they were to return him to his regular position, would he discontinue current activities and involvement with the 2009-2010 CGJ"? After his refusal to accept this offer, the meeting to discuss his return to previous duties was canceled.

The City disagrees. Director Mills did not offer to broker any meeting between Mr. Mawn and the Police Department, nor did she ask if he would discontinue his activities with the Civil Grand Jury if he was returned to his position. Director Mills met with members of the Civil Grand Jury and informed the members as such. It is clear that the members disregarded her statements, and she adamantly denied engaging in the alleged activity. In fact, Director Mills informed the members of the Grand Jury that during her meeting with Mr. Mawn she informed him that he needed to finish his assigned project.

The Grand Jury made four recommendations. Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05(b), the City responds to each of the recommendations as follows:

- (1) Update existing City of Long Beach Human Resource complaint procedures to include addressing protection afforded an employee who discloses information to a government agency where the employee has reasonable cause to believe that information discloses noncompliance with Federal, State and local rules and regulations.

The City has existing complaint procedures designed to protect employees who disclose information where the employee has reasonable cause to believe that information discloses noncompliance with Federal, State and local rules and regulations. The City will review its complaint procedures to determine if updates are warranted, and if they are, the City will abide by the Meyers-Millias-Brown Act prior to making any change that would affect represented employees' terms and conditions of employment.

- (2) Provide training of HR personnel to ensure these procedures are followed.

The City provides training to its personnel with respect to employee complaints and investigations and will continue to do so.

- (3) Ensure that City employees are aware of these policies and procedures and have access to them.

City employees are made aware of policies and procedures and have access to them. The City will continue to make employees aware and provide employee access to policies and procedures.


- (4) Establish a process for complaints submitted to HR that ensures no person or entity referenced in a complaint is involved in the resolution of same.

The City already has an established process for the submission of complaints. Employees are not required to submit complaints to any person or entity referenced in the complaint.

I anticipate this adequately responds to the Civil Grand Jury's report.

CITY OF LONG BEACH

By


PATRICK H. WEST, City Manager

PHW:CLC:kjm
A10-03244
L:\Apps\CtyLaw32\WPDocs\DO20\PO15\00276871.DOC

cc: Robert E. Shannon, City Attorney
Jim McDonnell, Chief of Police
Debbie Mills, Director of Human Resources

Rec'd 10/6/11

City of Hermosa Beach



Civic Center, 1315 Valley Drive, Hermosa Beach, CA 90254-3885

September 29, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Honorable Presiding Judge and Grand Jury:

Pursuant to Penal Code Sections 933(c) and 933.05, attached is the written response of the City of Hermosa Beach ("City") to the Findings and Recommendations pertaining to the City contained in the Grand Jury report entitled "Whoa! The State of Public Pensions in Los Angeles County" ("Report"). At its regular meeting of September 27, 2011, the City Council approved and authorized the City Manager to submit on its behalf the responses to the Findings and Recommendations as set out in the shaded boxes inserted following each respective Finding and Recommendation excerpted from the Report.

Also included in the City's response are technical responses prepared by City staff in consultation with the City's independent actuarial consultant to various factual assertions contained in the Report. These responses, also set out in the shaded boxes inserted into the text of the excerpted pages from the Report, identify and correct what the City believes are inaccuracies and misconceptions contained in the Report.

The City appreciates the dedication of the Grand Jury and the input given in the report.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Steven Burrell in black ink.


Steven Burrell
City Manager

Rec'd 9/23/11

PASADENA POLICE DEPARTMENT



PHILLIP L. SANCHEZ
CHIEF OF POLICE



207 N. GARFIELD AVENUE
PASADENA, CA 91101
(626) 744-4501

August 22, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Flotz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Please note the following responses to the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury analysis, findings and recommendations concerning the e-subpoena system.

Responses to the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury's Findings¹:


1. The respondent agrees with the finding.
2. The respondent agrees with the finding.
3. The respondent agrees with the finding.
4. The respondent agrees with the finding.
5. The respondent agrees with the finding.
6. The respondent agrees with the finding.
7. The respondent agrees with the finding.
8. The respondent agrees with the finding.
9. The respondent agrees with the finding.
10. The respondent agrees with the finding.
11. The respondent agrees with the finding.
12. The respondent agrees with the finding.
13. The respondent agrees with the finding.
14. The respondent agrees with the finding.
15. The respondent agrees with the finding.
16. The respondent agrees with the finding.
17. The respondent agrees with the finding.
18. The respondent agrees with the finding.
19. The respondent agrees with the finding.
20. The respondent agrees with the finding.

Responses to the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury's Recommendations:

1. The recommendation requires further analysis.
 - a. The Pasadena Police Department consistently attempts to harness the power of technology. The e-Subpoena system has the potential to reduce costs associated with court appearances by streamlining the subpoena process. Based on the information provided it appears the e-Subpoena system would also benefit police employees² by allowing advance notice concerning their presence in court.
2. The recommendation requires further analysis.
 - a. As the Pasadena Police Department considers the use of e-Subpoena discussion with the Pasadena City Attorney/City Prosecutor would be necessary to ensure a common understanding of the system and expected outcomes.
3. The recommendation does not impact the Pasadena Police Department.
 - a. The Pasadena Police Department is an independent, full-service, law enforcement agency not associated with the Los Angeles Police Department or the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The agencies do not share geographic law enforcement responsibilities.
4. The recommendation does not impact the Pasadena Police Department.
 - a. The Pasadena Police Department is an independent, full-service, law enforcement agency not associated with the Los Angeles Police Department or the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The agencies do not share geographic law enforcement responsibilities.
5. The recommendation requires further analysis.
 - a. However, if the Pasadena Police Department implemented the e-Subpoena system training from the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office would be necessary and invaluable to ensure the court liaison officer had a comprehensive understanding of the system and knowledge to resolve problems/conflicts raised by judicial officers, the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office, the Public Defender's Office, the individual employee, or labor unions representing the concerned employees.

Should you have questions concerning my responses, please feel free to contact me at (626) 744-4545 or electronic communication at Psanchez@cityofpasadena.net.

Sincerely,



PHILLIP L. SANCHEZ
Chief of Police

¹ Concordances with the assertions listed in the findings and recommendations are based on information provide in the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury report, analysis, and/or site visit. The respondent has no personal knowledge the law enforcement agencies listed in the report are experiencing significant reduction in cost associated, staff hours, or other potential benefits with the e-Subpoena system.

² Includes sworn police officers and civilian employees.

CITY OF MONTEREY PARK

320 West Newmark Avenue • Monterey Park • California 91754-2896
www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us



Jim Smith
Chief of Police

February 21, 2012

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Re: Civil Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations

Your Honor:

I sent you a letter in November of 2011 explaining that the Monterey Park Police Department agreed with the findings of the CGJ regarding the need to improve the subpoena process for Law Enforcement Agencies. We also concurred that the e-subpoena system appears to be a viable solution. After analyzing the e-subpoena implementation process and the possible cost savings we believed that implementation of the e-subpoena system would benefit our agency. We presented our findings to the Monterey Park City Council who concurred and approved funding for the project. We are currently in the process of implementing the system with our personnel

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (626) 307-1222 or at JSmith@montereypark.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Jim Smith", is written over a horizontal line.

Jim Smith
Chief of Police

Rec'd 12/6/11

CITY OF MONTEREY PARK

320 West Newhall Avenue • Monterey Park • California 91754-2696
www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us



Jim Smith
Chief of Police

November 28, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Re: Civil Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations

Your Honor:

The Monterey Park Police Department agrees with the findings of the CGJ regarding the need to improve the subpoena process for Law Enforcement Agencies. We also concur that the e-subpoena system appears to be a viable solution. The area of concern for our department lies in the underlying and ongoing cost of the software and implementation of the program vs. the benefit in cost savings and workload for the subpoena control unit of the department. Since we are a smaller department (72 sworn officers), subpoena control has not been seen in the past as a major workload issue.

We are continuing to analyze this issue and expect to complete this process within the next 30 days. The person assigned to our subpoena control duties has recently returned from several months of medical leave. Our supervisory personnel that were analyzing the viability of the e-subpoena system needed this persons input to accurately assess the program. That is currently being done. We also have an e-subpoena software company scheduled to present a demonstration of their product and its capabilities with our personnel as well as our I.T. contractor. Once this is completed and we receive a quote from the vendor for the cost and maintenance of the software we will be able to make an informed decision on whether or not to implement the program. I will notify you in writing of that decision.

I apologize for the delay in this response. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (626) 307-1222 or at JSmith@montereypark.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Jim Smith
Chief of Police

Rec'd 10/12/11



City of Monterey Park

320 W. Newmark Avenue Monterey Park CA 91754-2896
www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us

CITY COUNCIL
Betty Tom Chu
Mitchell Ing
David T. Lau
Teresa Real Sebastian
Anthony Wong

CITY CLERK
David Barron

CITY TREASURER
Joseph Leon

October 7, 2011

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: GRAND JURY REPORT
COVER LETTER DATED JUNE 23, 2011**

Dear Judge Edmon:

The City received a copy of the undated Grand Jury Report entitled "Whoa! The State of Public Pensions in Los Angeles County" at the end of June 2011 (the "Report"). The Report requested that the City respond to two recommendations:

"1. [That] Monterey Park's City Council adopt policies to fully fund the ARC for both the MMRP and OPEB retirement benefit plans for employees in order to ensure future funding of benefits and earn investment income which would discount the annual required contributions.

2. [That] Monterey Park's City Council direct its City management to explore alternatives for reducing retirement benefit costs, including possible additional revisions to the amount of the employee contribution pick up paid by the City and alternative employee cost sharing arrangements for retiree health benefits."

This letter responds to these recommendations in accordance with Penal Code § 933(c)(d).

Please note that the City identified many factual errors in the Report pertaining to Monterey Park. While the City respectfully declines to identify each of these, it does acknowledge that (like most cities in California) the City must continue acting to address the ever expanding retirement obligations incurred by the City. As you are aware, these obligations were generally negotiated between the City and its public employees over the course of many years. While these obligations continue to increase in cost, the economic downturn – and resulting decrease in public revenue – threatens the ability of every public agency in California to pay for such obligations.

Long before the Grand Jury issued the Report, the City Council recognized that the City must decrease its expenses as to public benefits. Consequently, it directed the City Manager to take a number of austerity measures to help balance the competing demands of public employee benefits with taxpayer interests of improving the community.

Toward that goal, the City Council negotiated several issues with its employees. Listed below are several matters the City has negotiated with three of the five bargaining units that took effect on October 1st (the Police and Fire units do not come due until June 30, 2012).

Steps taken:

- 1) Created a second tier of retirement. Lowering the 2.7% @ 55 to 2.5% @ 55 for new non-safety employees.
- 2) Requiring all non-safety employees to pick up 100% of the employee's portion of the PERS contribution. (Currently 8%)
- 3) Eliminating OPEB benefits for all new hires, and investigative studies of a VEBA or 115 Trust account for both current employees and new hires.
- 4) Lowering of caps of sick time, vacation time and administrative leave time on all employees. Also agreeing to forgo any cash outs during the next 12 months of the new MOUs.
- 5) Adding an additional \$500,000 annually towards the OPEB ARC.

While these actions do not completely cure the problem, they are certainly a step in the right direction. In a difficult economy, all sides mutually worked together to find solutions to the City's long term structural obligations.

Should you have any further questions or follow up, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



David T. Lau
Mayor



POLICE DEPARTMENT
City of Manhattan Beach

copy
manhattan beach

420 15th Street
MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90266
(310) 802-5103 FAX (310) 802-5101

EVE R. IRVINE
CHIEF OF POLICE

August 4, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012

Dear Presiding Judge:

We recently received the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report. The report makes the recommendation that the City of Manhattan Beach Police Department implement e-Subpoena as a cost saving and operational efficiency measure. In addition, the report recommends the City Attorney / City Prosecutor utilize the e-Subpoena system in locations wherein the police department is using the system.

I have reviewed the report and agree that the e-Subpoena system could benefit our Department in the area of cost savings and improved efficiency.

As a result of the Grand Jury recommendation, I have instructed my staff to begin an analysis of the e-Subpoena program to determine whether we should implement the program here at the Manhattan Beach Police Department. I have asked that the review be completed within six months of the date of the Grand Jury report. This analysis and implementation review is to be completed by December 30, 2011.

I want to thank you for bringing this new e-Subpoena program to my attention and I will be anxiously awaiting the results of our analysis of this program.

Thank you,

EVE R. IRVINE
CHIEF OF POLICE

"Policing through Partnerships"



POLICE DEPARTMENT
City of Manhattan Beach

420 15th Street
MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90266
(310) 802-5103 FAX (310) 802-5101

EVE R. IRVINE
CHIEF OF POLICE

January 31, 2012

Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury
Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
Clara Shortridge-Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury:

We received your request for a copy of our response to the recommendations of the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Report. We reviewed our file and determined that we had sent the response to the Presiding Judge of the Los Angeles County Superior Court on August 4, 2011, as instructed in the original request from the Civil Grand Jury. Apparently the response never made it to you.

I am including a copy of the original response that was mailed last August 2011. If you need anything further please don't hesitate to ask.

Thank you,

EVE R. IRVINE
CHIEF OF POLICE

"Policing through Partnerships"

City of Manhattan Beach Web Site: www.citymb.info

**Monrovia Police Department
Grand Jury Response
High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age
By
Captain Alan Sanvictores**

FINDINGS

FL Models – The respondent agrees with the findings.

1. Regional Joint Task Force Model – The respondent agrees with the findings.
2. Localized Joint Task Force Model – The respondent agrees with the findings.
3. Loosely aligned group of single jurisdiction FL – The respondent agrees with the findings.
4. Single jurisdiction FL with membership in Regional Joint Task Force(s) – The respondent agrees with the findings.

FL Skills and Equipment Considerations

1. A well equipped high tech forensics lab should include these skills: - The respondent agrees with the findings.
2. FL equipment and layout: The respondent agrees with the findings.

Risk Management Approach

1. The respondent agrees with the findings.
2. The respondent agrees with the findings.
3. The respondent agrees with the findings.
4. The respondent agrees with the findings.
5. The respondent agrees with the findings.
6. The respondent agrees with the findings.
7. The respondent agrees with the findings.
8. The respondent agrees with the findings.
9. The respondent agrees with the findings.

Training

1. The respondent agrees with the findings.
2. The respondent agrees with the findings.
3. The respondent agrees with the findings.
4. The respondent agrees with the findings.

5. The respondent partially agrees. / Training should also be allowed for specified non-sworn personnel. In a smaller agency such as ours, it is financially responsible to utilize non-sworn personnel.
6. The respondent partially agrees. / Training should also be allowed for specified non-sworn personnel. In a smaller agency such as ours, it is financially responsible to utilize non-sworn personnel.
7. The respondent agrees with the findings.

Promotion and Succession Planning

1. The respondent agrees with the findings.
2. The respondent agrees with the findings.

Digital Evidence and Procedures to Address Detected Intrusions

- 1a. The respondent agrees with the findings.
- b. The respondent agrees with the findings.

- 2a. the respondent agrees with the findings.
 - b. The respondent agrees with the findings.
 - c. The respondent agrees with the findings.
 - d. The respondent agrees with the findings.
 - e. The respondent agrees with the findings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2a. the recommendation is already implemented. There are two non-sworn personnel assigned to the Forensics Bureau. This bureau operates through established procedures to provide support to patrol and investigative sections.
 - b. The recommendation is already implemented. There are two non-sworn personnel assigned to the Forensics Bureau. This bureau operates through established procedures to provide support to patrol and investigative sections.
 - c. Forensics Bureau provides regular training and support to all patrol and investigative officers.
 - d. Forensics Bureau is in contact with POST to examine and pursue updated POST certification.



OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CARMEN A. TRUTANICH
CITY ATTORNEY

RICHARD M. BROWN
GENERAL COUNSEL
FOR WATER AND POWER

DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER
LEGAL DIVISION
P.O. BOX 51111 - SUITE 340
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90051-0100
TELEPHONE (213) 367-4500
FAX (213) 367-4588

No fee - 6103 Gov't Code

September 27, 2011

Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
Civil Grand Jury
County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street
Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Schonbach:

Re: Additional time requested by the Board of Water and Power Commissioners
of the City of Los Angeles to respond to:

Final Report
Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury 2010-2011

Investigative reports:


City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Who's Really in the Dark? (pp. 73-130)

Whoa! The State of Public Pensions in Los Angeles County
Assessment of the State of Pension Plans in Los Angeles
County
Phase II: Section 2
City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Employee Retirement Plan (pp. 254-265)

Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
September 27, 2011
Page two

For your information, attached please find a copy of letter dated September 27, 2011 presented on behalf of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners to the Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, seeking an additional 30 days in which the Board may file a response to the above-referenced investigative reports. The letter is to be filed with the court today.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Richard M. Brown', written over a horizontal line.

Richard M. Brown
General Counsel
Department of Water and Power

cc: Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Thomas S. Sayles, President, Board of Water and Power Commissioners
Ronald O. Nichols, General Manager, Department of Water and Power

245163v1



1 2011
9/20/11
7/11/11

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

**CARMEN A. TRUTANICH
CITY ATTORNEY**

**RICHARD M. BROWN
GENERAL COUNSEL
FOR WATER AND POWER**

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER
LEGAL DIVISION
P.O. BOX 51111 • SUITE 340
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90051-0100**

**TELEPHONE (213) 367-4500
FAX (213) 367-4588**

HAND DELIVERED

November 1, 2011

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
Civil Grand Jury
County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street
Room 11-506

Re: Delay encountered by the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of the
City of Los Angeles in responding to:

Final Report
Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury 2010-2011

Investigative reports:

*City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Who's Really in the Dark? (pp. 73-130)*

*Whoa! The State of Public Pensions in Los Angeles County
Assessment of the State of Pension Plans in Los Angeles
County*

Phase II: Section 2

*City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Employee Retirement Plan (pp. 254-265)*

Dear Presiding Judge Edmon and Foreperson Schonbach:


The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
November 1, 2011
Page 2

This Office writes on behalf of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners to advise that the Board it will not be able to file its response to the above-referenced investigative reports by the October 31, 2011 date that Presiding Judge Edmon had previously approved. While it was anticipated that the Board would be able to meet that date, the process of preparation and review is taking longer than had been anticipated.

The Board has a regularly scheduled meeting on November 15, 2011, at which time the matter may be considered, but the Board may choose to schedule a special meeting in regard to this matter. Scheduling may be affected by the Holiday Season. Please know that to this point considerable staff attention has been given to analysis of the above-referenced investigative reports, and it is anticipated that the staff work product will be presented to the Board shortly.

This Office will keep the Court and the Grand Jury advised of the progress of this matter until the response is filed.

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD M. BROWN
General Counsel
Department of Water and Power

cc: Thomas S. Sayles
President
Board of Water and Power Commissioners

Ronald O. Nichols
General Manager
Department of Water and Power

Rec

11/2/11



OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

**CARMEN A. TRUTANICH
CITY ATTORNEY**

**RICHARD M. BROWN
GENERAL COUNSEL
FOR WATER AND POWER**

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER
LEGAL DIVISION
P.O. BOX 51111 - SUITE 340
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90051-0100**

HAND DELIVERED

**TELEPHONE (213) 367-4500
FAX (213) 367-4588**

November 1, 2011

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
Civil Grand Jury
County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street
Room 11-506

Re: Delay encountered by the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of the
City of Los Angeles in responding to:

Final Report
Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury 2010-2011

Investigative reports:

*City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Who's Really in the Dark? (pp. 73-130)*

*Whoa! The State of Public Pensions in Los Angeles County
Assessment of the State of Pension Plans in Los Angeles
County
Phase II: Section 2
City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Employee Retirement Plan (pp. 254-265)*

Dear Presiding Judge Edmon and Foreperson Schonbach:


The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
November 1, 2011
Page 2

This Office writes on behalf of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners to advise that the Board it will not be able to file its response to the above-referenced investigative reports by the October 31, 2011 date that Presiding Judge Edmon had previously approved. While it was anticipated that the Board would be able to meet that date, the process of preparation and review is taking longer than had been anticipated.

The Board has a regularly scheduled meeting on November 15, 2011, at which time the matter may be considered, but the Board may choose to schedule a special meeting in regard to this matter. Scheduling may be affected by the Holiday Season. Please know that to this point considerable staff attention has been given to analysis of the above-referenced investigative reports, and it is anticipated that the staff work product will be presented to the Board shortly.

This Office will keep the Court and the Grand Jury advised of the progress of this matter until the response is filed.

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD M. BROWN
General Counsel
Department of Water and Power

cc: Thomas S. Sayles
President
Board of Water and Power Commissioners

Ronald O. Nichols
General Manager
Department of Water and Power

RECEIVED
9/28/2011

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

Jaime de la Vega
GENERAL MANAGER



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
100 S. Main St., 10th Floor
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

(213) 972-8480
FAX (866) 530-3154

ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
MAYOR

September 28, 2011

Civil Grand Jury, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Court
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012-3210

Subject: **Response to "Final Report, 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury, County of Los Angeles", June 30, 2011 re: Preferential Parking**

Honorable Grand Jurors:

Thank you for your efforts in evaluating our preferential parking program. The Los Angeles Department of Transportation's response to the Civil Grand Jury's (CGJ) findings and recommendations are attached.

Feel free to contact me at (213) 972-8448 or jaime.delavega@lacity.org or Assistant General Manager Amir Sedadi at (213) 972-8422 or amir.sedadi@lacity.org if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Jaime de la Vega
General Manager

Enclosure

cc: Amir Sedadi, Assistant General Manager
Tamara Martin, Parking Permits Division

Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) Response to "Final Report, 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury, County of Los Angeles", June 30, 2011 re: Preferential Parking

For purposes of the following responses, LADOT assumed that the term "PPD" refers to temporary preferential parking district 130 and petition activity surrounding sign posting on the 1600 block of Hi-Point Street.

Finding 1

LADOT agrees with the finding.

Note that the issue reviewed by the CGJ focused on whether or not signs should be posted in an existing temporary preferential parking district.

Finding 2a

LADOT agrees with the finding, as it relates to the department received an incomplete petition in 2008.

Finding 2b

LADOT agrees with the finding, as it relates to a request to post signs, not "installation of a PPD".

Finding 2c

LADOT agrees with the finding, as it relates to sign posting, not "establishment of a PPD".

Finding 3

LADOT has no position on the finding. LADOT has no record of the stated "attempts by residents to get the reasons for rescindment [of the request for sign posting]".

Finding 4

LADOT agrees with the finding, as it relates to canceling the July 29, 2010 approval of sign posting. LADOT notified all the affected residents in writing that the sign posting was imminent, but did not notify the affected residents when a counter-petition opposing sign posting was verified and the sign posting canceled. LADOT agrees that residents should have been informed.



County of Los Angeles CIVIL GRAND JURY

CLARA SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER
210 WEST TEMPLE STREET • ELEVENTH FLOOR • ROOM 11-506 • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
TELEPHONE (213) 893-1047 • FAX (213) 228-2595
<http://www.grandjury.co.la.ca.us/>

June 23, 2011

Sheriff Lee Baca
Los Angeles Sheriff's Department
4700 Ramona Blvd.
Monterey Park, California 91754

**Re: PRE RELEASE DELIVERY OF A PORTION OF THE 2010-2011 LOS ANGELES
COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT. NOTE: DO NOT DISCLOSE ANY REPORT
CONTENTS PRIOR TO JUNE 30, 2011**

Dear Sheriff Baca:

Pursuant to California Penal Code §933.05(f): *A grand jury shall provide to the affected agency a copy of the portion of the grand jury report relating to that person or entity two working days prior to its public release and after the approval of the presiding judge. No officer, agency, department, or governing body of a public agency shall disclose any contents of the report prior to the public release of the final report.* The Final Report by the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury will be released to the public on June 30, 2011.

In accordance with this requirement, please acknowledge receipt of the portion of the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report that affects this agency, department, or governing body by signing this letter. The jurors delivering this report will retain the copy of this letter signed by the recipient or recipient's agent.

A response to all Recommendations in a Civil Grand Jury Report is required by California Penal Code §933(c) and §933.05 within ninety (90) days following the release of the Report to the public. Attached are instructions on how to respond.

Sincerely,

Joe Safier, Foreperson
2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

RECEIVED BY

9/30/11

DATE

SIGNATURE

SHERIFF

Title

LEROY D. BACA

Printed Name

Attachments (2)

Department of Water and Power



the City of Los Angeles

ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
Mayor

Commission
THOMAS S. SAYLES, *President*
ERIC HOLOMAN, *Vice President*
RICHARD F. MOSS
CHRISTINA E. NOONAN
JONATHAN PARFREY
BARBARA E. MOSCHOS, *Secretary*

RONALD O. NICHOLS
General Manager

September 27, 2011

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Dear Presiding Judge Edmon:

Subject: Additional time requested by the Board of Water and Power
Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles to respond to:

Final Report
Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury 2010-2011

Investigative reports:

*City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Who's Really in the Dark? (pp. 73-130)*

*Whoa! The State of Public Pensions in Los Angeles
County*

*Assessment of the State of Pension Plans in
Los Angeles County*

Phase II: Section 2

*City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Employee Retirement Plan (pp. 254-265)*

Water and Power Conservation ... a way of life

111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, California 90012-2607 Mailing address: Box 51111, Los Angeles 90051-5700
Telephone: (213) 367-4211 Cable address: DEWAPOLA

✓
The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Page 2
September 27, 2011

On June 30, 2011 the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury issued its final report. Two of the 13 investigative reports contained within the final report concern the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power ("the Department") and call upon the Board of Water and Power Commissioners ("the Board") of the City of Los Angeles to respond to these reports. Under California Penal Code § 933(c), the "governing body of the public agency must comment to the presiding judge of the superior court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under control of the governing body" within 90 days of the date the grand jury submitted its final report. Both reports inform the Board that its response is due on September 30, 2011. See Final Report at pp.128, 265.

The Board respectfully requests that it be allowed an additional 30 days within which to file its responses to the findings and recommendations set forth in the two investigative reports referenced above. Should this request be granted, the new deadline for response would become Monday, October 31, 2011, inasmuch as the 30th will be a Sunday.

The requested additional time is needed for two reasons:


- 1. Additional time is needed to complete the analysis of the grand jury's findings and recommendations and prepare responding comments for the Board's consideration.**

The Board's response must be built upon a thorough analysis of the findings and recommendations contained within the reports. When completed, that analysis will have entailed a significant dedication of staff resources. One report addresses a wide range of matters concerning the Department and its operations – *Los Angeles Department of Water and Power: Who's Really in the Dark?* This 58-page report contains 18 findings and 13 recommendations. The other report concerns the Water and Power Employees' Retirement Plan ("WPERP") and constitutes but one component of a broader investigation of several public retirement systems in Los Angeles County: *Whoa! The State of Public Pensions in Los Angeles County: Assessment of the State of Pension Plans in Los Angeles County*. The WPERP report consists of 12 pages, 1 finding, and 4 recommendations. Additional time is required to complete the analysis of these reports for the Board's consideration.

2. Additional time is needed in order to allow the Board of Water and Power Commissioners sufficient time to consider the matter.

The reports call upon the Board to serve as the responding "agency" for all recommendations, but three of them also require responses from the City Council and the Los Angeles City Employees' Retirement System ("LACERS") Board of Administration. Under the Los Angeles City Charter, the Board serves as "head" of the Department, Charter § 600(b), and thus serves functionally as the "governing body" referenced in California Penal Code § 933(c) over matters within the Board's Charter authority. The Board is one of the citizen boards heading major City operating departments (others include Airports, Harbor, Fire, Police, Library, Public Works, and Recreation and Parks). Charter §§ 500(a), 600(a). The Board conducts regular meetings twice a month (1st & 3rd Tuesdays). Rules of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners, Rule 1 (Res. 011-223, March 1, 2011), although it can and sometimes does call special meetings. If the Board is the responding "agency," it must approve the response. Board approval is given by majority vote of its members, Charter § 503(c), at a noticed meeting as required by the applicable open meetings law, the Ralph M. Brown Act. California Government Code §§ 54950 *et seq.* The additional time requested will afford the Board sufficient opportunity to review analysis by Department staff in various functional areas and receive other input so that it can determine the responses to be made. The Board should be able to complete this work by the October 31 deadline being requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas S. Sayles
President
Board of Water and Power Commissioners

c: Ronald O. Nichols
General Manager

244674v2



OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

**CARMEN A. TRUTANICH
CITY ATTORNEY**

**RICHARD M. BROWN
GENERAL COUNSEL
FOR WATER AND POWER**

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER
LEGAL DIVISION
P.O. BOX 51111 · SUITE 340
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90051-0100**

**TELEPHONE (213) 367-4500
FAX (213) 367-4588**

HAND DELIVERED

November 17, 2011

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
Civil Grand Jury
County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street
Room 11-506

Re: Status report on the progress of the Board of Water and Power
Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles in responding to:

Final Report
Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury 2010-2011

Investigative reports:

*City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Who's Really in the Dark? (pp. 73-130)*

*Whoa! The State of Public Pensions in Los Angeles County
Assessment of the State of Pension Plans in Los Angeles
County*

Phase II: Section 2

*City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Employee Retirement Plan (pp. 254-265)*

Dear Presiding Judge Edmon and Foreperson Schonbach:

The Honorable Lee Smalley Edmon
Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
November 17, 2011
Page 2


In a letter of November 1, 2011, this Office indicated that it would keep the Court and the Grand Jury advised of the progress of this matter until the response of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners was filed.

We can report that the Board considered a preliminary draft prepared by staff at its regular meeting on November 15, 2011. While it had been anticipated that all Board members would be present, only three (but still a quorum) were present. The draft response was discussed by the members present, but no action was taken at that time to approve a response.

The Board will require additional time to consider its response and have the matter before the Board when more members are present. In consideration of the Holidays, the Board meets only once in December. The Board deferred consideration until a meeting in January.

This Office will continue to keep the Court and the Grand Jury advised of the progress of this matter until the Board's response is filed.

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD M. BROWN
General Counsel
Department of Water and Power

cc: Thomas S. Sayles
President
Board of Water and Power Commissioners

Ronald O. Nichols
General Manager
Department of Water and Power

Rec'd 8/11/11



Police Department
W. Joseph Leonardi
Chief of Police

401 Diamond Street, P.O. Box 639
Redondo Beach, California 90277-0639
www.redondo.org

tel 310 379-2477
fax 310 372-0167

August 8, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subj: 2010-2011 CGJ Report Recommendations

Madam:

1. The Redondo Beach disagrees partially with the findings of the Grand Jury.
2. The recommendation to "Implement e-Subpoena as a cost saving and operational efficiency measure" has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
3. The timeframe for implementation will depend on the cost of the implementation and the ability to coordinate the requirements of the Information Technology Departments of the City of Redondo Beach and the District Attorney's Office. The Police Department does not have information technology personnel dedicated to the department and projects are based on priority need.

The Redondo Beach Police Department agrees that the E-Subpoena system can be beneficial and improve procedure, but not for the reasons stated by the Grand Jury report. We disagree with some of assertions of the Grand Jury; they are not accurate as applied to the Redondo Beach Police Department. The Grand Jury uses the Los Angeles Police Department and others as the litmus test for efficiency and effectiveness. One size does not fit all, and the report does not account for agencies that have instituted subpoena control with policy, procedure and other computer programs for many years. The Redondo Beach Police Department has instituted a monitored and controlled subpoena program for more than thirteen years. We adapted practices learned from the Torrance Police Department that implemented these programs before us.

Page 21

The report emphasizes the strict time requirements of arraignment and preliminary hearing as being one of the primary needs for the system. It posits that the DA's lack of knowledge of completed service is the reason for issuing subpoenas to all officers on a case. "When paper subpoenas are delivered and

hand distributed, the DA has no timely confirmation of who is served. For example, if six officers investigate a crime, unless the prosecutor knows the lead officer receives their subpoena the DA often sends to all six officers involved." This is stated again on Page 24, item 7.a.

Our experience is that two very different criteria affect the number of subpoenas and the timeliness of subpoena delivery that far exceeds the effects of confirmation. First, the filing deputy, and not the prosecutor for the preliminary hearing, determines the number of officers subpoenaed to a case. The prelim deputy often does not receive or see the case until the day of the prelim and does not determine officers' attendance. If the police department attempts to reduce the number of officers appearing, it is done through personal contact with the witness coordinator for the local office. Second, the three-day workweek affects the ability of the department to serve officers if the subpoenas arrive on or after the last workday of their schedule. When leave time is granted, this exacerbates the problem.

The Redondo Beach Police Department retrieves its local subpoenas daily from the court and distributes them as soon as possible on the next available work day of the officers. More than 90% of all felony subpoenas for the Redondo Beach officers are from the Torrance Office. Delays do not occur for the majority of the department's subpoenas. A Court Liaison Officer dedicated to the retrieval, delivery, and proof of service of subpoenas manages our cases daily. The Court Liaison Officer confers with the witness coordinator in the Torrance DA's Office daily to reduce the number of officers called to cases. They work closely together, and they are effective. This combined with a Court Subpoena Database that has been used in our Department since about 1998 saves as much as \$60,000 or more in costs per month. It is the personal contact and credibility of these persons that realizes the reductions. When our liaison officer attempts to achieve the same results with foreign courts in other parts of Los Angeles and Orange County, they meet with resistance and often cannot reduce the number of officers. This occurs even with evidence of proof of service. This is why we believe the comments of the report are not accurate regarding the controlling factor to reduce the number of officers subpoenaed to appear. With certain defense attorneys, the control is even less, as we believe they subpoena all officers to cause an economic disadvantage in an attempt to discourage going to trial by raising overtime costs.

Page 25, Item 12

"Less manpower is needed to generate mail and manually track each subpoena." We believe that this will only be true if we are able to create an interface between our existing court tracking software and the e-Subpoena system and/or our Court Liaison Officer has the ability to receive notification of service in real time to allow adequate follow-up when subpoena timelines are critical. Their current involvement in service and validation of service for the DA will be impeded if the transactions are between the system and the officer only, and they require the Court Liaison Officer to run ad hoc queries to determine status. It is imperative that our management knows when the officer is subpoenaed and their response to the subpoena.

Page 25, Item 16

"Several departments that have implemented e-Subpoena encourage their officers to check email on their days off." We know from previous labor issues in the City of Redondo Beach that this will cause labor objections and assertions that this violates FLSA de minimus rules. If the timelines of a court appearance are close, the department will have to make contact with the officer to give a verbal order with or without the e-Subpoena system.

We are interested in determining how the system will deal with officers that are in long-term leave status or that are on leave. There are legitimate excusable circumstances that prevent officers'

attendance at court. With our current procedures, we are aware of these circumstances and can assist in finding alternatives to mitigate them.

Page 21

"This new system also permits law enforcement management to track offending officers with a history of missed hearings or who intentionally run up court appearance overtime. Previously, such officers could not be disciplined, as the agency had no knowledge of officers who were abusing the system." Again, the Grand Jury is making an assumption based on the LAPD and not on other agencies. We have long held our officers accountable to court appearances, and we have concern that the direct link between officer and the DA can lessen this accountability through the technology rather than improving it.

We have attempted to contact the DA's Office regarding the requirements and process to implement the e-Subpoena system. We will attempt to implement the system as long as it enhances our ability to hold officers accountable for their court appearances.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "W. Joseph Leonardi". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

W. Joseph Leonardi
Chief of Police



County of Los Angeles CIVIL GRAND JURY

CLARA SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER
210 WEST TEMPLE STREET • ELEVENTH FLOOR • ROOM 11-506 • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
TELEPHONE (213) 893-1047 • FAX (213) 229-2595
<http://www.grandjury.co.la.ca.us/>

November 18, 2011

Chief Joe Payne
South Pasadena Police Department
1422 Mission Street
South Pasadena, California 91030

Dear Chief Payne:

Pursuant to Penal Code §933, all Agencies cited in the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report are required to respond to the recommendations provided in the Final Report within sixty days for elected officials and no longer than ninety days for public agencies.

Please note, as of today's date the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury has not received the required responses from your agency.

If you have already responded to the recommendation(s) in the Final Report, please disregard this notice.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Bob Cremer, Chairperson, Continuity Committee
2011-2012 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

Alf Schonbach, Foreperson
2011-2012 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

E-SUBPOENA ONE WAY TO END THE PAPER CHASE

Received

JUN 29 2011

CHIEF'S OFFICE



Committee Members

Chairperson: Joseph H. Safier
John A. Rangel
Susan Stetson

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The CGJ reviewed DA prepared e-Subpoena presentation materials, an overview of the County's Information Systems Advisory Board (ISAB), Proactive Information Exchange (PIX) system, and several LEA e-Subpoena Policy/Procedure statements. The CGJ analyzed statistics of subpoenas issued by the DA during 2010 and prepared a Report of LEAs in descending order of number of subpoenas received. In addition, CGJ members met or spoke with representatives of the DA, ISAB and the following LEAs and City Attorneys to discuss the system:

1. Los Angeles Sheriffs Department (LASD)
2. Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD)
3. City of Alhambra Police Department
4. City of Bell Police Department
5. City of Bell Gardens Police Department
6. City of Beverly Hills Police Department
7. City of Burbank Police Department
8. City of Covina Police Department
9. City of Culver City Police Department
10. City of Gardena Police Department
11. City of Glendale Police Department
12. City of Glendora Police Department
13. City of Huntington Park Police Department
14. City of Inglewood Police Department
15. City of Inglewood City Attorney
16. City of Long Beach Police Department
17. City of Los Angeles Fire Department
18. City of Los Angeles Unified School District School Police
19. City of Manhattan Beach Police Department
20. City of Monrovia Police Department
21. City of Monterey Park Police Department
22. City of Pasadena Police Department
23. City of Redondo Beach Police Department
24. City of San Fernando Police Department
25. City of San Gabriel Police Department
26. City of South Pasadena Police Department
27. City of Torrance Police Department
28. City of West Covina Police Department
29. City of Whittier Police Department

- c. Improved control using case management systems versus ad hoc e-mail
- d. PIX ensures reliable delivery/return receipt and a standard interface to different law enforcement agency systems

All DA, Public Defender, APD, and City Attorneys/City Prosecutors in the future can use the same message formats and delivery mechanisms.

- 5. E-Subpoena was started approximately five (5) years ago with LAPD.
- 6. Electronic notice of delivery and receipt occurs between PIX and the following agencies:
 - a. LASD
 - b. LAPD
 - c. Long Beach Police Department
 - d. Inglewood Police Department
 - e. Culver City Police Department
 - f. Montebello Police Department

The last three (3) agencies on the preceding list use a third-party vendor that supply and maintain the technology for LEA delivery and receipt. At least one LEA reported that the implementation took one (1) month followed by a two (2) month period of running the systems in parallel. The biggest implementation problem encountered was officer resistance to change.

- 7. Additional benefits are:
 - a. Electronic service reduces officer overtime from having to subpoena more officers than actually needed (blanket subpoenas) since the DA can now verify which officer(s) were served.
 - b. With planned court closures, travel time as well as court overtime are reduced.
 - c. Because the officer is positively served and will appear, the DA, Public Defender, and APD reduce their case continuance costs.
 - d. Accuracy is improved through officer validation; the sender ensures that the correct officer is served.
 - e. The law enforcement agency's subpoena control personnel can review and manage multiple requests more efficiently.
 - f. Risk of loss of JDIC-printed or paper subpoenas is reduced.
 - g. Follow-up phone calls are minimized.
 - h. Formal audit trail of service is provided.

20. The following is a Table of law enforcement agencies receiving at least one hundred fifty (150) subpoenas from the DA during the period October through December 2010 and their e-Subpoena implementation status:

LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY-ISSUED LAW ENFORCEMENT SUBPOENAS AGENCIES RECEIVING AT LEAST 150 SUBPOENAS FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER THRU DECEMBER, 2010		
Agency	No. Issued	e-Subpoena Status
CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL	2,128	Interested
PASADENA POLICE DEPARTMENT	988	
GLENDALE POLICE DEPARTMENT	903	
HUNTINGTON PARK POLICE DEPARTMENT	685	
BURBANK POLICE DEPARTMENT	612	
HAWTHORNE POLICE DEPARTMENT	604	Interested
WHITTIER POLICE DEPARTMENT	593	
SANTA MONICA POLICE DEPARTMENT	537	In process
LASD - VARIOUS	515	Implemented
GARDENA POLICE DEPARTMENT	501	
DOWNEY POLICE DEPARTMENT	490	Interested
EL MONTE POLICE DEPARTMENT	474	Interested
POMONA POLICE DEPARTMENT	456	Interested
ALHAMBRA POLICE DEPARTMENT	433	
L. A. CITY FIRE DEPARTMENT	422	
SOUTH GATE POLICE DEPARTMENT	421	Interested
TORRANCE POLICE DEPARTMENT	403	
MONTEREY PARK POLICE DEPARTMENT	366	
WEST COVINA POLICE DEPARTMENT	364	
L. A. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT PD	318	
L. A. COUNTY CORONER	300	Interested
EL SEGUNDO POLICE DEPARTMENT	274	Interested
MONTEBELLO POLICE DEPARTMENT	271	In process
L. A. COUNTY PROBATION	255	Interested
SAN FERNANDO POLICE DEPARTMENT	216	
MANHATTAN BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT	189	
BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT	182	
COVINA POLICE DEPARTMENT	176	
MONROVIA POLICE DEPARTMENT	168	
GLENDORA POLICE DEPARTMENT	163	
SAN GABRIEL POLICE DEPARTMENT	163	
BELL GARDENS POLICE DEPARTMENT	159	
REDONDO BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT	159	
BELL POLICE DEPARTMENT	157	
LAPD – VARIOUS	155	Implemented
SOUTH PASADENA POLICE DEPARTMENT	154	

City of Covina (Police Department)
City of Gardena (Police Department)
City of Glendale (Police Department)
City of Glendora (Police Department)
City of Huntington Park (Police Department)
City of Los Angeles Fire Department
City of Los Angeles Unified School District (School Police)
City of Manhattan Beach (Police Department)
City of Monrovia (Police Department)
City of Monterey Park (Police Department)
City of Pasadena (Police Department)
City of Redondo Beach (Police Department)
City of San Fernando (Police Department)
City of San Gabriel (Police Department)
City of South Pasadena (Police Department)
City of Torrance (Police Department)
City of West Covina (Police Department)
City of Whittier (Police Department)

- 2 City of Inglewood (City Attorney)
- 3 City of Los Angeles (Police Department)
County of Los Angeles (Sheriffs Department)
- 4 County of Los Angeles (Sheriffs Department)
- 5 County of Los Angeles (District Attorney)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Rec'd 12/2/11



City of
Santa Monica[®]

Police Department
333 Olympic Drive
Santa Monica, California 90401

November 29, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street,
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3210

Dear Presiding Judge:

Pursuant to California Penal Code section §933, the Santa Monica Police Department hereby responds to certain sections of the County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury's recommendation – Final Report.

The Grand Jury made several recommendations (2a, b, c and d), which the Santa Monica Police Department has been ordered to respond, which will be separately discussed as follows:

(2a) Establish a "High Tech Forensics Bureau."

In 2008, the Santa Monica Police Department joined and assigned a detective to the Beverley Hills Police Department's Joint Computer Crime Task Force. In 2011, the detective was also sworn in as a Federal Marshall with the United States Secret Service's Electronic Crimes Task Force.

(b) Update regular law enforcement recruit and detective training to include orientation, procedures, protocols and other training with respect to digital evidence.

The assigned detective continues to provide high technology training on a regular basis to the department's detectives and patrol personnel during roll calls and other training events. The detective has also been trained and certified by the National White Collar Crime Center.

(c) Include training in digital evidence collection, analysis and use "roll call" training.

This area of training is covered during the High Technology training provided to detectives and patrol personnel as stated in (b).

(d) Take steps to acquire the POST certification for High Tech training courses for forensic examiners and cyber investigations to allow for reimbursement of the costs.

The Department's High Technology detective has attended several POST certified High Tech training courses to enhance his knowledge. The POST certified courses are listed below:

1. High Technology & Computer Crime Investigation
2. PC Forensics / Specialized Investigative Tools
3. PC Forensics / Basic Data Recovery & Acquisitions
4. Computer / Digital Evidence Recovery
5. PC Forensics / Specialized Investigative Tools
6. PC Forensics / Advanced Computer Forensics
7. Computer / LAN Investigations

In addition to the listed POST certified training, the detective will be receiving additional computer forensic and cyber investigation training from the federal government due to his affiliation with the United States Secret Service. This training is provided at no cost to the Santa Monica Police Department at the United States Secret Service's training facility in Hoover, Alabama.

If there are any other questions or comments, please contact our office at 310-458-8401.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. Jackman', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and somewhat cursive.

TIMOTHY J. JACKMAN
Chief of Police



CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA
POLICE DEPARTMENT
1414 MISSION STREET, SOUTH PASADENA, CA 91030
TEL: 626.403.7270 * FAX: 626.403.7271
WWW.SPPD.ORG

November 23, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: 2010-2011 CGJ E-Subpoena Recommendations

The South Pasadena Police Department has reviewed the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury report regarding electronic subpoena distribution process for Law Enforcement agencies and their recommendations.

The South Pasadena Police Department agrees with the recommendations and we are currently in the process of evaluating various options to implement the E-Subpoena program.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at (626) 403-7273.

Sincerely,

Joseph F. Payne
Chief of Police
South Pasadena Police Department
1422 Mission Street
South Pasadena, CA 91030



City of
San Gabriel

◆ City With A Mission ◆ Founded 1771 ◆

David A. Lawton, Chief of Police ◆ 626-308-2830

February 10, 2012

Foreperson Alf Schonbach
Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury
210 West Temple Street, 11th Floor – Room 11-506
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Foreperson Schonbach:

This is a letter requesting response to the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury findings regarding the E-Subpoena program.

The San Gabriel Police Department agrees with the finding. The San Gabriel Police Department has not yet implemented the finding, but will implement the finding in the future. It is anticipated that implementation can begin during the next twelve months after completion of other technology initiatives that are in progress. Specifically, the Department is implementing an on-line crime reporting system and on-line parking permit system. After the implementation of these projects Police Department staff will have the time needed to focus on E-Subpoenas.

Please contact me if there are any questions.

Sincerely,

David A. Lawton
Chief of Police

DAL:ja

Rec'd 10/4/11



CITY OF
San Fernando
Historic & Visionary

September 29, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street,
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Honorable Presiding Judge;

This is in response to the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report, regarding "E-Subpoena, One Way to End the Paper Chase." As an agency receiving more than one hundred fifty (150) DA subpoenas quarterly, the San Fernando Police Department is interested in implementing and participating in e-Subpoena. The City of San Fernando is always looking for innovative ways at reducing unintended costs, especially during the current economic climate.

Please feel free to contact me at 818.898.1281 with further information and / or if there is any associated cost to participate in e-Subpoena.

Sincerely yours,

TONY RUELAS
Chief of Police

By,

SYLVIA ARREDONDO
Records Bureau / Systems Administrator



Rec'd 9/19/11



CITY OF TORRANCE

POLICE DEPARTMENT

JOHN J. NEU
CHIEF OF POLICE

September 16, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple St., 11th Floor, Rm. 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012


Dear Presiding Judge of the L.A. Superior Court:

In compliance with California Penal Code requirements, the Torrance Police Department has reviewed the recommendation detailed in the 2010-2011 L.A. County Grand Jury Report – "E-Subpoena One Way to End the Paper Chase" and is responding as follows:

Recommendation 1: Implement e-Subpoena as a cost saving and operational efficiency measure for local law enforcement agencies receiving at least one hundred fifty (150) DA subpoenas quarterly.

Response 1: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but the Torrance Police Department has researched implementation of an E-Subpoena system and plans to begin beta testing of this technology in Fall 2011. Staff has examined available E-Subpoena software packages successfully deployed by law enforcement agencies in Los Angeles County and plans to deploy a similar system for a six month trial period. Through E-Subpoena implementation, the department hopes to better its cost and process efficiencies through such features as: email notification of subpoena receipt and service, streamlined audit trails, email notification of officer appearance instructions, and centralized performance reporting and service tracking. Additionally, the City of Torrance Prosecutor's Office has expressed interest in participating in the police department's E-Subpoena test trial, and discussions for coordination are ongoing.

Sincerely,


John J. Neu
Chief of Police



Rec'd 9/19/11

CITY OF TORRANCE

POLICE DEPARTMENT

JOHN J. NEU
CHIEF OF POLICE

September 16, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple St., 11th Floor, Rm. 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Presiding Judge of the L.A. Superior Court:

In compliance with California Penal Code requirements, the Torrance Police Department has reviewed the recommendations detailed in the 2010-2011 L.A. County Grand Jury Report – “High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age” and provides the following responses:

Recommendation 2a. Establish a “High Tech Forensics Bureau.”

Response 2a: The Torrance Police Department has already implemented this recommendation. A High Tech Crimes detail, housed in the Detectives Division, was established in January 2010. A full-time detective is assigned to the detail as the Computer Forensics Lab investigator. The Department completed renovations to establish a state of the art computer forensics lab in August 2010 which houses the equipment and systems needed for digital evidence processing. Detective duties include: conducting investigations and digital evidence recovery on computers, cell phones and various electronic devices; performing surveillance video recovery and enhancement investigations; providing expert witness testimony in court; and assisting task force members with cases and warrants at various locations around Los Angeles County. The detective is assigned to the Los Angeles Police Department’s Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force and the United States Secret Service’s Los Angeles Electronics Crimes Task Force (LAECTF). He is a graduate of the National Computer Forensic Institute “Basic Computer Evidence Recovery Training”; has attained “ACE” certification in Access Data’s Forensic Tool Kit; and is trained in mobile phone and computer forensics, as well as advanced internet examinations. As of March 2011, the detail has completed 41 forensic investigations with evidence retrieved from computers, cell phones, electronic video and audio, digital video recorders (DVR) and global positioning systems (GPS). These investigations included criminal cases involving homicide, identity theft, narcotics, theft and sex crimes. Another detective has been assigned to the High Tech Crimes detail and is being trained accordingly, as the original Computer Forensics Lab investigator is on medical leave.

Recommendation 2b. Update regular law enforcement recruit and detective training to include orientation, procedures, protocols and other training with respect to digital evidence.

Response 2b: The Torrance Police Department has already implemented this recommendation. Personnel from the High Tech Crimes detail and Detectives Division periodically inform new and experienced patrol officers of the purpose and capabilities of the High Tech Crimes detail. Presentation content includes digital evidence recognition and preservation and an overview of what circumstances warrant call out of the Computer Forensics Lab investigator. Additionally, Field Training Officers incorporate basic digital evidence training for newly hired officers as circumstances arise in the field; i.e. theft of GPS-enabled electronic devices, call/text data for cell phones in possession of known criminals, etc. Police officer probationers are therefore exposed to hands-on learning opportunities regarding the recognition, preservation and use of digital evidence in everyday police work.


Recommendation 2c. Include training in digital evidence collection, analysis and use in "roll call" training.

Response 2c: The Torrance Police Department has already implemented this recommendation. As mentioned earlier, personnel from the High Tech Crimes detail and Detectives Division periodically present digital evidence information to patrol staff. These presentations are made at daily patrol briefings and heighten officer awareness of digital evidence importance, recognition and preservation. Patrol officers are also informed of the capabilities of the High Tech Crimes detail and under what circumstances the detail's specialized skills should be called out to a crime scene.

Recommendation 2d. Take steps to acquire the POST certification for High Tech training courses for forensic examiners and cyber investigators to allow for reimbursement of the costs.

Response 2d: The recommendation is not applicable. It is the Torrance Police Department's understanding that POST certification is the responsibility of the training provider. The department is not a provider of High Tech training.

Sincerely,


John J. Neu
Chief of Police

Rec'd 12/2/11



CITY OF
TORRANCE

November 30, 2011

Mr. Bob Cremer, Chairperson, Continuity Committee
2011-2012 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple St., 11th Floor, Rm. 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Cremer:

This correspondence is in response to your letter dated November 18, 2011 which noted that the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury had not received the required responses from the Torrance Police Department.

Copies of the Torrance Police Department's written response letters, as well as the confirmation receipt letters have been enclosed for your reference as follows:

- (1) "E-Subpoena, One Way to End the Paper Chase" response letter
- (1) "High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age" response letter
- (1) "E-Subpoena, One Way to End the Paper Chase" confirmation receipt letter
- (1) "High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age" confirmation receipt letter

Please feel free to contact me, Kent Sentinella, Administrative Analyst at (310) 618-5677 should you require anything further.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. NEU
Chief of Police

Kent Sentinella, Administrative Analyst
Torrance Police Department

Enclosures (4)

cc: Mr. Alf Schonbach, Foreperson



Whittier Police Department

Quality People - Quality Service

Jeff A. Piper
Chief of Police

Serving the Communities of Whittier and Santa Fe Springs

September 19, 2011

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Eleventh Floor, Room 11-506
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Response to Civil Grand Jury High Tech Forensics Recommendations

Dear Presiding Judge,

Please allow this correspondence to fulfill the requirements set forth in Penal Code Sections 933(c) and 933.05 in responding to the High Tech Forensics report submitted by the Civil Grand Jury.

Findings:

FL Skills and Equipment Consideration:

1. (a) – Agree with finding
1. (b) – Agree with finding
1. (c) – Agree with finding
1. (d) – Agree with finding
1. (e) – Agree with finding

2. (a) – Agree with finding
2. (b) (i) – Agree with finding
2. (b) (ii) – Agree with finding
2. (b) (iii) – Agree with finding
2. (b) (iv) – Agree with finding
2. (b) (v) – Agree with finding
2. (b) (vi) – Agree with finding

Risk Management Approach:

1. Agree with finding
2. Agree with finding
3. Agree with finding
4. Agree with finding
5. Agree with finding
6. Agree with finding
7. Agree with finding
8. Agree with finding
9. Agree with finding

Training:

1. Agree with finding
2. Agree with finding
3. Agree with finding
4. Agree with finding
5. Agree with finding
6. Agree with finding
7. Agree with finding

Promotion and Succession Planning

1. Agree with finding
2. Agree with finding

Digital Evidence and Procedures to Address Detected Intrusions

1. (a) Agree with finding
1. (b) Agree with finding
2. (a) Agree with finding
2. (b) Does not apply to this agency
2. (c) Agree with finding.
2. (d) Does not apply to this agency
2. (e) (i) Agree with finding
2. (e) (ii) Agree with finding

The Civil Grand Jury provided five (5) recommendations in their report; however, only one recommendation containing four (4) subsections pertains to this agency:

2. (a) Establish a "High Tech Forensics Bureau." This will facilitate:

(i) Promotions and career opportunities for those who are trained and skilled in this area without having to leave the discipline

(ii) Succession planning and transfer of high tech expertise, preserving the investment made in creating expertise.

The Department has a three-member dedicated civilian forensics team including a senior forensics specialist. One member of the team has successfully completed 400 hours of computer and high tech forensics training, including POST, CA DOJ, EnCase and Paraban. Another member of the team is currently attending similar training for the purpose of succession planning. The team utilizes four computers with write blockers for image acquisition and analysis, EnCase software for forensic analysis of computers, VMware for browsing suspect hard drives in a live environment, Cellebrite Universal Extraction Device (UFED) for cell phone analysis, many different open source software applications for specialized parsing of data Linux Live CD's, Faraday box for isolating cell phones and preventing them from connecting with a network, and various micro tool sets for dismantling computers and cell phone devices.

Since all three forensics specialists are career civilian personnel, they do not rotate to other assignments within the organization.

2. (b) Update regular law enforcement recruit and detective training to include orientation, procedures, protocols and other training with respect to digital evidence.

Detectives have received regular training from forensics personnel on handling and collecting digital evidence. Due to the 24/7 /365 availability of Department trained computer forensics personnel, detectives regularly summon expert assistance in intermediate and complex digital evidence processing and retrieval.

The Forensics Bureau will develop training curriculum in the area of digital evidence to be included in the field training manual for new police recruits.


-
2. (c) Include training in digital evidence collection, analysis and use in "roll call" training.

The Forensics Bureau will develop training curriculum in the area of digital evidence to be included in patrol operations briefings.

2. (d) Take steps to acquire the POST certification for High Tech training courses for forensics examiners and cyber investigators to allow for reimbursement of the costs.

As mentioned in 2. (a), one forensic specialist has already attended POST and DOJ certification and the Department benefitted from POST reimbursement. The Department will continue to seek POST and DOJ funded training for other forensic specialist.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeff A. Piper". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "J" and "P".

Jeff A. Piper
Chief of Police

Rec'd 12/1



STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS FOR THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES HELD IN ROOM 381B
OF THE KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

Tuesday, October 4, 2011

9:30 AM

13. Recommendation: Approve the responses to the 2010-11 findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury that pertain to County government matters under the control of the Board; instruct the Executive Officer of the Board to transmit copies of the report to the Grand Jury upon approval by the Board; and to file a copy of the report with the Superior Court upon approval by the Board. (Continued from meeting of 9-27-11) (11-4163)

On motion of Supervisor Knabe, seconded by Supervisor Antonovich, this item was approved.

Ayes: 5 - Supervisor Molina, Supervisor Ridley-Thomas, Supervisor Yaroslavsky, Supervisor Knabe and Supervisor Antonovich

Attachments: Board Letter

The foregoing is a fair statement of the proceedings of the regular meeting held October 4, 2011, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts, agencies and authorities for which said Board so acts.



Sachi A. Hamai, Executive Officer
Executive Officer-Clerk
of the Board of Supervisors

By Sachi A. Hamai

Sachi A. Hamai
Executive Officer

ATTEST: SACHI A. HAMAI
EXECUTIVE OFFICER
CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
September 27, 2011
Page 3

- 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/FINANCING

Certain Grand Jury recommendations require additional financing resources. 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 during the 2012-13 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 2010-2011 County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury Final Report:

ATTACHMENT	DEPARTMENT
A	Chief Executive Office
B	Chief Information Office
C	Children and Family Services
D	District Attorney
E	Health Services
F	Probation
G	Public Health
H	Sheriff

Please note that the Departments of Children and Family Services and Probation have both responded to the Grand Jury Report on Transition Age Youth.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
September 27, 2011
Page 4

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Not applicable.

Respectfully submitted,



William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

WTF:EFS:MKZ
FC:BAM:ib

Attachments (8)

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
Sheriff
District Attorney
Auditor-Controller
Chief Information Office
Children and Family Services
County Counsel
Health Services
Internal Services
LACERA
Probation
Public Health

ATTACHMENT A



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

September 27, 2011

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

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

2010-2011 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are this Office's responses to the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security
- Public Pensions in Los Angeles County

If you have any 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:EFS:MKZ
FC:BAM:ib

Attachment

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – Chief Executive Office
(Intergovernmental and External Affairs)

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HIGH TECH FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY CRIME FIGHTING IN
THE DIGITAL AGE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors should task their lobbyists in Sacramento and Washington with looking at opportunities to redirect fees and taxes on land line phones, cell phones or internet access services to provide funding allocated to support high tech forensics, cyber security and forensic examination programs.

RESPONSE

Because there is no Board-approved policy to pursue the redirection of fees and taxes on land line phones, cell phones or internet access services to fund high tech forensics, cyber security and forensic examination programs, **this is a matter for Board policy determination.** The Board of Supervisors sets all legislative policies with regard to the assessment and use of fees and taxes throughout the County.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – Chief Executive Office
(Public Safety)

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HIGH TECH FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY CRIME FIGHTING IN
THE DIGITAL AGE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles establish a "High Tech Endowed Badge Program" to support the training and equipping of Forensic Examiners (FE) and Cyber Investigators (CI) throughout local law enforcement. Initially, establishment of eight (8) Endowed Badges (EBs) could be evaluated. Setting up five (5) EBs by the LAC Board of Supervisors District one for each Supervisorial District; and setting up three (3) EBs by the City of Los Angeles one for each of the Proprietary Departments (Department of Water and Power, the Port of Los Angeles, Los Angeles International Airport (LAWA)) for a total of eight (8) EBs.

RESPONSE

The Chief Executive Office recognizes the importance of forensic science and cyber investigation in today's world and that it is a critical and necessary element of a successful criminal investigation. Collected, managed and analyzed correctly, forensic science can often help to establish the guilt or innocence of individuals as well as be a determining factor in a criminal or civil case.

While we agree that partnering with private industry to fund a training program in this important field is something we should explore/pursue, currently the State and Federal government offer a variety of training and grant programs related to forensic examination and cyber investigation as part of their effort to enhance the criminal justice system. Many of the State and Federal training programs are offered free to local law enforcement agencies, or grants are provided to help offset the costs of training staff in this ever-evolving field. Below is a list of a few of the training programs currently offered by the Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to local law enforcement agencies.

- In partnership with BJA, the National Forensic Science Technology Center (NFSTC) provides hands-on training and technical assistance to a broad community of stakeholders, including law enforcement and investigators, on a variety of forensic science applications. The NFSTC (with support from the National Association of Medical Examiners) developed a 40-hour workshop to provide Forensic Pathology Fellows with knowledge of the scope and application of the forensic sciences within the criminal justice system.

- In partnership BJA, the Mississippi State University's National Forensic Training Center (NFTC) provides no-cost training to law enforcement officers to fight cyber crime. With the growing level of cyber crime today, it is critical that law enforcement officers have the ability to handle and examine digital evidence. The NFTC seeks to solve this issue by offering training in a broad range of cyber crime areas. The training that is offered by the NFTC is free of charge for all law enforcement personnel.
- Derived from the University of Tennessee's National Forensic Academy curriculum, National Forensic Science Institute's 40-hour, specialized courses in various topics are available on a limited basis throughout the year, at both onsite and offsite locations nationwide. The Crime Scene Management in Correctional Facilities course is a 5-day, 40-hour, hands-on training program offering correctional investigators and security officers access to forensic evidence identification, documentation, collection, and preservation procedures.
- Introduction to Internet Crime Investigation is a training program that introduces law enforcement investigators to the ways in which criminal activity is perpetrated within online computer networks and instructs them in techniques and software tools for working these cases online. Attendees will be exposed to Google as an investigative tool, identifying users of social networking sites, tracing e-mails and web sites, understanding Internet Protocol (IP) and how to trace IP addresses, and who owns a specific web site and where to serve search warrants.
- The Investigation of Computer Crime teaches that the internet is alive and well, and is a dynamic resource for millions worldwide. It is also a place for criminals to prey on unsuspecting victims. Many victims are children, while some are adults, and others are corporations. This 4 ½-day course teaches criminal justice investigators and support staff how to investigate high-technology theft and computer-related crime. It provides participants with an understanding of computer technology, its application to criminal endeavors, and the issues associated with investigating these cases. This course will provide current real-world case studies and solutions that can be adapted to current investigations. Topics will also include identity theft, Internet-based fraud, child exploitation, hacking and compromised systems, and phishing.
- The Seizure and Examination of Computers teaches criminal justice investigators the basic concepts of computers and digital evidence recovery. The 3-day course teaches investigators new to high-technology crime how to safely seize a computer system, make duplicate images of hard drives, and recognize compressed and encrypted data. Participants will become familiar with forensic software and the basics of digital evidence analysis. The course will also discuss directory structure and how it can impact your investigations; file headers and extensions, steganography, and encryption and how it is used.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – Chief Executive Office
(Benefits, Compensation Policy & Employee Relations)

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
PHASE II, SECTION 1 OF "WHOA! THE STATE OF PUBLIC PENSIONS
IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY"

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Eliminate administrative policies that permit employees to spike their final average salary in the final years of employment. When the County next decides to modify pension benefits, include in the modification scope an examination of the efficacy of:

- a. Changing the period used to determine FAS from 12 months to 36 months for most plans.
- b. Eliminating all pensionable pay categories that are not mandatory, such as vacation and sick leave buy-back pay.

RESPONSE

We concur with Recommendation 1a. The Grand Jury Report points out that the County maintains three defined benefit retirement plans open to new hires, and these plans are commonly known as "General Member Plans D and E" and "Safety Member Plan B" (hereinafter referred to as Plans D, E, and Safety B, respectively). Plans D and Safety B incorporate a single highest year final compensation period for determining final average salary (FAS), and Plan E incorporates a three-year (36-month) FAS. The report recommends a three-year FAS be considered for new hires under Plans D and Safety B, and we agree with that recommendation.

A three-year FAS would be appropriate from a plan design standpoint, and would mitigate future costs for the affected plans. As noted in the report, the cost reduction would be generated from the employment of new hires and would materialize gradually as the Plan D and Safety B populations turn over. It should be noted, however, that this change would be the proper subject of collective bargaining under the Myers-Milias-Brown Act and would, therefore, require negotiations with employee representatives. Nevertheless, it is a change worth pursuing, and we plan to address this matter in conjunction with other issues in future collective bargaining efforts.

With regard to Recommendation 1b, we agree the County should consider any opportunity to eliminate (or not create) any item of compensation that is unnecessary or ineffective from a compensation policy standpoint – pensionable or not. We do not agree, however, that pensionability concerns, alone, should drive these decisions or that the two examples cited in this recommendation are items that can be eliminated without significant adverse consequences to the County. The following information is a brief explanation of why this is the case with regard to the payments for accumulated vacation time:

1. Paying employees for excess accumulated vacation time is a practice that was established at a time when the payments were not pensionable under the County Employees Retirement Law (CERL). The practice is provided for in our current fringe benefit memoranda of understanding and has been the subject of many rounds of negotiations with employee representatives. As noted in the report, the event that made these payments pensionable was the 1997 court case commonly known as the Ventura Case – a case which changed the ground rules on what is and is not pensionable.
2. Existing County policy provides that vacation benefits must either be taken off by employees or, under specified conditions, paid off in cash. Cash pay offs to active County employees may only occur if an individual's unused accumulated vacation balance exceeds a designated threshold which, in most cases, is equivalent to the maximum vacation time an employee can earn over three working years. Accumulated vacation time below the three year threshold may be carried on the books indefinitely, but all such time must be paid off at termination at the rate of pay an employee is earning at that point in time. This time is not pensionable (even under the Ventura Case), but it creates a book liability that must be reported on the County's financial statements.
3. Ideally, accumulated vacation time should be taken or "managed" off, not paid off. However, the operational needs of the various County departments do not always allow for that circumstance. For example, approximately one-third of the County's workforce occupy positions known as "post positions" where the job must be staffed at designated days/times (e.g. hospital Registered Nurse, Deputy Sheriff, etc.). When absenteeism or other staffing shortages occur, other employees must be called in to backfill the positions on an overtime basis.

The report acknowledges the impact of the Ventura Case, but it also states that the above described in-service payoff of excess accumulated vacation time has been "designated as pensionable salary by administrative policy of the County" and is "not mandatory." This is confusing language given there should be no question that the pensionability of these payments has been determined solely by CERL and the Ventura Case, not the County. However, if by "not mandatory" the report is referring to the fact that the County could pursue, through the collective bargaining process, the complete elimination of in-service pay offs for excess accumulated vacation time (and the related pensionable income issue), that is true. But, as noted above, there would be consequences to that change that would adversely impact operations and be very costly.

The County also reimburses employees, under specified conditions, for unused accumulated sick leave time, and that practice is also a target of this recommendation. This policy also pre-dates the Ventura Case and has also been the subject of many negotiation cycles with employee representatives. The policy is intended to reward employees for strong attendance, and has significantly reduced employee usage of County provided sick leave benefits. Without going into the details of this program, we would like to voice a similar concern, as that outlined above, in that the elimination of this program would increase absenteeism, adversely impact County operations, and generate new costs.

We believe a better tactic than eliminating pay practices that make sense is to eliminate the law that makes them pensionable. The Chief Executive Office, in conjunction with the California Association of Counties (CSAC) will develop proposed legislation that would make the necessary amendments to CERL.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Through the collective bargaining process, the County could also reduce or eliminate automatic pay increases given to employees as they approach retirement, such as longevity and wellness pay, which contribute to pension spiking.

RESPONSE

We understand this recommendation reflects concern over the longevity pay negotiated with the Peace Officer and Supervising Peace Officer bargaining units in 2005. As noted in the report, the longevity pay in question provides additional salary of 3%, 4%, and 4% upon completion of 19, 24, and 29 years of service, respectively. As with any increase in salary, these adjustments affect pensions and pension costs.

We understand the concern over the 2005 agreement, and we agree that no prior policy decision should be immune to re-consideration in connection with future bargaining efforts. However, we believe the 2005 agreements with the two Peace Officer groups were important to maintaining a competitive pay policy for law enforcement personnel. As pointed out in the report, there was a veritable tidal wave of pension enhancements taking place throughout the California public sector at that time, and that movement started with the State of California itself.

With regard to law enforcement personnel, our concerns regarding competitive pay policy are driven, in large part, by the practices of the City of Los Angeles. The City is our major competitor for this particular talent and has historically paid more than the County in both salaries and pensions. The City has also provided longevity pay, historically beginning at 10 years of service. The imbalance, however, was largely remedied by the 2005 agreement to provide longevity pay – an agreement which ultimately reflected the recommendations of an independent mediator as well as Chief Executive Office staff.

The County also agreed to a 3% Fire Fighter “wellness bonus” in 2006. This was effectively an across-the-board salary adjustment for all Fire Fighters conditioned on each affected employee meeting or exceeding certain specified fitness standards. This form of pay is not seniority or longevity based and is no more conducive to pension spiking than any other type of across-the-board salary adjustment. It is, therefore, unclear as to why this item is included in this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The County to consider changes to pension plans for new employees, capping pensionable salaries or placing a cap on the maximum value of pension allowed, including changes to the Replacement Benefit Plan for highly compensated employees.

RESPONSE

We understand this recommendation to be focused primarily on Plan D and Safety Plan B as the Plan E benefit is currently capped at 80% of FAS after 45 years of County service. While we cannot disagree with a recommendation to consider further pension changes for new hires, we believe the recommendation to impose additional pension caps on future employees should be tempered by the following points:

1. Although the benefits under Plans D and Safety B are capped at 100% of FAS, these are contributory retirement plans wherein employee contributions pay for a substantial portion of the benefit. In the case of Plan D, for example, employee contributions are geared to finance one-half of the service retirement benefit. Therefore, the portion paid by the County is effectively capped right now at 50%.
2. The report makes note of the fact that the County requires substantial employee contributions to the retirement system, and this is in stark contrast to the practices of many other public jurisdictions, particularly jurisdictions participating the California Public Employees Retirement System.
3. It is important to consider that the County operates one of the largest health care systems in the United States. Many of the County's highest paid employees are physicians who can be difficult to recruit. A pension cap could make them more difficult to recruit. Moreover, physicians and certain other employees in relatively high paid occupations, such as Deputy District Attorneys, are now represented. Therefore, imposition of a pension cap on these groups, even on new hires only, would require both negotiations with employee representatives and legislation to amend CERL.
4. The body of the report makes reference to the Replacement Benefit Plan approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2010 and the fact that this plan may permit the payment of pension benefits in amounts higher than that "allowed" by the current limitations for qualified defined retirement plans set out in Section 415(b) of the Internal Revenue Code. We would like to clarify that the Replacement Benefit Plan mechanism, itself, is provided for in Section 415(m) of the Internal Revenue Code, and that this plan is necessary to ensure that Plans D, E, and Safety B remain in full compliance with both State and Federal law. The Replacement Benefit Plan is specifically permitted by Federal law and required by CERL.

Except for the three-year FAS issue addressed in Recommendation 1a, we believe that there is little justification for a general rollback (i.e. new tier) with respect to Plans D and Safety B. The benefit formulas have not been increased since the inception of the plans more than 30 years ago, and are generally below the level of benefits prevalent in the California public sector.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The County to consider negotiating changes in the Retiree Health Benefit Plan with labor organizations, to reduce the County net cost for the retiree health benefit, by either modifying benefit levels or increasing the member's share in the cost of retiree health insurance.

RESPONSE

We concur with this recommendation and efforts in this area are underway between the Chief Executive Office, employee representatives, and LACERA.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

The County to consider applying the full amount of the \$470.7 million County Contribution Credit Reserve to the retiree health trust as a first step toward accumulating reserves for OPEB benefits.

RESPONSE

With regard to both this recommendation and Recommendation 6, we concur that the County should complete a strategy to pre-fund its retiree health insurance liability, and that strategy should consider using, for this purpose, part or all of the remaining funds in the County Contribution Credit Reserve. There are many competing demands for the County's limited financial resources, especially now as we recover from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. The strategy we follow must carefully consider this reality as well.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

The County begin contributing the full annual required contribution for retiree health benefits in an attempt to build reserves and apply investment income as discounts toward the cost of benefits.

RESPONSE

See response to Recommendation 5.

ATTACHMENT B



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICE**

350 S. Figueroa St., Suite 188
World Trade Center
Los Angeles, CA 90071

RICHARD SANCHEZ
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Telephone: (213) 253-5600
Facsimile: (213) 633-4733

August 19, 2011

To: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Office

From: Richard Sanchez
Chief Information Office

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard Sanchez", written over the printed name and title.

**2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HIGH TECHNOLOGY
FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY CRIME FIGHTING IN THE DIGITAL AGE**

This is in response to your memo dated July 11, 2011 requesting the information below regarding the 2010-2011 Grand Jury recommendations for High Technology Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3a

The Los Angeles County (LAC) Chief Information Office (CIO) and Internal Services Department should conduct internal reviews concerning cyber security and infrastructure protection from Cyber-attacks and terrorism:

- a) LAC must have protocols, policies and procedures facilitating timely, efficient rapid response by the most able Cyber security resources available, and ancillary emergency response by other agencies, if warranted, in the event of a Cyber intrusion, fire wall breach, or other Cyber-attack.

RESPONSE

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be in the future along with a timeframe for implementation.

This response derives from an internal review conducted recently by the CIO concerning Cyber security incident response. The review included numerous documented protocols, policies, and procedures deployed several years before this report that promotes an effective internal incident response. The response may include personnel that are Cyber security professionals from the Internal Services Department (ISD) and the Auditor-Controller (A-C), depending on the type of Cyber-attack. Historically, the ISD and A-C has provided Cyber incident response expertise and

William T Fujioka
August 19, 2011
Page 2

support during business and emergency instances in support of the Countywide Computer Emergency Response Team (CCERT). It should be noted, that each department, in accordance with Board of Supervisors' policy is required to have a Departmental Computer Emergency Response Team (DCERT).

To address a timely and effective incident notification in support of the CCERT, an electronic notification system was implemented recently to notify the County's Departmental Information Security Officers (e.g., DCERT), when required, and coordinated by the County's Chief Information Security Officer (CISO).

As Cyber security attacks evolve and become increasingly sophisticated, LAC processes (e.g., CCERT and DCERT) will continually evolve to include, at the minimum, countywide mock drills lead by the CISO. The CCERT, established in June 2004, would achieve this task on a continual basis.

In response to the statement, "the most able Cyber security resources available and ancillary emergency response by other agencies", LAC is planning a competitive solicitation to obtain an Incident Response Services Master Services Agreement (IRS/MSA) with a firm that specializes in Cyber security incident response. The outcome of this solicitation will acquire the most able Cyber security resources to complement ISD and A-C resources, while providing Cyber security incident response services throughout the County. This promotes a consistent incident response methodology and provides a level of expertise to support the continual threat that we are faced with constantly to maintain the confidentiality and integrity of LAC computing resources and assets. Additionally, the CISO will examine opportunities to leverage Cyber security resources at the County of Los Angeles District Attorney's (DA) High Technology Crimes Investigation Unit.

Emergency response notification to other agencies (e.g., State and Federal government) was implemented to engage Cyber security officials prior to the delivery of this report.

In conclusion, plans are underway by the CIO/CISO to establish an IRS/MSA and examine opportunities at the DA's High Technology Crimes Investigation Unit within a 12-month period from the final date of this response.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3b

- b) These should include coordination with key third party vendors. Many basic services within the LAC are provided by third party vendors. The Metropolitan Water District and California Edison are two (2) examples.

William T Fujioka
August 19, 2011
Page 3

RESPONSE

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be in the future along with a timeframe for implementation.

This response derives from an internal review conducted recently by the Chief Information Office (CIO) concerning Cyber security incident response resulting from a Cyber-attack on our infrastructure (e.g., water systems and power grid). The review included numerous documented protocols, policies, and procedures deployed several years in advance of this report that promotes an effective internal incident response. This response includes personnel that are Cyber security professionals from within this organization as well as external agencies (e.g., California Standardized Emergency Management System).

When a Cyber security attack occurs on LAC infrastructure, the CIO/CISO has inserted themselves into the emergency response notification procedures as facilitated by the County Chief Executive Office, Office of Emergency Management (OEM). OEM has established protocols, policies, and procedures for internal County departments (e.g., ISD and Sheriff), as well as external agencies (e.g., agencies within State and Federal government).

In conclusion, as stated previously (i.e., Recommendation No. 3a), plans are underway by the CIO/CISO to establish an IRS/MSA and examine opportunities at the DA's High Technology Crimes Investigation Unit within a 12-month period from the final date of this response. This agreement will provide Cyber security expertise to support this recommendation, as well.

If you have any questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Robert Pittman, CISO at 213-253-5631 or rpittman@cio.lacounty.gov.

RS:RP:pa

cc: Ellen Sandt, DCEO
Steve Cooley, District Attorney
Tom Tindall, Internal Services
Wendy L. Watanabe, Auditor-Controller
Brian Mahan, Chief Executive Office

ATTACHMENT C



County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

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

PHILIP L. BROWNING
Interim Director

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

September 14, 2011

To: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

From: Philip L. Browning
Interim Director

**DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES RESPONSES TO THE
2010-2011 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT**

In response to your July 11th, 2011 memo, the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) respectfully submits the responses to the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury report pertaining to Post Adoption Services (PAS) and the Transition Age Youth (TAY) Journey recommendations.

Grand Jury Recommendations for Adoptions – Post Adoption Services (PAS)

The following responses are specific to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury recommendations regarding Post Adoption Services.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1

DCFS provide for a management audit to evaluate PAS work procedures as related to adoptive reunions with particular focus on the conversion of post adoption information in the electronic database (AIS).

RESPONSE

Adoption Permanency Resource Division (APRD) supports this recommendation and is currently developing a team to analyze the PAS Program.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1a

Evaluation of the reunion program, its organizational structure, service levels written policies, procedures and regulations, along with key processes; to determine whether processes have been effectively implemented to ensure compliance with policies, procedures, and adoption regulations.

Grand Jury Response
September 14, 2011
PAGE 2

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. APRD is to conduct an extensive review and evaluation of the adoption reunions; assess the effectiveness of our current practices and policies to ensure timely reunions. Establish a customer survey for this population to determine the effectiveness of the program.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1b

Determination as to whether effective and adequate internal controls are in place that provide reasonable assurance of minimal errors and maximize service efficiency.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. APRD is to conduct an evaluation of the Program's filing system of consents and waivers and its effectiveness and accessibility to ensure timely reunions.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1c

Tracking the number of Consents for Contact (for birth parents), Waivers of Confidentiality (for siblings), and Consents for Contact (for adoptees) over a certain period of time. This allows for the number of reunion requests made and successful reunifications processed by PAS on a historical basis. The CGJ suggests a fourteen-year (14) time frame seven (7) years before and seven (7) years after December 2003.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. Since January 2011, APRD has been keeping a manual log of all Waivers of Confidentiality and Consents for Contact received. This ensures tracking and will enable future reporting. Since 2003, PAS has been entering information on cases with Waivers or Consents into the Adoption Integrated System (AIS), but there has been no mechanism to run a report of all the cases that have such an entry. Thus, APRD does not have the data available to do a historical analysis for 14 years as recommended by the CGJ. To further enhance this tracking and reporting capability, APRD is partnering with the Business Information Systems (BIS) Division to establish a coding system on AIS to capture the number of consents and waivers filed on AIS and the number which result in actual reunions, and to measure the time frame.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1d

Estimation of the number of consents and reunion requests misfiled or lost by using a sampling method.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. Since a manual log of Waivers of Confidentiality and Consents for Contact was initiated in January 2011, PAS will conduct a sampling to ensure they were filed properly. Since Waivers, Consents and Reunion Requests were filed in the cases but not centrally tracked previously, it is not possible to complete an estimation of the number that had been misfiled or lost. Based on our client inquiries received regarding PAS, we believe the number lost or misfiled has been low. Once an automated tracking system is in place, PAS will be able to better track future consents and reunion requests and assess the processes for more successful and timely reunions.

RECOMMENDATION NO 2

In order to move forward with the matching of pre/post computer AIS adoption information processes, consider charging a "reunification fee" to assist in defraying the cost of locating information in the files.

RESPONSE

APRD does not support this recommendation. PAS is a service entity within a public agency to serve and support adoption clients. APRD does not want any monetary barrier to discourage adoption clients from seeking reunions.

RECOMMENDATION NO 3

Establish a method to reach out to adoptees and their birth parents and educate the general public regarding the pre-computer/post-computer processes, which would allow for pre-computer adoptees and their birth parents to update their files for entry into the post-computer process.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. APRD services are accessible through the DCFS website. Adoption clients can access the DCFS website and view PAS services. Adoption Reunion Services will be highlighted on the website. Reunion information will be disseminated to the Adoption Promotion and Support Services agencies with whom APRD partners and will also be disseminated to DCFS staff in the regional offices who work with birth parents. The possibility of listing the PAS duty line number in the government listings of the public phone book will be explored.

Grand Jury Response
September 14, 2011
PAGE 4

RECOMMENDATION NO 4

Address the need for additional PAS Social Workers to facilitate adoption support services in the community.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. To clarify, APRD is in partnership with Adoption Promotion Support Services (APSS) providers, which are 8 contracted community agencies, with 12 offices located in each of the Service Provider Areas (SPA) throughout Los Angeles County. APSS agencies assist the Department in providing needed services to Post Adoption families. APSS is funded by the Federal government via the Promoting Safe and Stable Families funding.

APSS agencies provide the following services: individual, group or family therapy; mentors; support groups for children and/or adults; case management; and referrals for linkage services that can include childcare, health care, mental health, physical and developmental services, Regional Center Services, educational, special education, substitute adult role model, income support and transportation services.

The Post Adoption Services (PAS) Children's Social Workers (CSWs) work directly for DCFS and provide crisis intervention and referral services and Adoption Assistance Program (AAP, which is akin to foster care funding for adoptive children) services to adoptive families. APRD will continue to monitor PAS workload in consideration of staffing resources allocation.

Grand Jury Recommendations for Transition Age Youth (TAY) Journey

The following responses are specific to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury recommendations regarding the Transition Age Youth (TAY) Journey.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Undertake an impartial, external audit and evaluation of TAY programs, particularly housing and ILP services.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. The Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller is currently performing an external audit and evaluation of Youth Development Services (YDS) total programs. The report is expected to be available in September 2011. YDS will be required to respond to the audit recommendations and provide any needed corrective action plan, including timeframes.

Grand Jury Response
September 14, 2011
PAGE 5

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Develop and implement an evaluation plan that acknowledges self-sufficiency during and beyond the program.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. This will be a focus for the business mapping referenced in Recommendation No. 1 as well as the use of departmental TAY outcomes from existing data reporting mechanisms: the National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD) and the Federal Exit Outcome Report (Soc 405).

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Submit ILP and transition housing participation data to the State as part of the requirement for funds.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. YDS will ensure that there is a consistent understanding and definition of "participation" among the data gathered from its ILP Transition Coordinators for the submission of its February 2012 State report.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

Define and develop methodologies, frequency and reliability of work data collection methods and systems.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. By January 1, 2012, YDS will assess existing data tracking systems – NYTD, Homeless Integration Services (HMIS), Exit Outcomes (Soc 405) and the Emancipation Services Independent Living Program Data Tracking System (ESILP) – to determine where gaps in data tracking impact the reliability of participant information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Develop and maintain consistent criteria participation data for ILP and other TAY services.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. This will be achieved as part of YDS' business mapping process, to begin no later than October 2011.

Grand Jury Response
September 14, 2011
PAGE 6

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

Initiate the process of tracking youths' denial of ILP services if offered and follow-up to reinstate the ILP.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. YDS is currently working with key TAY stakeholders to implement an ILP review process for approved and/or denied ILP requested services by January 1, 2012.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

Evaluate effectiveness of the existing data management system and explore new software that could streamline data collection and analysis.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. YDS will work with the Department's BIS Division to come up with recommendations by March 1, 2012 to address the response. However, there are certain Federal and State regulations that prohibit dual entry of data, which needs to be factored into the recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

Increase and improve communication efforts with TAY participants after they leave the program.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. YDS will develop strategies, with its community stakeholders (ILP and housing contractors, postsecondary education partners, AB12 partners), for implementation by March 2012.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

Establish confidential e-mail distribution lists and send regularly scheduled e-mails.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation, as YDS has already begun obtaining e-mail addresses to provide information and maintain communication with TAY upon their exiting the program. YDS will establish a central mechanism to maintain the e-mail addresses for the distribution of information and to keep in contact with TAY.

Grand Jury Response
September 14, 2011
PAGE 7

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

Increase frequency of participant progress updates and complete surveys that measure progress, satisfaction, and solicit input and suggestions.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. By February 2012, YDS will review and assess its current surveying mechanisms (NYTD Youth Surveys, ILPONLINE.org online survey, THP program exit survey) to determine necessary enhancements to increase survey responses from ILP and housing participants. YDS will also explore the feasibility of internet social networking sites, such as Facebook and MySpace, including the consideration of community partners (i.e., California Youth Connection, Foster Wise) as collaborators/partners towards achieving better participant input and suggestions.

If you have any questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Aldo Marin, Board Relations Manager, at (213) 351-5530.

PLB:am

ATTACHMENT D



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

August 19, 2011

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

FROM:  Steve Cooley
District Attorney

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2010-11 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND
JURY FINAL REPORT**

Attached is my Department's response to the recommendations contained in the following sections of the 2010-11 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report:

E-Subpoena – One Way to End the Paper Chase
High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security - Crime Fighting in the Digital Age

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

lv

Attachments

c: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES -- DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
E-SUBPOENA PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5: The DA staff is encouraged to conduct an E-Subpoena training class for court liaison/subpoena control officers and encourage departments still receiving paper subpoenas to implement E-Subpoena.

RESPONSE:

The District Attorney's Office has and will continue to actively encourage all Los Angeles County law enforcement agencies to participate in the E-Subpoena program. Since launching the E-Subpoena program with LAPD only three years ago, over 30 additional agencies have been provided with information regarding the District Attorney's E-Subpoena program. Currently over 75% of subpoenas are sent electronically to law enforcement agencies. Santa Monica Police Department began receiving electronic subpoenas on August 15, 2011 and several other agencies are close to implementation.

Additional training for law enforcement court liaison/subpoena control officers continues to be available. In June, 2011, a representative of the District Attorney's Office provided training in Alhambra to several law enforcement agencies regarding best practices for implementing an e-subpoena program. Additionally, representatives from the District Attorney's Office are available to provide technical and non-technical assistance post-implementation. The District Attorney's Office remains committed to providing assistance to all interested law enforcement agencies.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DISTRICT ATTORNEY

SUBJECT: 2010-11 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: HIGH TECH FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY CRIME FIGHTING IN THE DIGITAL AGE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. a.

The District Attorney should establish and keep up to date a list of all State, Federal, and private training related to high tech and forensics examination, and cyber investigation and security.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office currently receives notices of training opportunities from the following organizations: California District Attorney's Association; National Computer Forensics Institute; Peace Officers Standards and Training; High Tech Crime Investigator's Association; International Association of Financial Crime Investigators; National District Attorney's Association; and LA Clear. Though the office does not have the resources to monitor all training opportunities offered in the private sector, it continues to post all such training notices on the Criminal Justice Institute website, which serves as a central clearinghouse for this type of information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.b.

The District Attorney should provide outreach to all police departments and the sheriff on a regular basis regarding the value of training in high tech forensics in crime fighting in Los Angeles County through seminars for groups of law enforcement agencies and "roll-call" training for individual law enforcement agencies.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office currently provides the following training seminars, available to all law enforcement agencies in Los Angeles County: identity theft; access card fraud; high tech crimes; digital evidence; and cell phone forensics. The Office is in the process of creating and implementing "roll-call" training on the topic of cell phone forensics to these agencies as well.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. c.

The District Attorney should keep a log of the use of digital evidence in the prosecution of all types of cases. This log should indicate the nature of the evidence and its significance in each case. The District Attorney should encourage municipal agencies to track this information on misdemeanors as well.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office currently keeps statistics on cases involving identity theft, access card fraud, network intrusion, intellectual property theft, and child exploitation. Unfortunately, the Office does not have adequate staffing to track all cases in which some form of digital evidence is used, given the increasing involvement of digital evidence in criminal investigations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. d.

The District Attorney should establish a program for all Deputy District Attorneys to acquire the basic knowledge and skills necessary to develop their cases using digital evidence in an effective manner.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office conducts ongoing training for deputies on a variety of legal topics, including those related to high tech crime and forensics. All deputies are encouraged to attend regularly held Saturday Seminars where such training is offered. In February 2010, the Office held a Saturday Seminar on high tech crime and forensics. Another Saturday Seminar on the same topic will be held in January 2010. The Office is also prepared to include basic training on the use of cell phone forensic evidence for the next class of newly hired deputies. For more experienced prosecutors, the Office will hold a two-day Digital Evidence College in March of 2012.

Recommendation NO. 1. e.

The District Attorney should develop and conduct seminars to educate judges in the use of digital evidence in the criminal justice system.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office has been in contact with Judge Beverly O'Connell, of the Los Angeles County Superior Court Office of Judicial Education's Planning and Research Department, regarding our assistance with an upcoming training on digital evidence for judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys. The Office is helping to identify pertinent topics and experts for use at the training.

ATTACHMENT E



Health Services
LOS ANGELES COUNTY

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

Mitchell H. Katz, M.D.
Director

Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D., Ph.D.
Chief Medical Officer

John F. Schunhoff, Ph.D.
Chief Deputy Director

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

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

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

*To ensure access to high-quality,
patient-centered, cost-effective
health care to Los Angeles County
residents through direct services at
DHS facilities and through
collaboration with community and
university partners.*

August 19, 2011

TO: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Mitchell H. Katz, M.D.
Director

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2010-2011 LOS ANGELES
COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT**

Attached is the Department of Health Services' response to the recommendations made in the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report. We generally concur with and have taken or initiated corrective actions to address the recommendations contained in the report.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please let me know or you may contact Tobi L. Moree at (213) 240-7901.

MHK:eg

Attachment

c: John F. Schunhoff, Ph.D.
Gregory Polk

RECEIVED
2011 AUG 23 PM 12: 21
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE



www.dhs.lacounty.gov

2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury – Uncollected Medical Bills in The County's Three Major
Medical Facilities
DHS Response
Page 1 of 5

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
UNCOLLECTED MEDICAL BILLS IN THE COUNTY'S THREE MAJOR
MEDICAL FACILITIES

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Increase the hours and staffing at Urgent Care and Community clinics to better meet the needs of the community.

RESPONSE

DHS partially disagrees with this recommendation. All of the DHS acute Hospitals, Multi-Service Ambulatory Care Centers, three Comprehensive Health Centers, and a limited number of the community clinics provide Urgent Care services. The current strategic goal of DHS and Community clinics, in light of health care reform, is to expand and improve primary care capacity which includes having weekend and extended hours. A consequence of the primary care expansion and improvement should reduce unnecessary Urgent Care visits. The objective is to ensure that patients who choose to use DHS and community clinics have a primary care provider and a medical home so that the use of Urgent Care is only necessary for those patients who are experiencing an acute clinical issue or do not have a medical home identified.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

LAC+USC to increase their Urgent Care patient referral rate from 7.5% to 25% - the average patient referral rate of Olive View and Harbor-UCLA.

RESPONSE

DHS disagrees with this recommendation. LAC+USC Medical Center currently identifies non-emergent patients at their Emergency Room and transfers these patients to the Urgent Care. However, achieving a target of 25% may not be realistic as the target may be dependent on the urgent care capacity and the emergency room patient volume. We will track and trend the referral rate and determine a target rate in the future. In addition, as of July 1, 2011, DHS has a new agreement with Community Partner participants (formerly known as Public/Private Partnerships). This agreement expands primary care access beyond that of the DHS operated clinics by integrating the public and private primary care capacity and enabling DHS to refer patients who do not have a primary care provider to a Community Partner on a systematic level. The new agreement will increase Urgent Care referrals to primary care in the near future by

identifying patients on a quarterly basis from DHS specialty clinics, in-patient services, and Urgent Care who do not have a primary care provider. The objective of this effort is to identify and re-direct all patients to a primary care provider/medical home.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Increase ER referrals to Community Clinics and Public-Private Partnership Program.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. Effective July 1, 2011, DHS has a new agreement with Community Partner participants which will result in increased ER referrals to primary care in the near future. The agreement with Community Partners expands primary care access by integrating the public and private primary care capacity and enabling DHS to refer patients who do not have a primary care provider to a Community Partner on a systematic level.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Initial Contact Nurse to provide a referral list of nearby low cost County Community Health Centers and private community-based providers to those patients who request prescription refills, or treatment for minor medical issues and primary care.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. Emergency room staff direct patients to DHS operated clinics and community clinics when appropriate. Patients who enter the hospital through the emergency room will continue to receive a medical screening exam to determine if they have an emergent or non-emergent medical condition and also whether they have a primary care provider. Patients who do not have an emergent condition and do not currently have a primary care provider are provided a referral list of Community Partners, County Community Health Centers, or Hospital Outpatient primary care clinics

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Support the effort to change the Etter Consent Decree (ECD) allowing the County to increase its medical cost reimbursement levels.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. DHS Revenue Management (RM) and County Counsel (CC) will continue a collaborative effort to improve County program eligibility requirements by making and/or recommending changes to programs, which are impacted by the ECD, to allow the County to increase its medical cost reimbursement,

2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury – Uncollected Medical Bills in The County's Three Major Medical Facilities

DHS Response

Page 3 of 5

including the Pre-Payment Plan. Beginning January 2011, RM and CC initiated negotiations with the Etter Consent Plaintiffs (ECP), and completed key changes such as: changing the zero liability for Ability-To-Pay (ATP) from Medi-Cal Maintenance Needs to 133% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL); and Outpatient Reduced-Cost Simplified Application (ORSA) from 133 1/3% to 133% of FPL; making cooperation with Healthy Way LA (HWLA) a requirement of the ATP and ORSA programs; and streamlining the process by changing the income guidelines for ORSA to be similar to ATP. In early 2012, program changes, for which an agreement has not yet been reached, will be recommended to the ECP by RM and CC. It is anticipated that changes to the Pre-Payment Plan will be included in these recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

Establish a policy for Pre-Payment billings and collections that is consistent in all three (3) major medical facilities in LAC.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. DHS Financial Practice No. 520.26, Pre-Payment Plan, effective March 1, 2008, indicates if the patient does not have third-party coverage or is not interested in applying for any health care program, they will be offered the Pre-Payment plan. DHS RM will review current procedures for offering the Pre-Payment plan to patients at the three (3) major medical facilities to determine which procedures would provide the greatest benefit to DHS. Based on the findings, RM and CC will make recommendations in early 2012 to the ECP and revise DHS Financial Practice No. 520.26 to reflect consistent Pre-Payment plan procedures throughout DHS. Subsequent to the completion of the revision, DHS Financial Practice No. 520.26 will become the policy.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

Develop and implement a staff policy and procedure that ensures patient awareness of the availability of the Extended Payment Plan (EPP) option.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. DHS Financial Practice No. 520.27, Extended Payment Plan, effective January 15, 2010, indicates the EPP option is available to hospital patients including patients who have been granted a discount on their medical bill. DHS provides a flyer containing information on all of the County's No-Cost/Low-Cost programs to patients at every DHS health facility when treatment is first sought. DHS RM will work with CC and the ECP to revise the No-Cost/Low-Cost flyer, to include information regarding the EPP. Pursuant to the ECD, RM will submit the revised No-Cost/Low-Cost flyer to the ECP for review and comment by December 31, 2011, and the flyer will be finalized after the comment period.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

Establish a directive to expand the use of EPP by uninsured patients who have the means to pay for services.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. By December 31, 2011, DHS RM will work with CC to revise the governing DHS Financial Practice No. 520.27, Extended Payment Plan, to specify that the EPP should be offered to patients. Subsequent to the completion of the revision, DHS Financial Practice No. 520.27 will become the directive. After which, staff will receive training on the revised Financial Practice. The EPP is an option to pay, and does not cover the process for evaluating a patient's means to pay. The evaluation of a patient's means to pay for services is determined if the patient provides the required information during financial screening, where patients are made aware of all payment and coverage options.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

Design and implement a program to analyze and prosecute abuse of the LAC public hospital medical care system.

RESPONSE

DHS disagrees with this recommendation. Procedures are already in place to report suspected fraud or abuse. Suspected Medi-Cal fraud is reported to the California Department of Health Services Investigation Branch. Suspected abuse in programs in which DHS processes the program application, such as ATP, ORSA, and Healthy Way LA, are referred to DHS Audit and Compliance Division (A&CD) for investigation as outlined in DHS Policy No. 1000, DHS Compliance Program/Code of Conduct, effective January 8, 2007. The policy indicates that DHS A&CD will investigate suspected violations that may result in an inappropriate claim for payment or that may have an unknown consequence such as identity theft. Investigations that identify fraud are referred to the appropriate authorities, including but not limited to law enforcement and the District Attorney for prosecution. Investigations which substantiate abuse are referred to Finance for collections and to the facility to take appropriate corrective actions, as needed. DHS Patient Financial Services staff will receive training on reporting suspected fraud for programs in which DHS processes the program application, to be completed by June 30, 2012.

2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury – Uncollected Medical Bills in The County's Three Major
Medical Facilities
DHS Response
Page 5 of 5

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

Change the classification from Self-Pay to Financial Liability because currently it is not a self-pay system but a financial liability for the County.

RESPONSE

DHS disagrees with this recommendation. Federal, State, and County agencies require the Self-Pay classification data to be reported. Additionally, the classification of Self-Pay is an industry standard, and is not recorded as a liability.

REPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 7 of 9

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

Evaluate effectiveness of the existing data management system and explore new software that could streamline data collection and analysis which improves identification of service gaps and accomplishments.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ We will consult with our Bureau of Information Services Section (BIS) to explore streamlining our data collection efforts. However, there are certain Federal and State regulations that prohibit dual entry of data. Our primary database is the state owned Child Welfare Services Case Management System (CWS/CMS) which tracks limited data and does not accommodate uploading of information.
- ✓ The Probation Department is also participating in Business Objects Training to learn how to streamline processes and maximize reports that can be generated for CWS/CMS. This will allow Probation's YDS operation to analyze the data and identify service trends and service gaps which can ultimately improve overall service delivery.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

Increase and improve communication efforts with TAY participants to raise awareness of ILP housing and other TAY related services by improving data collection efforts and maintaining contact with participants after they leave the program.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ As previously mentioned, Probation has begun requesting e-mail addresses from youth while they are receiving services. These addresses can be utilized not only to maintain contact during the period of time that they are accessing services but also upon exiting the program to provide follow-up and assist with aftercare services. Transition Coordinators (TCs) were additionally instructed to obtain (whenever possible) an emergency contact phone number and name for each youth receiving ILP services and continue to obtain home addresses whenever available for involved relatives.
- ✓ With the implementation of the 90-day Transition Plan, we will assure that all youth exiting out of foster care will be connected with YDS prior to leaving the system. It will also give us accurate addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses to stay connected with these youth after they leave.

REPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 8 of 9

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

Establish confidential e-mail distribution lists and send regularly scheduled e-mails to provide awareness of scholarships, ILP services, available resources, and job opportunities.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ As mentioned in Recommendation 8, we have initiated collecting e-mail addresses to provide information to youth receiving services as well as improving our continued communication with them upon exiting the program.
- ✓ Currently, announcements relating to scholarships, tuition assistance, as well as the full array of ILP services including but not limited to, clothing allowance and computer training have been posted on the ILPOnline site. The website is accessible by anyone who has internet access and inquiries are not limited to just youth in the program, but to anyone seeking information about the program, processes and procedures.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

Increase frequency in which participants provide progress updates and complete surveys that measure progress, satisfaction and solicit input and suggestions. Improved and increased communication between participants and staff may allow the recommended evaluation plan to be effectively implemented. The second method for maintaining ongoing communication with youth participants could involve the increased use of social networking, such as facebook.com, since most youths are already using these social networking sites

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ NYTD Surveys (see #2 response) measures progress, satisfaction as well as soliciting input and suggestions from the youth. In addition, there are two surveys that meets these goals: 1) The ILP Survey which is online and the youth are provided an incentive for participation and 2) The THP exit survey which measures satisfaction with the program and identifies service trends for program improvement.
- ✓ We have considered this recommendation; however, there are County guidelines and issues of liability which prohibit the hosting of such social networking environments. County Counsel has concerns with county departments posting

REPOSENSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 9 of 9

information on social networking sites due to possible liability issues that could arise from the potential inappropriate content of other visitors who can post on the county sponsored site.

- ✓ Nevertheless, YDS is collaborating with the Los Angeles County Youth Council, Foster Wise, to initiate a website to maintain ongoing communication with youth participants via social networking as well as provide service and resource information. The Youth Council is in the process of working with the CEO to present this plan to obtain funding and/or resources to launch their website. In addition, the chair of this committee has been appointed the Southern Counties CYC Regional Coordinator and will begin outreach efforts for the Los Angeles area as well as adjacent counties. The first statewide meeting for this effort will take place on August 20, 2011.

ATTACHMENT G



JONATHAN E. FIELDING, M.D., M.P.H.
Director and Health Officer

JONATHAN E. FREEDMAN
Chief Deputy Director

313 North Figueroa Street, Room 806
Los Angeles, California 90012
TEL (213) 240-8117 • FAX (213) 975-1273

www.publichealth.lacounty.gov



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 5, 2011

TO: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Jonathan E. Fielding, M.D., M.P.H. *JEF*
Director and Health Officer

SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH'S RESPONSE TO THE 2010-2011 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

The 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Final Report includes six recommendations that pertain to Health Facilities Inspection Division (HFID) operations in Sub-Acute Health Facilities. Attached you will find our responses to each recommendation.

Under contract with the California Department of Public Health, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health (DPH), HFID performs licensing and certification functions of Health Facilities and Ancillary Health Services, including Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNF), in Los Angeles County (LAC).

HFID is responsible for the licensing, certification and inspection of privately owned and operated healthcare facilities in Los Angeles County. HFID has the responsibility to ensure that these facilities are in compliance with State and Federal laws and regulations. HFID evaluators are required to attend and complete both State and Federal training courses before they are permitted to perform surveys and evaluations of all licensed and certified health facilities within Los Angeles County.

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments.

JEF:cb

c: Sheila Shima
Richard Mason
Brian Mahan
Jonathan E. Freedman
Ernest Pooleon

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – PUBLIC HEALTH

SUBJECT: 2010-11 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
SUB-ACUTE HEALTH FACILITIES IS THE FOX INSPECTING THE
HENHOUSE?

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1:

Ensure that a Sub-Acute facility being inspected has a separate and distinct Sub-Acute policy in place. All Sub-Acute personnel must be trained in that policy.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. Facilities are required by regulation to establish and implement policies and procedures pertaining to all aspects of care and resident acuity levels and ensure that facility staff is trained in those policies/procedures.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2:

Ensure that during each inspection a policy is in place and used consistently for the Remote Ventilator Alarms Connecting and Usage. The policy must state that the Remote Ventilator Alarm must remain ON at all times. Stipulate that it may be turned off when the nursing home employee is in the room with the ventilator patient; however, it must be turned back to the ON position before the employee leaves the patient's room.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. During survey inspections, Health Facilities Inspection Division (HFID) staff reviews policies and procedures to see if they meet the regulations and the needs of the residents to ensure that there are provisions for a safe and adequate environment such that appropriate care is provided based on the needs of the resident. This includes the need to maintain ventilator alarms to be in the ON position at all times.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3:

Ensure that each licensed facility has a policy regarding proper procedure in handling tracheotomy tubes, ensuring it is not disconnected from the ventilator tubing.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. Policies and procedures are reviewed to see if they meet the regulations and the needs of the residents to ensure that there are provisions for a safe and adequate environment such that appropriate care is provided based on the needs of the resident, including those residents with tracheotomy tubes and ventilator connections.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4:

Ensure that each licensed facility has a policy in place for use of a "crash cart" and that it is enforced.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. The use of an emergency cart or "crash cart" is determined by the needs of the facility as it relates to the acuity level of the resident population to whom it provides care. Facilities are evaluated pursuant to the California and federal regulations that mandate policies and procedures must be developed, implemented and staff trained in the policies and procedures. During the survey process, if a facility has a crash cart, then policies and procedures related to its use are reviewed and verifications is made that staff are trained in the implementation and use of said equipment.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5:

Ensure that each licensed facility has a policy for the administration of oxygen and is followed judiciously.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. If a resident is being administered oxygen, the facility is required to have policies/procedures in place to ensure a safe environment for the use of medical gases.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6:

Require evaluators inspecting a health facility participating in the Sub-Acute program have the same qualifications as required by the State of California to administer the following:

- a. Tracheotomy care with continuous mechanical ventilation for at least 50% of the day.
- b. Tracheotomy care with suctioning and room air mist or oxygen as needed, and one of the six (6) treatment procedures listed below.

ATTACHMENT

- c. Administration of any three (3) of the six (6) treatment procedures listed below:
- i. Total parental nutrition
 - ii. Inpatient physical, occupational, and/or speech therapy at least two (2) hours per day five (5) days a week.
 - iii. Tube feeding (nasogastric or gastrostomy)
 - iv. Inhalation therapy treatments every shift for a minimum of four (4) times per 24-hour period.
 - v. Intravenous therapy involving: the continuous administration of a therapeutic agent; the need for hydration; and frequent intermittent INTR drug administration via a peripheral and/or central line (for example, with a Heparin lock)
 - vi. Debridement, packing and medicated irrigation with or without whirlpool treatment
 - vii. Inspections are required to include Recommendations 1 through 6 above when a survey or recertification is performed.

RESPONSE:

Partially Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. This year we have already implemented training applicable to residents requiring ventilators. However, there is no State or federal requirement or regulation that requires evaluators to have the same qualifications as those employees that work at Sub-Acute facilities. HFID evaluators have access to State consultants regarding physical and occupational therapy, pharmacy and pharmaceutical services, dietary and nutritional services and medical services. The evaluators are directed to utilize these consultants when a question or a situation arises.

The California Department of Public Health and the Centers for Medicaid/Medicare Services (CMS) provide guidelines and tools to surveyor staff regarding how to survey facilities providing care for all residents, including the ventilator dependant (sub-acute). HFID follows the same survey process, guidelines and protocols that have been established by the State of California Licensing and Certification and the CMS when conducting inspections of Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNF). All Surveyors who inspect SNF facilities must first complete a Federal Basic Long Term Care Training course and successfully pass the Surveyor Minimum Qualifications Test (SMQT). Additionally, HFID offers continuous training courses to surveyor staff to ensure that they are current and knowledgeable with the regulations and have a current skill set in order to survey the various acuity levels encountered in the SNF resident population including the sub-acute resident.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7:

DPH RESPONSE:

ATTACHMENT

The Civil Grand Jury Final Report indicates a Recommendation Number 7, yet there is no Recommendation Number 7 identified.

ATTACHMENT H



LEROY D. BACA, SHERIFF

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



August 19, 2011

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 2010-11
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY**

Attached is the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's (Department) response to the 2010-11 Civil Grand Jury Report recommendations (Attachment A). The Civil Grand Jury's areas of interest specific to the Department included our participation in the E-Subpoena, High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age, Education Based Incarceration, The Six Pods of Module 172, and Jails Committee. Should you have questions regarding our response, please contact Division Director Victor Rampulla at (323) 526-5357.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Leroy D. Baca".

LEROY D. BACA
SHERIFF

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
E-SUBPOENA

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

LASD and LAPD evaluate electronically transmitting other documents such as police reports and probable cause determinations among law enforcement agencies, Prosecutors and the Court.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD is currently working on electronically transmitting probable cause determinations/declarations (ePCD project) from the arresting agency to the courts and then receiving an automated approved PCD at the arresting agency. LASD is also working on a Field-Based reporting System (FBRS) that once implemented will facilitate the transmission of automated reports to all criminal justice partners in Los Angeles County.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

LASD to expand implementation of filing Pitchess motions electronically. A Pitchess Motion defines those portions of a deputy's personnel file which may be made available to defense counsel.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD, the Public Defender's office and Compton Court completed a pilot project regarding the electronic filing of Pitchess motions and the results were extremely positive. The cost savings to the agencies involved was significant and the concept is currently being expanded to all courts in Los Angeles County.

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HIGH TECH FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY
CRIME FIGHTING IN THE DIGITAL AGE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2a

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD), along with other police agencies in Los Angeles County, shall establish a "High Tech Forensics Bureau" which will facilitate:

- Promotions and career opportunity for those who are trained and skilled in this area without leaving the discipline.
- Succession planning and transfer of high tech expertise, preserving the investment made in creating the expertise.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department agrees with this recommendation. Currently, LASD operates a regional high tech task force (*Southern California High Tech Task Force -SCHTTF*) that investigates computer related crimes and also provides forensic examinations of technical equipment and software related to cyber crimes. SCHTTF is currently funded by a state grant through this current fiscal year.

- i. LASD acknowledges that it would be desirable to foster promotions and career advancement for those investigators currently assigned to the high tech task force. Maintaining experienced investigators in an ever changing technical world would enable the seamless transitioning of personnel promotions within the unit enabling the retention of trained personnel. Unfortunately court mandated processes require centralized testing to place personnel in coveted positions, and due to past and current promotional practices, significant changes in policy and civil service rules will have to occur in order to implement this recommendation.
- ii. On September 1, 2011, LASD will add three investigators to SCHTTF to augment the current number of nine investigators who handle forensic computer examinations and cyber investigations. The reason for the additional investigators is to train the new investigators and prepare them to replace pending retirements of currently assigned veteran investigators. It typically takes years to fully train cyber investigators and the three new investigators should make for a seamless transition when the retirements do occur.

ATTACHMENT

LASD is currently preparing a request to acquire additional personnel and funding for a permanent and expanded high tech forensics unit. The request will be submitted during the 2011-2012 budget proposal process.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2b

LASD should update law enforcement recruit and detective training to include orientation, procedures, protocols, and other training with respect to digital evidence.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD has created a structured class curriculum to educate detectives about basic techniques and protocols relative to digital /cyber crime investigations. Three classes have been scheduled during the month of August 2011, which will include detectives from all three field operations regions. Training for recruits will begin when a class curriculum is completed.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2c

LASD should include digital evidence collection, analysis and use training at the station level during roll call (shift briefing.)

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD is currently providing basic cyber crime training for all field operations personnel who are assigned to their station's detective bureaus. The intent of this training (sometimes referred to as "Train the Trainer") is to provide general entry level instruction relative to cyber crime to these station detectives. Once the initial detectives are trained, they will return to their units of assignments and hold in-service (roll call) training for all three field patrol shifts at their stations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2d

LASD should take steps to acquire POST certification for high tech training courses for forensic and cyber investigators to allow for the reimbursement of the costs.

REPSONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD is currently researching and designing a curriculum that will be submitted for possible POST certification by the State. Captain Michael Parker who commands the Department's Headquarters (and Information) Bureau is the project manager. He is currently working with Federal, State, local and private entities to gather information and advice in order to initiate a training program that would be POST certified.

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
EDUCATION BASED INCARCERATION

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

LASD Community Transition Unit to increase network with community service groups and local businesses to gain employment opportunities for inmates who have completed the EBI program. This can be achieved by attendance at community service clubs such as Rotary, Kiwanis, and Chamber of Commerce meetings. LASD representatives are encouraged to be proactive and attend these meetings fully prepared with names and experiences of EBI graduates.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) agrees with this recommendation. The recommendation will be discussed at the next EBI committee meeting. If feasible, the LASD Inmate Services Bureau will appoint representatives to identify suitable service clubs and community-based organizations as well as attend meetings to discuss EBI and the experiences of EBI graduates.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Assign LASD community outreach staff to actively and consistently network with corporations to acquire corporate support. In addition to financial contributions, seek to acquire access to corporate inventory of excess computers, training, and equipment and classroom furnishings for use in EBI classrooms. Seek expertise of potential guest speakers and enlist assistance from much needed computer training.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation. The LASD currently has no system in place to accept donations of cash or equipment; however, a nonprofit arm of the LASD, Inmate Services Bureau, is being explored. This recommendation will be discussed at the next EBI committee meetings, and if feasible, the LASD will appoint representatives to identify and "network" with potential vendors. As to the second part of the recommendation, the LASD agrees. It should be noted that the LASD educational programs currently utilize a host of guest speakers, including motivational speakers, Alcoholics Anonymous/Narcotics Anonymous, EBI graduates, and former gang members who qualify for entry in LASD custody facilities.

ATTACHMENT

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Procure inventory of translation equipment to effectively communicate course content to the Spanish-speaking population and increase the number of Spanish-speaking instructors. Seek funding approval from Board of Supervisors for translation equipment and/or utilize funds from IWC.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation. As the Los Angeles County jail system houses a substantial number of Hispanic inmates, the LASD has made every effort to present the same educational opportunities available to English-speaking inmates. The LASD has a small number of Spanish translation devices which are used to translate instruction in the MERIT and SMART programs. This recommendation will be discussed at the next EBI committee meeting as well as the possibility of requesting IWC funds to purchase additional translation equipment. In the event that IWC funds are unavailable, the EBI committee will explore the possibility of funding from the Board of Supervisors.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

Evaluate effectiveness of the current level of communication with the Board of Supervisors and all local city councils to increase awareness and support of EBI programs. A strong "circle of influence" in local government is imperative for the ongoing success of the EBI program. Consistent exposure is advised through attendance and agenda input at the Board of Supervisors and countywide city council meetings by high level LASD officials. Ensure funding is sought for specific needs such as computers, translation aids, and other classroom equipment.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation. Sheriff Baca has spoken frequently to the Board of Supervisors regarding the importance of EBI. The sheriff has also appeared in print media and local radio programming to espouse the importance of inmate education. The LASD has developed an EBI website containing information regarding recidivism, inmate education, and alternative sentencing strategies and is available for public viewing at <http://www.lasdhq.org/divisions/correctional/ebi/index.html>. Members of the EBI committee have made a number of appearances as well, including a recent workshop by Lieutenant Brian Fitch at the 38th Annual National Association of Blacks in Criminal Justice in St. Louis, Missouri. Representatives, particularly Department executives, will continue to represent EBI at Board of Supervisors meetings, community functions, and conferences. The LASD further agrees with the recommendation to fund specific needs such as computers, translation aids, and other classroom equipment. As stated in the response to recommendation number two, the LASD is working to create a nonprofit arm of the LASD capable of accepting donations of cash or equipment.

ATTACHMENT

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Identify and address obstacles that exist in jails that deter inmates from participating in education programs due to gang peer pressure. While it is recognized there is no quick or easy fix, the fact remains that this is a major obstacle to increase participation in this valuable program. LASD should actively enlist support from organizations like Home Boy Industries, Communities in Schools, and other gang experts, i.e., ex-gang members to assist in identifying solutions to this major challenge.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation, specifically with the idea of enlisting ex-gang members to assist in identifying solutions to major challenges. The LASD currently contracts with the Amer-I-Can program which utilizes ex-offenders as teachers. The LASD also partners with former offenders working with the Delancey Street Foundation as well as graduates of the LASD MERIT program and members of Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous. As the CGJ is well aware, because of security concerns, ex-offenders who have been convicted of certain offenses are precluded from entering custody facilities within Los Angeles County. Nonetheless, the LASD believes that ex-offenders can play a critical role in overcoming the peer pressure and other obstacles that may deter inmates from participating in EBI. Additionally, the LASD has formed an EBI steering committee to assist with EBI-related concerns. The committee is comprised of members from higher education (California State University, Dominguez Hills; California State University, Long Beach; California State University, Los Angeles; the University of La Verne; and University of California, Los Angeles) as well as members of the Delancey Street Foundation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

Review the usage of the IWF expenditures to determine what portion is currently being used for EBI versus other jail expenditures such as capital expenditures. Is there a clearly defined budget allocated for educating inmates and providing recovery programs? Is it being adhered to? Is an appropriate level of funding being allocated to external agencies which can aid in bridging communication gaps that may exist between inmates and uniformed personnel? Ensure adherence to California Penal Code Section 4025 as it relates to the expenditures of the approximate \$47 million in the Inmate Welfare Fund.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation in theory. The LASD adheres strictly to guidelines of Penal Code Section 4025. Currently, IWC funds are allocated as follows: 51 percent to inmate programs and education; 49 percent to maintenance of county jail facilities. As a result of the LASD's reduced jail population (currently about 15,000 inmates countywide), contracts with LA Works for vocational instruction and start-up funds for the HOPE Leadership Charter High School, the IWC funds are rapidly being

ATTACHMENT

depleted. This includes future moneys which have already been allocated for inmate education through the Inmate Services Bureau, including the Community Transition Unit. The primary purpose of the Inmate Services Bureau as well as the Community Transition Unit is to provide services, training, and resources aimed at improving the quality of life for the inmate population, reducing recidivism through education, and bridging the gap between uniformed personnel and members of the inmate population as well as providing post-release services aimed at improving quality of life and reducing the possibility of future arrest.

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT – CUSTODY
OPERATIONS DIVISION

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
THE SIX PODS OF MODULE 172

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The CGJ recommends that the Board of Supervisors considers both the Sheriff's Proposal along with the CGJ's Report and approve cameras – beginning with the Pods of Module 172.

RESPONSE

The Sheriff's Department concurs with the CGJ's recommendation. A site analysis has been completed and submitted to the Department's Facility's Services Bureau. The installation of cameras into Module 172 will increase safety not only for inmates, but for staff as well. Additionally, the Department believes the installation will also help reduce liability and mitigate the cost of civil defense claims and lawsuits.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The CGJ recommends that pilot programs for new technologies (Transmission Imaging and RFID) be implemented.

RESPONSE

The Sheriff's Department concurs with the CGJ's recommendation. Department members recently conducted a site visit to multiple correctional institutions using Transmission Imaging technology and found it to be a viable solution to curbing contraband. The Division Chief is actively seeking a solution to fund the purchase of the Transmission Imaging units.

The Department is also a proponent to Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology. Staff is in the process of developing a pilot project to test the technical aspects of the application.

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
JAILS COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Long Beach Courthouse lockup facility –

- a. Establish a cleaning schedule for the Courthouse jail.
- b. Establish a checklist to ensure that areas are cleaned effectively

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department agrees with this recommendation. The Internal Services Department (Janitorial service provider) was contacted and an appropriate check list and schedule was established for the lock up area. Follow up to the daily cleaning schedule will be documented and reviewed by a supervisor in the Title 15 Lock Up book.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Pasadena Courthouse lockup facility -

- a. Establish a process to identify areas in the facility that require painting.
- b. Establish a checklist to ensure that areas are cleaned regularly.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department agrees with this recommendation. The Internal Services Department (Janitorial service provider) was contacted and an appropriate check list and schedule was established for the lock up area. Additionally, Sheriff's Facilities Services Bureau has been contacted and has identified the areas requiring painting which include the holding areas, lock up doors, wire mesh, lock up ramps, and the Sheriff's office. Since the responsibility for maintaining all courthouse buildings (including lock ups) in Los Angeles County has been transferred to the State we have submitted a request to the State to secure funding for the painting project.

9/27/11



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

September 27, 2011

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

13 October 4, 2011

Sachi A. Hamai
SACHI A. HAMAI
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Dear Supervisors:

RESPONSES TO THE 2010-2011 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 2010-2011 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 2010-2011 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.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

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

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.

On June 30, 2011, the 2010-2011 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 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Report.

The recommendations directed to all future Grand Juries have been forwarded to the 2011-2012 Grand Jury for consideration. Recommendations that make reference to non-County agencies have been referred directly by the Grand Jury to those entities. The Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Association (LACERA) has responded directly to the Grand Jury on Recommendation No. 7 regarding the report on State of Public Pensions in Los Angeles County.

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 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/FINANCING

Certain Grand Jury recommendations require additional financing resources. 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 during the 2012-13 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 2010-2011 County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury Final Report:

ATTACHMENT	DEPARTMENT
A	Chief Executive Office
B	Chief Information Office
C	Children and Family Services
D	District Attorney
E	Health Services
F	Probation
G	Public Health
H	Sheriff

Please note that the Departments of Children and Family Services and Probation have both responded to the Grand Jury Report on Transition Age Youth.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
September 27, 2011
Page 4

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Not applicable.

Respectfully submitted,



William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

WTF:EFS:MKZ
FC:BAM:ib

Attachments (8)

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
 Sheriff
 District Attorney
 Auditor-Controller
 Chief Information Office
 Children and Family Services
 County Counsel
 Health Services
 Internal Services
 LACERA
 Probation
 Public Health

ATTACHMENT A



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

September 27, 2011

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

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

2010-2011 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are this Office's responses to the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security
- Public Pensions in Los Angeles County

If you have any 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:EFS:MKZ
FC:BAM: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
(Intergovernmental and External Affairs)

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HIGH TECH FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY CRIME FIGHTING IN
THE DIGITAL AGE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors should task their lobbyists in Sacramento and Washington with looking at opportunities to redirect fees and taxes on land line phones, cell phones or internet access services to provide funding allocated to support high tech forensics, cyber security and forensic examination programs.

RESPONSE

Because there is no Board-approved policy to pursue the redirection of fees and taxes on land line phones, cell phones or internet access services to fund high tech forensics, cyber security and forensic examination programs, **this is a matter for Board policy determination.** The Board of Supervisors sets all legislative policies with regard to the assessment and use of fees and taxes throughout the County.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – Chief Executive Office
(Public Safety)

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HIGH TECH FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY CRIME FIGHTING IN
THE DIGITAL AGE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles establish a "High Tech Endowed Badge Program" to support the training and equipping of Forensic Examiners (FE) and Cyber Investigators (CI) throughout local law enforcement. Initially, establishment of eight (8) Endowed Badges (EBs) could be evaluated. Setting up five (5) EBs by the LAC Board of Supervisors District one for each Supervisorial District; and setting up three (3) EBs by the City of Los Angeles one for each of the Proprietary Departments (Department of Water and Power, the Port of Los Angeles, Los Angeles International Airport (LAWA)) for a total of eight (8) EBs.

RESPONSE

The Chief Executive Office recognizes the importance of forensic science and cyber investigation in today's world and that it is a critical and necessary element of a successful criminal investigation. Collected, managed and analyzed correctly, forensic science can often help to establish the guilt or innocence of individuals as well as be a determining factor in a criminal or civil case.

While we agree that partnering with private industry to fund a training program in this important field is something we should explore/pursue, currently the State and Federal government offer a variety of training and grant programs related to forensic examination and cyber investigation as part of their effort to enhance the criminal justice system. Many of the State and Federal training programs are offered free to local law enforcement agencies, or grants are provided to help offset the costs of training staff in this ever-evolving field. Below is a list of a few of the training programs currently offered by the Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to local law enforcement agencies.

- In partnership with BJA, the National Forensic Science Technology Center (NFSTC) provides hands-on training and technical assistance to a broad community of stakeholders, including law enforcement and investigators, on a variety of forensic science applications. The NFSTC (with support from the National Association of Medical Examiners) developed a 40-hour workshop to provide Forensic Pathology Fellows with knowledge of the scope and application of the forensic sciences within the criminal justice system.

- In partnership BJA, the Mississippi State University's National Forensic Training Center (NFTC) provides no-cost training to law enforcement officers to fight cyber crime. With the growing level of cyber crime today, it is critical that law enforcement officers have the ability to handle and examine digital evidence. The NFTC seeks to solve this issue by offering training in a broad range of cyber crime areas. The training that is offered by the NFTC is free of charge for all law enforcement personnel.
- Derived from the University of Tennessee's National Forensic Academy curriculum, National Forensic Science Institute's 40-hour, specialized courses in various topics are available on a limited basis throughout the year, at both onsite and offsite locations nationwide. The Crime Scene Management in Correctional Facilities course is a 5-day, 40-hour, hands-on training program offering correctional investigators and security officers access to forensic evidence identification, documentation, collection, and preservation procedures.
- Introduction to Internet Crime Investigation is a training program that introduces law enforcement investigators to the ways in which criminal activity is perpetrated within online computer networks and instructs them in techniques and software tools for working these cases online. Attendees will be exposed to Google as an investigative tool, identifying users of social networking sites, tracing e-mails and web sites, understanding Internet Protocol (IP) and how to trace IP addresses, and who owns a specific web site and where to serve search warrants.
- The Investigation of Computer Crime teaches that the internet is alive and well, and is a dynamic resource for millions worldwide. It is also a place for criminals to prey on unsuspecting victims. Many victims are children, while some are adults, and others are corporations. This 4 ½-day course teaches criminal justice investigators and support staff how to investigate high-technology theft and computer-related crime. It provides participants with an understanding of computer technology, its application to criminal endeavors, and the issues associated with investigating these cases. This course will provide current real-world case studies and solutions that can be adapted to current investigations. Topics will also include identity theft, Internet-based fraud, child exploitation, hacking and compromised systems, and phishing.
- The Seizure and Examination of Computers teaches criminal justice investigators the basic concepts of computers and digital evidence recovery. The 3-day course teaches investigators new to high-technology crime how to safely seize a computer system, make duplicate images of hard drives, and recognize compressed and encrypted data. Participants will become familiar with forensic software and the basics of digital evidence analysis. The course will also discuss directory structure and how it can impact your investigations; file headers and extensions, steganography, and encryption and how it is used.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – Chief Executive Office
(Benefits, Compensation Policy & Employee Relations)

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
PHASE II, SECTION 1 OF "WHOA! THE STATE OF PUBLIC PENSIONS
IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY"

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Eliminate administrative policies that permit employees to spike their final average salary in the final years of employment. When the County next decides to modify pension benefits, include in the modification scope an examination of the efficacy of:

- a. Changing the period used to determine FAS from 12 months to 36 months for most plans.
- b. Eliminating all pensionable pay categories that are not mandatory, such as vacation and sick leave buy-back pay.

RESPONSE

We concur with Recommendation 1a. The Grand Jury Report points out that the County maintains three defined benefit retirement plans open to new hires, and these plans are commonly known as "General Member Plans D and E" and "Safety Member Plan B" (hereinafter referred to as Plans D, E, and Safety B, respectively). Plans D and Safety B incorporate a single highest year final compensation period for determining final average salary (FAS), and Plan E incorporates a three-year (36-month) FAS. The report recommends a three-year FAS be considered for new hires under Plans D and Safety B, and we agree with that recommendation.

A three-year FAS would be appropriate from a plan design standpoint, and would mitigate future costs for the affected plans. As noted in the report, the cost reduction would be generated from the employment of new hires and would materialize gradually as the Plan D and Safety B populations turn over. It should be noted, however, that this change would be the proper subject of collective bargaining under the Myers-Milias-Brown Act and would, therefore, require negotiations with employee representatives. Nevertheless, it is a change worth pursuing, and we plan to address this matter in conjunction with other issues in future collective bargaining efforts.

With regard to Recommendation 1b, we agree the County should consider any opportunity to eliminate (or not create) any item of compensation that is unnecessary or ineffective from a compensation policy standpoint – pensionable or not. We do not agree, however, that pensionability concerns, alone, should drive these decisions or that the two examples cited in this recommendation are items that can be eliminated without significant adverse consequences to the County. The following information is a brief explanation of why this is the case with regard to the payments for accumulated vacation time:

1. Paying employees for excess accumulated vacation time is a practice that was established at a time when the payments were not pensionable under the County Employees Retirement Law (CERL). The practice is provided for in our current fringe benefit memoranda of understanding and has been the subject of many rounds of negotiations with employee representatives. As noted in the report, the event that made these payments pensionable was the 1997 court case commonly known as the Ventura Case – a case which changed the ground rules on what is and is not pensionable.
2. Existing County policy provides that vacation benefits must either be taken off by employees or, under specified conditions, paid off in cash. Cash pay offs to active County employees may only occur if an individual's unused accumulated vacation balance exceeds a designated threshold which, in most cases, is equivalent to the maximum vacation time an employee can earn over three working years. Accumulated vacation time below the three year threshold may be carried on the books indefinitely, but all such time must be paid off at termination at the rate of pay an employee is earning at that point in time. This time is not pensionable (even under the Ventura Case), but it creates a book liability that must be reported on the County's financial statements.
3. Ideally, accumulated vacation time should be taken or "managed" off, not paid off. However, the operational needs of the various County departments do not always allow for that circumstance. For example, approximately one-third of the County's workforce occupy positions known as "post positions" where the job must be staffed at designated days/times (e.g. hospital Registered Nurse, Deputy Sheriff, etc.). When absenteeism or other staffing shortages occur, other employees must be called in to backfill the positions on an overtime basis.

The report acknowledges the impact of the Ventura Case, but it also states that the above described in-service payoff of excess accumulated vacation time has been "designated as pensionable salary by administrative policy of the County" and is "not mandatory." This is confusing language given there should be no question that the pensionability of these payments has been determined solely by CERL and the Ventura Case, not the County. However, if by "not mandatory" the report is referring to the fact that the County could pursue, through the collective bargaining process, the complete elimination of in-service pay offs for excess accumulated vacation time (and the related pensionable income issue), that is true. But, as noted above, there would be consequences to that change that would adversely impact operations and be very costly.

The County also reimburses employees, under specified conditions, for unused accumulated sick leave time, and that practice is also a target of this recommendation. This policy also pre-dates the Ventura Case and has also been the subject of many negotiation cycles with employee representatives. The policy is intended to reward employees for strong attendance, and has significantly reduced employee usage of County provided sick leave benefits. Without going into the details of this program, we would like to voice a similar concern, as that outlined above, in that the elimination of this program would increase absenteeism, adversely impact County operations, and generate new costs.

We believe a better tactic than eliminating pay practices that make sense is to eliminate the law that makes them pensionable. The Chief Executive Office, in conjunction with the California Association of Counties (CSAC) will develop proposed legislation that would make the necessary amendments to CERL.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Through the collective bargaining process, the County could also reduce or eliminate automatic pay increases given to employees as they approach retirement, such as longevity and wellness pay, which contribute to pension spiking.

RESPONSE

We understand this recommendation reflects concern over the longevity pay negotiated with the Peace Officer and Supervising Peace Officer bargaining units in 2005. As noted in the report, the longevity pay in question provides additional salary of 3%, 4%, and 4% upon completion of 19, 24, and 29 years of service, respectively. As with any increase in salary, these adjustments affect pensions and pension costs.

We understand the concern over the 2005 agreement, and we agree that no prior policy decision should be immune to re-consideration in connection with future bargaining efforts. However, we believe the 2005 agreements with the two Peace Officer groups were important to maintaining a competitive pay policy for law enforcement personnel. As pointed out in the report, there was a veritable tidal wave of pension enhancements taking place throughout the California public sector at that time, and that movement started with the State of California itself.

With regard to law enforcement personnel, our concerns regarding competitive pay policy are driven, in large part, by the practices of the City of Los Angeles. The City is our major competitor for this particular talent and has historically paid more than the County in both salaries and pensions. The City has also provided longevity pay, historically beginning at 10 years of service. The imbalance, however, was largely remedied by the 2005 agreement to provide longevity pay – an agreement which ultimately reflected the recommendations of an independent mediator as well as Chief Executive Office staff.

The County also agreed to a 3% Fire Fighter “wellness bonus” in 2006. This was effectively an across-the-board salary adjustment for all Fire Fighters conditioned on each affected employee meeting or exceeding certain specified fitness standards. This form of pay is not seniority or longevity based and is no more conducive to pension spiking than any other type of across-the-board salary adjustment. It is, therefore, unclear as to why this item is included in this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The County to consider changes to pension plans for new employees, capping pensionable salaries or placing a cap on the maximum value of pension allowed, including changes to the Replacement Benefit Plan for highly compensated employees.

RESPONSE

We understand this recommendation to be focused primarily on Plan D and Safety Plan B as the Plan E benefit is currently capped at 80% of FAS after 45 years of County service. While we cannot disagree with a recommendation to consider further pension changes for new hires, we believe the recommendation to impose additional pension caps on future employees should be tempered by the following points:

1. Although the benefits under Plans D and Safety B are capped at 100% of FAS, these are contributory retirement plans wherein employee contributions pay for a substantial portion of the benefit. In the case of Plan D, for example, employee contributions are geared to finance one-half of the service retirement benefit. Therefore, the portion paid by the County is effectively capped right now at 50%.
2. The report makes note of the fact that the County requires substantial employee contributions to the retirement system, and this is in stark contrast to the practices of many other public jurisdictions, particularly jurisdictions participating the California Public Employees Retirement System.
3. It is important to consider that the County operates one of the largest health care systems in the United States. Many of the County's highest paid employees are physicians who can be difficult to recruit. A pension cap could make them more difficult to recruit. Moreover, physicians and certain other employees in relatively high paid occupations, such as Deputy District Attorneys, are now represented. Therefore, imposition of a pension cap on these groups, even on new hires only, would require both negotiations with employee representatives and legislation to amend CERL.
4. The body of the report makes reference to the Replacement Benefit Plan approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2010 and the fact that this plan may permit the payment of pension benefits in amounts higher than that "allowed" by the current limitations for qualified defined retirement plans set out in Section 415(b) of the Internal Revenue Code. We would like to clarify that the Replacement Benefit Plan mechanism, itself, is provided for in Section 415(m) of the Internal Revenue Code, and that this plan is necessary to ensure that Plans D, E, and Safety B remain in full compliance with both State and Federal law. The Replacement Benefit Plan is specifically permitted by Federal law and required by CERL.

Except for the three-year FAS issue addressed in Recommendation 1a, we believe that there is little justification for a general rollback (i.e. new tier) with respect to Plans D and Safety B. The benefit formulas have not been increased since the inception of the plans more than 30 years ago, and are generally below the level of benefits prevalent in the California public sector.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The County to consider negotiating changes in the Retiree Health Benefit Plan with labor organizations, to reduce the County net cost for the retiree health benefit, by either modifying benefit levels or increasing the member's share in the cost of retiree health insurance.

RESPONSE

We concur with this recommendation and efforts in this area are underway between the Chief Executive Office, employee representatives, and LACERA.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

The County to consider applying the full amount of the \$470.7 million County Contribution Credit Reserve to the retiree health trust as a first step toward accumulating reserves for OPEB benefits.

RESPONSE

With regard to both this recommendation and Recommendation 6, we concur that the County should complete a strategy to pre-fund its retiree health insurance liability, and that strategy should consider using, for this purpose, part or all of the remaining funds in the County Contribution Credit Reserve. There are many competing demands for the County's limited financial resources, especially now as we recover from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. The strategy we follow must carefully consider this reality as well.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

The County begin contributing the full annual required contribution for retiree health benefits in an attempt to build reserves and apply investment income as discounts toward the cost of benefits.

RESPONSE

See response to Recommendation 5.

ATTACHMENT B



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICE**

350 S. Figueroa St., Suite 188
World Trade Center
Los Angeles, CA 90071

RICHARD SANCHEZ
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Telephone: (213) 253-5600
Facsimile: (213) 633-4733

August 19, 2011

To: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Office

From: Richard Sanchez 
Chief Information Office

**2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HIGH TECHNOLOGY
FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY CRIME FIGHTING IN THE DIGITAL AGE**

This is in response to your memo dated July 11, 2011 requesting the information below regarding the 2010-2011 Grand Jury recommendations for High Technology Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3a

The Los Angeles County (LAC) Chief Information Office (CIO) and Internal Services Department should conduct internal reviews concerning cyber security and infrastructure protection from Cyber-attacks and terrorism:

- a) LAC must have protocols, policies and procedures facilitating timely, efficient rapid response by the most able Cyber security resources available, and ancillary emergency response by other agencies, if warranted, in the event of a Cyber intrusion, fire wall breach, or other Cyber-attack.

RESPONSE

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be in the future along with a timeframe for implementation.

This response derives from an internal review conducted recently by the CIO concerning Cyber security incident response. The review included numerous documented protocols, policies, and procedures deployed several years before this report that promotes an effective internal incident response. The response may include personnel that are Cyber security professionals from the Internal Services Department (ISD) and the Auditor-Controller (A-C), depending on the type of Cyber-attack. Historically, the ISD and A-C has provided Cyber incident response expertise and

William T Fujioka
August 19, 2011
Page 2

support during business and emergency instances in support of the Countywide Computer Emergency Response Team (CCERT). It should be noted, that each department, in accordance with Board of Supervisors' policy is required to have a Departmental Computer Emergency Response Team (DCERT).

To address a timely and effective incident notification in support of the CCERT, an electronic notification system was implemented recently to notify the County's Departmental Information Security Officers (e.g., DCERT), when required, and coordinated by the County's Chief Information Security Officer (CISO).

As Cyber security attacks evolve and become increasingly sophisticated, LAC processes (e.g., CCERT and DCERT) will continually evolve to include, at the minimum, countywide mock drills lead by the CISO. The CCERT, established in June 2004, would achieve this task on a continual basis.

In response to the statement, "the most able Cyber security resources available and ancillary emergency response by other agencies", LAC is planning a competitive solicitation to obtain an Incident Response Services Master Services Agreement (IRS/MSA) with a firm that specializes in Cyber security incident response. The outcome of this solicitation will acquire the most able Cyber security resources to complement ISD and A-C resources, while providing Cyber security incident response services throughout the County. This promotes a consistent incident response methodology and provides a level of expertise to support the continual threat that we are faced with constantly to maintain the confidentiality and integrity of LAC computing resources and assets. Additionally, the CISO will examine opportunities to leverage Cyber security resources at the County of Los Angeles District Attorney's (DA) High Technology Crimes Investigation Unit.

Emergency response notification to other agencies (e.g., State and Federal government) was implemented to engage Cyber security officials prior to the delivery of this report.

In conclusion, plans are underway by the CIO/CISO to establish an IRS/MSA and examine opportunities at the DA's High Technology Crimes Investigation Unit within a 12-month period from the final date of this response.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3b

- b) These should include coordination with key third party vendors. Many basic services within the LAC are provided by third party vendors. The Metropolitan Water District and California Edison are two (2) examples.

William T Fujioka
August 19, 2011
Page 3

RESPONSE

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be in the future along with a timeframe for implementation.

This response derives from an internal review conducted recently by the Chief Information Office (CIO) concerning Cyber security incident response resulting from a Cyber-attack on our infrastructure (e.g., water systems and power grid). The review included numerous documented protocols, policies, and procedures deployed several years in advance of this report that promotes an effective internal incident response. This response includes personnel that are Cyber security professionals from within this organization as well as external agencies (e.g., California Standardized Emergency Management System).

When a Cyber security attack occurs on LAC infrastructure, the CIO/CISO has inserted themselves into the emergency response notification procedures as facilitated by the County Chief Executive Office, Office of Emergency Management (OEM). OEM has established protocols, policies, and procedures for internal County departments (e.g., ISD and Sheriff), as well as external agencies (e.g., agencies within State and Federal government).

In conclusion, as stated previously (i.e., Recommendation No. 3a), plans are underway by the CIO/CISO to establish an IRS/MSA and examine opportunities at the DA's High Technology Crimes Investigation Unit within a 12-month period from the final date of this response. This agreement will provide Cyber security expertise to support this recommendation, as well.

If you have any questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Robert Pittman, CISO at 213-253-5631 or rpittman@cio.lacounty.gov.

RS:RP:pa

cc: Ellen Sandt, DCEO
Steve Cooley, District Attorney
Tom Tindall, Internal Services
Wendy L. Watanabe, Auditor-Controller
Brian Mahan, Chief Executive Office

ATTACHMENT C



County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

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

PHILIP L. BROWNING
Interim Director

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

September 14, 2011

To: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

From: Philip L. Browning
Interim Director

**DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES RESPONSES TO THE
2010-2011 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT**

In response to your July 11th, 2011 memo, the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) respectfully submits the responses to the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury report pertaining to Post Adoption Services (PAS) and the Transition Age Youth (TAY) Journey recommendations.

Grand Jury Recommendations for Adoptions – Post Adoption Services (PAS)

The following responses are specific to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury recommendations regarding Post Adoption Services.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1

DCFS provide for a management audit to evaluate PAS work procedures as related to adoptive reunions with particular focus on the conversion of post adoption information in the electronic database (AIS).

RESPONSE

Adoption Permanency Resource Division (APRD) supports this recommendation and is currently developing a team to analyze the PAS Program.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1a

Evaluation of the reunion program, its organizational structure, service levels written policies, procedures and regulations, along with key processes; to determine whether processes have been effectively implemented to ensure compliance with policies, procedures, and adoption regulations.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. APRD is to conduct an extensive review and evaluation of the adoption reunions; assess the effectiveness of our current practices and policies to ensure timely reunions. Establish a customer survey for this population to determine the effectiveness of the program.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1b

Determination as to whether effective and adequate internal controls are in place that provide reasonable assurance of minimal errors and maximize service efficiency.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. APRD is to conduct an evaluation of the Program's filing system of consents and waivers and its effectiveness and accessibility to ensure timely reunions.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1c

Tracking the number of Consents for Contact (for birth parents), Waivers of Confidentiality (for siblings), and Consents for Contact (for adoptees) over a certain period of time. This allows for the number of reunion requests made and successful reunifications processed by PAS on a historical basis. The CGJ suggests a fourteen-year (14) time frame seven (7) years before and seven (7) years after December 2003.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. Since January 2011, APRD has been keeping a manual log of all Waivers of Confidentiality and Consents for Contact received. This ensures tracking and will enable future reporting. Since 2003, PAS has been entering information on cases with Waivers or Consents into the Adoption Integrated System (AIS), but there has been no mechanism to run a report of all the cases that have such an entry. Thus, APRD does not have the data available to do a historical analysis for 14 years as recommended by the CGJ. To further enhance this tracking and reporting capability, APRD is partnering with the Business Information Systems (BIS) Division to establish a coding system on AIS to capture the number of consents and waivers filed on AIS and the number which result in actual reunions, and to measure the time frame.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1d

Estimation of the number of consents and reunion requests misfiled or lost by using a sampling method.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. Since a manual log of Waivers of Confidentiality and Consents for Contact was initiated in January 2011, PAS will conduct a sampling to ensure they were filed properly. Since Waivers, Consents and Reunion Requests were filed in the cases but not centrally tracked previously, it is not possible to complete an estimation of the number that had been misfiled or lost. Based on our client inquiries received regarding PAS, we believe the number lost or misfiled has been low. Once an automated tracking system is in place, PAS will be able to better track future consents and reunion requests and assess the processes for more successful and timely reunions.

RECOMMENDATION NO 2

In order to move forward with the matching of pre/post computer AIS adoption information processes, consider charging a "reunification fee" to assist in defraying the cost of locating information in the files.

RESPONSE

APRD does not support this recommendation. PAS is a service entity within a public agency to serve and support adoption clients. APRD does not want any monetary barrier to discourage adoption clients from seeking reunions.

RECOMMENDATION NO 3

Establish a method to reach out to adoptees and their birth parents and educate the general public regarding the pre-computer/post-computer processes, which would allow for pre-computer adoptees and their birth parents to update their files for entry into the post-computer process.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. APRD services are accessible through the DCFS website. Adoption clients can access the DCFS website and view PAS services. Adoption Reunion Services will be highlighted on the website. Reunion information will be disseminated to the Adoption Promotion and Support Services agencies with whom APRD partners and will also be disseminated to DCFS staff in the regional offices who work with birth parents. The possibility of listing the PAS duty line number in the government listings of the public phone book will be explored.

RECOMMENDATION NO 4

Address the need for additional PAS Social Workers to facilitate adoption support services in the community.

RESPONSE

APRD supports this recommendation. To clarify, APRD is in partnership with Adoption Promotion Support Services (APSS) providers, which are 8 contracted community agencies, with 12 offices located in each of the Service Provider Areas (SPA) throughout Los Angeles County. APSS agencies assist the Department in providing needed services to Post Adoption families. APSS is funded by the Federal government via the Promoting Safe and Stable Families funding.

APSS agencies provide the following services: individual, group or family therapy; mentors; support groups for children and/or adults; case management; and referrals for linkage services that can include childcare, health care, mental health, physical and developmental services, Regional Center Services, educational, special education, substitute adult role model, income support and transportation services.

The Post Adoption Services (PAS) Children's Social Workers (CSWs) work directly for DCFS and provide crisis intervention and referral services and Adoption Assistance Program (AAP, which is akin to foster care funding for adoptive children) services to adoptive families. APRD will continue to monitor PAS workload in consideration of staffing resources allocation.

Grand Jury Recommendations for Transition Age Youth (TAY) Journey

The following responses are specific to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury recommendations regarding the Transition Age Youth (TAY) Journey.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Undertake an impartial, external audit and evaluation of TAY programs, particularly housing and ILP services.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. The Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller is currently performing an external audit and evaluation of Youth Development Services (YDS) total programs. The report is expected to be available in September 2011. YDS will be required to respond to the audit recommendations and provide any needed corrective action plan, including timeframes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Develop and implement an evaluation plan that acknowledges self-sufficiency during and beyond the program.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. This will be a focus for the business mapping referenced in Recommendation No. 1 as well as the use of departmental TAY outcomes from existing data reporting mechanisms: the National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD) and the Federal Exit Outcome Report (Soc 405).

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Submit ILP and transition housing participation data to the State as part of the requirement for funds.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. YDS will ensure that there is a consistent understanding and definition of "participation" among the data gathered from its ILP Transition Coordinators for the submission of its February 2012 State report.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

Define and develop methodologies, frequency and reliability of work data collection methods and systems.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. By January 1, 2012, YDS will assess existing data tracking systems – NYTD, Homeless Integration Services (HMIS), Exit Outcomes (Soc 405) and the Emancipation Services Independent Living Program Data Tracking System (ESILP) – to determine where gaps in data tracking impact the reliability of participant information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Develop and maintain consistent criteria participation data for ILP and other TAY services.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. This will be achieved as part of YDS' business mapping process, to begin no later than October 2011.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

Initiate the process of tracking youths' denial of ILP services if offered and follow-up to reinstate the ILP.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. YDS is currently working with key TAY stakeholders to implement an ILP review process for approved and/or denied ILP requested services by January 1, 2012.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

Evaluate effectiveness of the existing data management system and explore new software that could streamline data collection and analysis.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. YDS will work with the Department's BIS Division to come up with recommendations by March 1, 2012 to address the response. However, there are certain Federal and State regulations that prohibit dual entry of data, which needs to be factored into the recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

Increase and improve communication efforts with TAY participants after they leave the program.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. YDS will develop strategies, with its community stakeholders (ILP and housing contractors, postsecondary education partners, AB12 partners), for implementation by March 2012.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

Establish confidential e-mail distribution lists and send regularly scheduled e-mails.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation, as YDS has already begun obtaining e-mail addresses to provide information and maintain communication with TAY upon their exiting the program. YDS will establish a central mechanism to maintain the e-mail addresses for the distribution of information and to keep in contact with TAY.

Grand Jury Response
September 14, 2011
PAGE 7

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

Increase frequency of participant progress updates and complete surveys that measure progress, satisfaction, and solicit input and suggestions.

RESPONSE

Agree with this recommendation. By February 2012, YDS will review and assess its current surveying mechanisms (NYTD Youth Surveys, ILPONLINE.org online survey, THP program exit survey) to determine necessary enhancements to increase survey responses from ILP and housing participants. YDS will also explore the feasibility of internet social networking sites, such as Facebook and MySpace, including the consideration of community partners (i.e., California Youth Connection, Foster Wise) as collaborators/partners towards achieving better participant input and suggestions.

If you have any questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Aldo Marin, Board Relations Manager, at (213) 351-5530.

PLB:am

ATTACHMENT D



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

August 19, 2011

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

FROM:  Steve Cooley
District Attorney

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2010-11 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND
JURY FINAL REPORT**

Attached is my Department's response to the recommendations contained in the following sections of the 2010-11 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report:

E-Subpoena – One Way to End the Paper Chase
High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security - Crime Fighting in the Digital Age

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

lv

Attachments

c: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
E-SUBPOENA PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5: The DA staff is encouraged to conduct an E-Subpoena training class for court liaison/subpoena control officers and encourage departments still receiving paper subpoenas to implement E-Subpoena.

RESPONSE:

The District Attorney's Office has and will continue to actively encourage all Los Angeles County law enforcement agencies to participate in the E-Subpoena program. Since launching the E-Subpoena program with LAPD only three years ago, over 30 additional agencies have been provided with information regarding the District Attorney's E-Subpoena program. Currently over 75% of subpoenas are sent electronically to law enforcement agencies. Santa Monica Police Department began receiving electronic subpoenas on August 15, 2011 and several other agencies are close to implementation.

Additional training for law enforcement court liaison/subpoena control officers continues to be available. In June, 2011, a representative of the District Attorney's Office provided training in Alhambra to several law enforcement agencies regarding best practices for implementing an e-subpoena program. Additionally, representatives from the District Attorney's Office are available to provide technical and non-technical assistance post-implementation. The District Attorney's Office remains committed to providing assistance to all interested law enforcement agencies.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DISTRICT ATTORNEY

SUBJECT: 2010-11 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION: HIGH TECH FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY CRIME FIGHTING IN THE DIGITAL AGE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. a.

The District Attorney should establish and keep up to date a list of all State, Federal, and private training related to high tech and forensics examination, and cyber investigation and security.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office currently receives notices of training opportunities from the following organizations: California District Attorney's Association; National Computer Forensics Institute; Peace Officers Standards and Training; High Tech Crime Investigator's Association; International Association of Financial Crime Investigators; National District Attorney's Association; and LA Clear. Though the office does not have the resources to monitor all training opportunities offered in the private sector, it continues to post all such training notices on the Criminal Justice Institute website, which serves as a central clearinghouse for this type of information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.b.

The District Attorney should provide outreach to all police departments and the sheriff on a regular basis regarding the value of training in high tech forensics in crime fighting in Los Angeles County through seminars for groups of law enforcement agencies and "roll-call" training for individual law enforcement agencies.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office currently provides the following training seminars, available to all law enforcement agencies in Los Angeles County: identity theft; access card fraud; high tech crimes; digital evidence; and cell phone forensics. The Office is in the process of creating and implementing "roll-call" training on the topic of cell phone forensics to these agencies as well.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. c.

The District Attorney should keep a log of the use of digital evidence in the prosecution of all types of cases. This log should indicate the nature of the evidence and its significance in each case. The District Attorney should encourage municipal agencies to track this information on misdemeanors as well.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office currently keeps statistics on cases involving identity theft, access card fraud, network intrusion, intellectual property theft, and child exploitation. Unfortunately, the Office does not have adequate staffing to track all cases in which some form of digital evidence is used, given the increasing involvement of digital evidence in criminal investigations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. d.

The District Attorney should establish a program for all Deputy District Attorneys to acquire the basic knowledge and skills necessary to develop their cases using digital evidence in an effective manner.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office conducts ongoing training for deputies on a variety of legal topics, including those related to high tech crime and forensics. All deputies are encouraged to attend regularly held Saturday Seminars where such training is offered. In February 2010, the Office held a Saturday Seminar on high tech crime and forensics. Another Saturday Seminar on the same topic will be held in January 2011. The Office is also prepared to include basic training on the use of cell phone forensic evidence for the next class of newly hired deputies. For more experienced prosecutors, the Office will hold a two-day Digital Evidence College in March of 2012.

Recommendation NO. 1. e.

The District Attorney should develop and conduct seminars to educate judges in the use of digital evidence in the criminal justice system.

RESPONSE

The District Attorney's Office has been in contact with Judge Beverly O'Connell, of the Los Angeles County Superior Court Office of Judicial Education's Planning and Research Department, regarding our assistance with an upcoming training on digital evidence for judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys. The Office is helping to identify pertinent topics and experts for use at the training.

ATTACHMENT E



Health Services
LOS ANGELES COUNTY

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

August 19, 2011

TO: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Mitchell H. Katz, M.D.
Director

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2010-2011 LOS ANGELES
COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT**

RECEIVED
2011 AUG 23 PM 12: 21
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Mitchell H. Katz, M.D.
Director

Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D., Ph.D.
Chief Medical Officer

John F. Schunhoff, Ph.D.
Chief Deputy Director

Attached is the Department of Health Services' response to the recommendations made in the 2010-2011 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report. We generally concur with and have taken or initiated corrective actions to address the recommendations contained in the report.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please let me know or you may contact Tobi L. Moree at (213) 240-7901.

MHK:eg

Attachment

c: John F. Schunhoff, Ph.D.
Gregory Polk

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

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

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

To ensure access to high-quality, patient-centered, cost-effective health care to Los Angeles County residents through direct services at DHS facilities and through collaboration with community and university partners.

www.dhs.lacounty.gov



RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
UNCOLLECTED MEDICAL BILLS IN THE COUNTY'S THREE MAJOR
MEDICAL FACILITIES

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Increase the hours and staffing at Urgent Care and Community clinics to better meet the needs of the community.

RESPONSE

DHS partially disagrees with this recommendation. All of the DHS acute Hospitals, Multi-Service Ambulatory Care Centers, three Comprehensive Health Centers, and a limited number of the community clinics provide Urgent Care services. The current strategic goal of DHS and Community clinics, in light of health care reform, is to expand and improve primary care capacity which includes having weekend and extended hours. A consequence of the primary care expansion and improvement should reduce unnecessary Urgent Care visits. The objective is to ensure that patients who choose to use DHS and community clinics have a primary care provider and a medical home so that the use of Urgent Care is only necessary for those patients who are experiencing an acute clinical issue or do not have a medical home identified.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

LAC+USC to increase their Urgent Care patient referral rate from 7.5% to 25% - the average patient referral rate of Olive View and Harbor-UCLA.

RESPONSE

DHS disagrees with this recommendation. LAC+USC Medical Center currently identifies non-emergent patients at their Emergency Room and transfers these patients to the Urgent Care. However, achieving a target of 25% may not be realistic as the target may be dependent on the urgent care capacity and the emergency room patient volume. We will track and trend the referral rate and determine a target rate in the future. In addition, as of July 1, 2011, DHS has a new agreement with Community Partner participants (formerly known as Public/Private Partnerships). This agreement expands primary care access beyond that of the DHS operated clinics by integrating the public and private primary care capacity and enabling DHS to refer patients who do not have a primary care provider to a Community Partner on a systematic level. The new agreement will increase Urgent Care referrals to primary care in the near future by

identifying patients on a quarterly basis from DHS specialty clinics, in-patient services, and Urgent Care who do not have a primary care provider. The objective of this effort is to identify and re-direct all patients to a primary care provider/medical home.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Increase ER referrals to Community Clinics and Public-Private Partnership Program.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. Effective July 1, 2011, DHS has a new agreement with Community Partner participants which will result in increased ER referrals to primary care in the near future. The agreement with Community Partners expands primary care access by integrating the public and private primary care capacity and enabling DHS to refer patients who do not have a primary care provider to a Community Partner on a systematic level.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Initial Contact Nurse to provide a referral list of nearby low cost County Community Health Centers and private community-based providers to those patients who request prescription refills, or treatment for minor medical issues and primary care.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. Emergency room staff direct patients to DHS operated clinics and community clinics when appropriate. Patients who enter the hospital through the emergency room will continue to receive a medical screening exam to determine if they have an emergent or non-emergent medical condition and also whether they have a primary care provider. Patients who do not have an emergent condition and do not currently have a primary care provider are provided a referral list of Community Partners, County Community Health Centers, or Hospital Outpatient primary care clinics

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Support the effort to change the Etter Consent Decree (ECD) allowing the County to increase its medical cost reimbursement levels.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. DHS Revenue Management (RM) and County Counsel (CC) will continue a collaborative effort to improve County program eligibility requirements by making and/or recommending changes to programs, which are impacted by the ECD, to allow the County to increase its medical cost reimbursement,

including the Pre-Payment Plan. Beginning January 2011, RM and CC initiated negotiations with the Etter Consent Plaintiffs (ECP), and completed key changes such as: changing the zero liability for Ability-To-Pay (ATP) from Medi-Cal Maintenance Needs to 133% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL); and Outpatient Reduced-Cost Simplified Application (ORSA) from 133 1/3% to 133% of FPL; making cooperation with Healthy Way LA (HWLA) a requirement of the ATP and ORSA programs; and streamlining the process by changing the income guidelines for ORSA to be similar to ATP. In early 2012, program changes, for which an agreement has not yet been reached, will be recommended to the ECP by RM and CC. It is anticipated that changes to the Pre-Payment Plan will be included in these recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

Establish a policy for Pre-Payment billings and collections that is consistent in all three (3) major medical facilities in LAC.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. DHS Financial Practice No. 520.26, Pre-Payment Plan, effective March 1, 2008, indicates if the patient does not have third-party coverage or is not interested in applying for any health care program, they will be offered the Pre-Payment plan. DHS RM will review current procedures for offering the Pre-Payment plan to patients at the three (3) major medical facilities to determine which procedures would provide the greatest benefit to DHS. Based on the findings, RM and CC will make recommendations in early 2012 to the ECP and revise DHS Financial Practice No. 520.26 to reflect consistent Pre-Payment plan procedures throughout DHS. Subsequent to the completion of the revision, DHS Financial Practice No. 520.26 will become the policy.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

Develop and implement a staff policy and procedure that ensures patient awareness of the availability of the Extended Payment Plan (EPP) option.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. DHS Financial Practice No. 520.27, Extended Payment Plan, effective January 15, 2010, indicates the EPP option is available to hospital patients including patients who have been granted a discount on their medical bill. DHS provides a flyer containing information on all of the County's No-Cost/Low-Cost programs to patients at every DHS health facility when treatment is first sought. DHS RM will work with CC and the ECP to revise the No-Cost/Low-Cost flyer, to include information regarding the EPP. Pursuant to the ECD, RM will submit the revised No-Cost/Low-Cost flyer to the ECP for review and comment by December 31, 2011, and the flyer will be finalized after the comment period.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

Establish a directive to expand the use of EPP by uninsured patients who have the means to pay for services.

RESPONSE

DHS agrees with this recommendation. By December 31, 2011, DHS RM will work with CC to revise the governing DHS Financial Practice No. 520.27, Extended Payment Plan, to specify that the EPP should be offered to patients. Subsequent to the completion of the revision, DHS Financial Practice No. 520.27 will become the directive. After which, staff will receive training on the revised Financial Practice. The EPP is an option to pay, and does not cover the process for evaluating a patient's means to pay. The evaluation of a patient's means to pay for services is determined if the patient provides the required information during financial screening, where patients are made aware of all payment and coverage options.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

Design and implement a program to analyze and prosecute abuse of the LAC public hospital medical care system.

RESPONSE

DHS disagrees with this recommendation. Procedures are already in place to report suspected fraud or abuse. Suspected Medi-Cal fraud is reported to the California Department of Health Services Investigation Branch. Suspected abuse in programs in which DHS processes the program application, such as ATP, ORSA, and Healthy Way LA, are referred to DHS Audit and Compliance Division (A&CD) for investigation as outlined in DHS Policy No. 1000, DHS Compliance Program/Code of Conduct, effective January 8, 2007. The policy indicates that DHS A&CD will investigate suspected violations that may result in an inappropriate claim for payment or that may have an unknown consequence such as identity theft. Investigations that identify fraud are referred to the appropriate authorities, including but not limited to law enforcement and the District Attorney for prosecution. Investigations which substantiate abuse are referred to Finance for collections and to the facility to take appropriate corrective actions, as needed. DHS Patient Financial Services staff will receive training on reporting suspected fraud for programs in which DHS processes the program application, to be completed by June 30, 2012.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

Change the classification from Self-Pay to Financial Liability because currently it is not a self-pay system but a financial liability for the County.

RESPONSE

DHS disagrees with this recommendation. Federal, State, and County agencies require the Self-Pay classification data to be reported. Additionally, the classification of Self-Pay is an industry standard, and is not recorded as a liability.

ATTACHMENT F



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROBATION DEPARTMENT

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



DONALD H. BLEVINS
Chief Probation Officer

September 13, 2011

TO: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Donald H. Blevins *DHB*
Chief Probation Officer

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
TRANSITION AGE YOUTH (TAY) JOURNEY

Please see attached response to the Grand Jury Final Report for 2010-2011 Grand Jury Recommendations for Transition Age Youth (TAY) Journey.

If you need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Reaver E. Bingham, Deputy Chief, at (562) 940-2513.

Attachment

DHB:REB:ed



DONALD H. BLEVINS
Chief Probation Officer

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROBATION DEPARTMENT

JUVENILE PLACEMENT SERVICES BUREAU
9150 EAST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY – DOWNEY, CALIFORNIA 90242
(562) 940-2663



August 16, 2011

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION
DEPARTMENT (YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICES [YDS] DIVISION)

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
TRANSITION AGE YOUTH (TAY) JOURNEY

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Undertake an impartial, external audit and evaluation of Transition Age Youth (TAY) programs, particularly housing and Independent Living Program (ILP) services. The Assessment may allow for an evaluation of differences and successes of DCFS and LAHSA in their roles as housing providers to TAY. The study may provide for an evaluation of the ILP programs and services. A successful evaluation requires access to current and former youth participants. The evaluation could allow consultants to survey and interview current and past participants. A study with a longer timeframe may provide more time to gather data and information necessary for a comprehensive evaluation that best identifies service gaps and impediments in process of operations, staffing, financial resources and overall service approaches.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ The Los Angeles County Auditor Controller is currently conducting an external audit and review of YDS programs and services. We are awaiting the outcome of the Auditor Controller's review. Although this is a fiscal and internal controls focused audit, this audit is imperative to ILP operations as most services are based on available resources and funding. In addition, the Auditor Controller is conducting a fiscal and internal controls audit of the HUD Transitional Housing program. Prior YDS audits reviewed individual case files to ensure that funding requests and services provided were consistent with ILP policies and guidelines. In addition, prior audits looked at youth eligibility and age requirements for services received for both current and past participants.

REPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 2 of 9

- ✓ CDSS and the County recently completed our Systems Improvement Plan (SIP) which focused on improving outcomes for emancipating foster youth. The SIP is an on-going plan done every three years. The vehicle to gather information and make recommendations for system's improvement is the Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR). In this year's PQCR, the Probation Department along with the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), State representatives, stakeholders, and youth developed focus groups met to identify gaps in services, and potential solutions for TAY. The focus groups not only identified barriers to youth and their successful access of ILP services, but also provided a vehicle for youth and stakeholders to evaluate all services/programs and make suggestions for improvement. The focus groups included but were not limited to youth groups (Probation and DCFS), YDS staff, Housing staff, as well as community providers. The results from the focus groups were then organized into a report that was presented to stakeholders and youth groups at a conference. The results were provided to the State as part of our final SIP, which in turn will inform future policy, legislation, and funding priorities for older foster care youth exiting the system.
- ✓ The Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP) is currently being evaluated by the Inter-Universities Consortium (IUC) to determine the program participant outcomes.
- ✓ YDS also has an annual Single Audit Report performed by Macias, Gini & O'Connell auditors, an independent contractor.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Develop and implement an evaluation plan that acknowledges self sufficiency of participants during and beyond the program period to better evaluate progress during the program and their sustainability of skills and knowledge after program service/eligibility.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ In an effort to evaluate the progress of how self sufficient youth are when they exit care, YDS has began implementing the Federal National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD) requirements. The States are required to report four types of information about youth exiting care: services provided to youth; youth characteristics; outcomes and basic demographics. More specifically, the States must collect and report information on six general outcomes: 1) Increase youth financial self-sufficiency 2) Improve youth educational attainment 3) Reduce homelessness among youth 4) Reduce high-risk behavior among youth. The States are to survey the youth regarding their outcome information at three

REPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 3 of 9

different intervals: On or about the youth's 17th birthday while the youth is in foster care; two years later on or about the youth's 19th birthday; and again on or about the youth's 21st birthday.

- ✓ The survey has two (2) objectives: 1) to obtain youth responses within 45 days of their 17th birthday and 2) to compile an adequate number of NYTD youth survey responses from designated cohorts of ILP eligible youth. We are currently in the first phase of the NYTD Survey, which began October 2010. This survey is particularly critical as this is a self reported survey from current and former foster youth about their ILP experience and the services that they have received. Thus, via both the collection of the outcome data and the youth survey, Probation YDS will have an ongoing evaluation tool that will monitor self-sufficiency of participants during and beyond the transition phase. The last survey/ evaluation will be completed prior to them aging out of ILP services.
- ✓ In an effort to measure the participant's self sufficiency, three mandatory areas will be addressed in the Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP). The TILP is the required document for initiating services for ILP eligible youth. The three mandatory areas addressed are education, housing, and employment/job training. The Department is mandated to ensure that each youth in foster care has a plan, and identifies the requisite services for self sufficiency. In cases where the youth has documented physical, mental or emotional limitations, the TILP must identify the supportive services to address the needs for these youth to obtain self sufficiency.
- ✓ This year the County adopted self sufficiency as the fourth outcome for children in DCFS and Probation. There will be a special emphasis on measuring permanency, housing, education, work force readiness, and social and emotional wellbeing. Evaluation of these outcomes will continue until the youth's 21st birthday; utilizing CWS/CMS as the repository for both DCFS and Probation youth.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Submit ILP and transition housing participation data to the State as part of the reporting requirement for funds.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ YDS is currently gathering ILP and housing data for the State via the Annual State Statistical and Narrative Report. This annual report includes, but is not limited to, the number of youth receiving services, the number of youth in college

REPOSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 4 of 9

- and the number of youth seeking housing. The Statistical Report is submitted to the State in October and the Narrative Report is submitted in February.
- ✓ YDS has already implemented an internal database and reporting system that measures monthly the number of youth participating in ILP services as well as identifying new and returning youth. This internal database has assisted Probation's YDS operation in verifying information the program has generated independent of the current systems. Now that Probation Departments have been given access to the CWS/CMS system, it is expected that we will be able to obtain pertinent information from CWS/CMS in the future and that the program will be able to eliminate dual entry/dual monitoring systems.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

Define and develop methodologies, frequency and reliability of work data collection methods and systems to clearly define recorded data so that participation data is more reliable.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ YDS was given access to the CMS/CWS computer system in October 2009, to report youth outcomes and services rendered. The components being utilized are National Youth in Transition Data – Base (NYTD), Homeless Management Integration Services (HMIS), Exit Outcomes and Emancipation Services Independent Living Program Data Tracking System (ESILP). To ensure reliability of this data, YDS is utilizing quality control reports to validate the accuracy of entries. These reports include: the number of youth that received an ILP service; the type of ILP services the youth receive; which youth did not receive any services at all; the number of youth that completed a youth survey; the number of youth that did not complete a youth survey; and the number of youth that were homeless. The data is collected and reviewed consistently every six months. The Federal government will also impose fiscal penalties upon states for entering inaccurate data. Thus, data related to demographic, start and end dates and education are reviewed for accuracy via compliance reports generated throughout each six month period. The inaccurate data identifies the user who entered the data. Each user is responsible to correct any inaccuracies that are identified.
- ✓ In an effort to further improve and monitor outcomes for youth, the Probation Department has implemented monthly monitoring systems that measure each ILP coordinator's accomplishments and compliance with departmental, state and federal requirements, which in turn assist the coordinator in providing services to youth. The internal monitoring systems utilize the Probation's Group Home Population report as a means to inform coordinators of where ILP youth are

REPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 5 of 9

located as well as for coordinators to plan for service delivery. For the last 10 months, the Probation ILP coordinators have now begun entering services and youth information into the system. The Business Objects Training course has begun and will inform managers and the bureau of trends in the placement population, as well as track bureau and program outcomes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Develop and maintain consistent criteria participation data for ILP and other TAY services.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ Consistent participation data is captured and maintained via three existing systems: 1) CWS/CMS and NYTD which identifies all services provided to youth receiving any ILP related services. The State generates reports on these services every six months to monitor services delivered and accuracy. 2) ES/ILP tracking system which captures all fund requests and services that are fiscal related. These services include but are not limited to: rent assistance; college assistance; employment assistance, etc. 3) The HMIS system which periodically captures participation data on youth who are case managed by the THP HUD program.
- ✓ The current criteria for participation and eligibility for ILP services is posted on ILPOnline and is updated each year to include any changes. Youth and interested stakeholders can access the website (using a computer with internet capabilities) and can navigate the site to review and print out frequently asked questions, announcements, forms, as well as All County Letters which provide guidelines for participation and any policy or procedural updates. Furthermore, the website provides a vehicle for any individual or youth with questions or concerns about eligibility and ILP services to email a question to the website administrator. The administrator then routes the questions to the appropriate unit (Housing, ILP coordinators, THP +) or manager for a response.
- ✓ In addition, Probation YDS management has participated in discussions with DCFS management in the formulation of the updated criteria that was issued this year (2011).
- ✓ YDS currently has procedural guidelines that are posted and updated regularly on ILPOnline.org as well as other printed brochures and booklets. Program criteria are defined by federal and state authority. YDS internal policy for distribution of benefits establishes consistent criteria for all participants eligible

REPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 6 of 9

for services and or benefits. YDS housing programs also have consistent admission criteria to ensure all youth in need are able to benefit from services.

- ✓ YDS has gained access to TAY housing and mental health services, such as Full Service Partnerships funded through the Department of Mental Health. DMH currently houses a staff with DCFS and Probation. Eligibility for these programs is identified by the staff and access to these services has increased exponentially.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

Initiate the process of tracking youths' denial of ILP services if offered and record data and follow up to reinstate the ILP.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ Youth participation in ILP is on a voluntary basis; therefore youth who choose not to participate remain eligible and may elect to access services at a later date (up until age 21). Youth are continuously offered services and resources through various outreach programs and events the duration of their eligibility.
- ✓ The YDS program works in partnership within the County's eight Service Planning Areas (SPA) Steering Committees in organizing and coordinating resource job fairs. YDS staff have participated in these events and have made information about ILP services available to any former foster care youth, caregiver or provider attending those events. Youth who choose not to participate in life skill classes are continuously targeted for participation in the next modules by the ILP Contractors. Children Social Workers (CSWs) and Deputy Probation Officers (DPOs) are encouraged to consult with ILP Coordinators to learn about services as well as encourage youth to accept ILP services. Community Workers contact youth and conduct peer level discussions on the benefits of ILP participation. These outreach efforts provide an "open door" policy, allowing youth to access services at any time. When a youth refuses ILP services, a case note is added to the CWS/CMS.
- ✓ ILP services will continue to be offered to youth at the 90 Day Transition Conference, which is federally mandated for all youth aging out of care. In addition, youth can come back to the ILP Program anytime before their 21st birthday and request services.

REPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 7 of 9

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

Evaluate effectiveness of the existing data management system and explore new software that could streamline data collection and analysis which improves identification of service gaps and accomplishments.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ We will consult with our Bureau of Information Services Section (BIS) to explore streamlining our data collection efforts. However, there are certain Federal and State regulations that prohibit dual entry of data. Our primary database is the state owned Child Welfare Services Case Management System (CWS/CMS) which tracks limited data and does not accommodate uploading of information.
- ✓ The Probation Department is also participating in Business Objects Training to learn how to streamline processes and maximize reports that can be generated for CWS/CMS. This will allow Probation's YDS operation to analyze the data and identify service trends and service gaps which can ultimately improve overall service delivery.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

Increase and improve communication efforts with TAY participants to raise awareness of ILP housing and other TAY related services by improving data collection efforts and maintaining contact with participants after they leave the program.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ As previously mentioned, Probation has begun requesting e-mail addresses from youth while they are receiving services. These addresses can be utilized not only to maintain contact during the period of time that they are accessing services but also upon exiting the program to provide follow-up and assist with aftercare services. Transition Coordinators (TCs) were additionally instructed to obtain (whenever possible) an emergency contact phone number and name for each youth receiving ILP services and continue to obtain home addresses whenever available for involved relatives.
- ✓ With the implementation of the 90-day Transition Plan, we will assure that all youth exiting out of foster care will be connected with YDS prior to leaving the system. It will also give us accurate addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses to stay connected with these youth after they leave.

REPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 8 of 9

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

Establish confidential e-mail distribution lists and send regularly scheduled e-mails to provide awareness of scholarships, ILP services, available resources, and job opportunities.

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ As mentioned in Recommendation 8, we have initiated collecting e-mail addresses to provide information to youth receiving services as well as improving our continued communication with them upon exiting the program.
- ✓ Currently, announcements relating to scholarships, tuition assistance, as well as the full array of ILP services including but not limited to, clothing allowance and computer training have been posted on the ILPOnline site. The website is accessible by anyone who has internet access and inquiries are not limited to just youth in the program, but to anyone seeking information about the program, processes and procedures.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

Increase frequency in which participants provide progress updates and complete surveys that measure progress, satisfaction and solicit input and suggestions. Improved and increased communication between participants and staff may allow the recommended evaluation plan to be effectively implemented. The second method for maintaining ongoing communication with youth participants could involve the increased use of social networking, such as facebook.com, since most youths are already using these social networking sites

RESPONSE

The Probation Department agrees with this recommendation.

- ✓ NYTD Surveys (see #2 response) measures progress, satisfaction as well as soliciting input and suggestions from the youth. In addition, there are two surveys that meets these goals: 1) The ILP Survey which is online and the youth are provided an incentive for participation and 2) The THP exit survey which measures satisfaction with the program and identifies service trends for program improvement.
- ✓ We have considered this recommendation; however, there are County guidelines and issues of liability which prohibit the hosting of such social networking environments. County Counsel has concerns with county departments posting

REPOSNE TO THE GRAND JURY

August 16, 2011

Page 9 of 9

information on social networking sites due to possible liability issues that could arise from the potential inappropriate content of other visitors who can post on the county sponsored site.

- ✓ Nevertheless, YDS is collaborating with the Los Angeles County Youth Council, Foster Wise, to initiate a website to maintain ongoing communication with youth participants via social networking as well as provide service and resource information. The Youth Council is in the process of working with the CEO to present this plan to obtain funding and/or resources to launch their website. In addition, the chair of this committee has been appointed the Southern Counties CYC Regional Coordinator and will begin outreach efforts for the Los Angeles area as well as adjacent counties. The first statewide meeting for this effort will take place on August 20, 2011.

ATTACHMENT G



JONATHAN E. FIELDING, M.D., M.P.H.
Director and Health Officer

JONATHAN E. FREEDMAN
Chief Deputy Director

313 North Figueroa Street, Room 806
Los Angeles, California 90012
TEL (213) 240-8117 • FAX (213) 976-1273

www.publichealth.lacounty.gov



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 5, 2011

TO: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Jonathan E. Fielding, M.D., M.P.H. *J. Fielding m*
Director and Health Officer

SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH'S RESPONSE TO THE 2010-2011 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

The 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Final Report includes six recommendations that pertain to Health Facilities Inspection Division (HFID) operations in Sub-Acute Health Facilities. Attached you will find our responses to each recommendation.

Under contract with the California Department of Public Health, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health (DPH), HFID performs licensing and certification functions of Health Facilities and Ancillary Health Services, including Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNF), in Los Angeles County (LAC).

HFID is responsible for the licensing, certification and inspection of privately owned and operated healthcare facilities in Los Angeles County. HFID has the responsibility to ensure that these facilities are in compliance with State and Federal laws and regulations. HFID evaluators are required to attend and complete both State and Federal training courses before they are permitted to perform surveys and evaluations of all licensed and certified health facilities within Los Angeles County.

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments.

JEF:cb

c: Sheila Shima
Richard Mason
Brian Mahan
Jonathan E. Freedman
Ernest Pooleon

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – PUBLIC HEALTH

SUBJECT: 2010-11 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
SUB-ACUTE HEALTH FACILITIES IS THE FOX INSPECTING THE
HENHOUSE?

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1:

Ensure that a Sub-Acute facility being inspected has a separate and distinct Sub-Acute policy in place. All Sub-Acute personnel must be trained in that policy.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. Facilities are required by regulation to establish and implement policies and procedures pertaining to all aspects of care and resident acuity levels and ensure that facility staff is trained in those policies/procedures.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2:

Ensure that during each inspection a policy is in place and used consistently for the Remote Ventilator Alarms Connecting and Usage. The policy must state that the Remote Ventilator Alarm must remain ON at all times. Stipulate that it may be turned off when the nursing home employee is in the room with the ventilator patient; however, it must be turned back to the ON position before the employee leaves the patient's room.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. During survey inspections, Health Facilities Inspection Division (HFID) staff reviews policies and procedures to see if they meet the regulations and the needs of the residents to ensure that there are provisions for a safe and adequate environment such that appropriate care is provided based on the needs of the resident. This includes the need to maintain ventilator alarms to be in the ON position at all times.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3:

Ensure that each licensed facility has a policy regarding proper procedure in handling tracheotomy tubes, ensuring it is not disconnected from the ventilator tubing.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. Policies and procedures are reviewed to see if they meet the regulations and the needs of the residents to ensure that there are provisions for a safe and adequate environment such that appropriate care is provided based on the needs of the resident, including those residents with tracheotomy tubes and ventilator connections.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4:

Ensure that each licensed facility has a policy in place for use of a "crash cart" and that it is enforced.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. The use of an emergency cart or "crash cart" is determined by the needs of the facility as it relates to the acuity level of the resident population to whom it provides care. Facilities are evaluated pursuant to the California and federal regulations that mandate policies and procedures must be developed, implemented and staff trained in the policies and procedures. During the survey process, if a facility has a crash cart, then policies and procedures related to its use are reviewed and verifications is made that staff are trained in the implementation and use of said equipment.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5:

Ensure that each licensed facility has a policy for the administration of oxygen and is followed judiciously.

RESPONSE:

Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. If a resident is being administered oxygen, the facility is required to have policies/procedures in place to ensure a safe environment for the use of medical gases.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6:

Require evaluators inspecting a health facility participating in the Sub-Acute program have the same qualifications as required by the State of California to administer the following:

- a. Tracheotomy care with continuous mechanical ventilation for at least 50% of the day.
- b. Tracheotomy care with suctioning and room air mist or oxygen as needed, and one of the six (6) treatment procedures listed below.

ATTACHMENT

- c. Administration of any three (3) of the six (6) treatment procedures listed below:
- i. Total parental nutrition
 - ii. Inpatient physical, occupational, and/or speech therapy at least two (2) hours per day five (5) days a week.
 - iii. Tube feeding (nasogastric or gastrostomy)
 - iv. Inhalation therapy treatments every shift for a minimum of four (4) times per 24-hour period.
 - v. Intravenous therapy involving: the continuous administration of a therapeutic agent; the need for hydration; and frequent intermittent INTR drug administration via a peripheral and/or central line (for example, with a Heparin lock)
 - vi. Debridement, packing and medicated irrigation with or without whirlpool treatment
 - vii. Inspections are required to include Recommendations 1 through 6 above when a survey or recertification is performed.

RESPONSE:

Partially Agree - The recommendation has been implemented. This year we have already implemented training applicable to residents requiring ventilators. However, there is no State or federal requirement or regulation that requires evaluators to have the same qualifications as those employees that work at Sub-Acute facilities. HFID evaluators have access to State consultants regarding physical and occupational therapy, pharmacy and pharmaceutical services, dietary and nutritional services and medical services. The evaluators are directed to utilize these consultants when a question or a situation arises.

The California Department of Public Health and the Centers for Medicaid/Medicare Services (CMS) provide guidelines and tools to surveyor staff regarding how to survey facilities providing care for all residents, including the ventilator dependant (sub-acute). HFID follows the same survey process, guidelines and protocols that have been established by the State of California Licensing and Certification and the CMS when conducting inspections of Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNF). All Surveyors who inspect SNF facilities must first complete a Federal Basic Long Term Care Training course and successfully pass the Surveyor Minimum Qualifications Test (SMQT). Additionally, HFID offers continuous training courses to surveyor staff to ensure that they are current and knowledgeable with the regulations and have a current skill set in order to survey the various acuity levels encountered in the SNF resident population including the sub-acute resident.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7:

DPH RESPONSE:

ATTACHMENT H



LERROY D. BACA, SHERIFF

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



August 19, 2011

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 2010-11
LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY**

Attached is the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's (Department) response to the 2010-11 Civil Grand Jury Report recommendations (Attachment A). The Civil Grand Jury's areas of interest specific to the Department included our participation in the E-Subpoena, High Tech Forensics and Cyber Security Crime Fighting in the Digital Age, Education Based Incarceration, The Six Pods of Module 172, and Jails Committee. Should you have questions regarding our response, please contact Division Director Victor Rampulla at (323) 526-5357.

Sincerely,

LERROY D. BACA
SHERIFF

A Tradition of Service

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
E-SUBPOENA

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

LASD and LAPD evaluate electronically transmitting other documents such as police reports and probable cause determinations among law enforcement agencies, Prosecutors and the Court.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD is currently working on electronically transmitting probable cause determinations/declarations (ePCD project) from the arresting agency to the courts and then receiving an automated approved PCD at the arresting agency. LASD is also working on a Field-Based reporting System (FBRS) that once implemented will facilitate the transmission of automated reports to all criminal justice partners in Los Angeles County.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

LASD to expand implementation of filing Pitchess motions electronically. A Pitchess Motion defines those portions of a deputy's personnel file which may be made available to defense counsel.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD, the Public Defender's office and Compton Court completed a pilot project regarding the electronic filing of Pitchess motions and the results were extremely positive. The cost savings to the agencies involved was significant and the concept is currently being expanded to all courts in Los Angeles County.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HIGH TECH FORENSICS AND CYBER SECURITY
CRIME FIGHTING IN THE DIGITAL AGE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2a

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD), along with other police agencies in Los Angeles County, shall establish a "High Tech Forensics Bureau" which will facilitate:

- Promotions and career opportunity for those who are trained and skilled in this area without leaving the discipline.
- Succession planning and transfer of high tech expertise, preserving the investment made in creating the expertise.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department agrees with this recommendation. Currently, LASD operates a regional high tech task force (*Southern California High Tech Task Force -SCHTTF*) that investigates computer related crimes and also provides forensic examinations of technical equipment and software related to cyber crimes. SCHTTF is currently funded by a state grant through this current fiscal year.

- i. LASD acknowledges that it would be desirable to foster promotions and career advancement for those investigators currently assigned to the high tech task force. Maintaining experienced investigators in an ever changing technical world would enable the seamless transitioning of personnel promotions within the unit enabling the retention of trained personnel. Unfortunately court mandated processes require centralized testing to place personnel in coveted positions, and due to past and current promotional practices, significant changes in policy and civil service rules will have to occur in order to implement this recommendation.
- ii. On September 1, 2011, LASD will add three investigators to SCHTTF to augment the current number of nine investigators who handle forensic computer examinations and cyber investigations. The reason for the additional investigators is to train the new investigators and prepare them to replace pending retirements of currently assigned veteran investigators. It typically takes years to fully train cyber investigators and the three new investigators should make for a seamless transition when the retirements do occur.

ATTACHMENT

LASD is currently preparing a request to acquire additional personnel and funding for a permanent and expanded high tech forensics unit. The request will be submitted during the 2011-2012 budget proposal process.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2b

LASD should update law enforcement recruit and detective training to include orientation, procedures, protocols, and other training with respect to digital evidence.

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD has created a structured class curriculum to educate detectives about basic techniques and protocols relative to digital /cyber crime investigations. Three classes have been scheduled during the month of August 2011, which will include detectives from all three field operations regions. Training for recruits will begin when a class curriculum is completed.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2c

LASD should include digital evidence collection, analysis and use training at the station level during roll call (shift briefing.)

RESPONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD is currently providing basic cyber crime training for all field operations personnel who are assigned to their station's detective bureaus. The intent of this training (sometimes referred to as "Train the Trainer") is to provide general entry level instruction relative to cyber crime to these station detectives. Once the initial detectives are trained, they will return to their units of assignments and hold in-service (roll call) training for all three field patrol shifts at their stations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2d

LASD should take steps to acquire POST certification for high tech training courses for forensic and cyber investigators to allow for the reimbursement of the costs.

REPSONSE

LASD agrees with this recommendation. LASD is currently researching and designing a curriculum that will be submitted for possible POST certification by the State. Captain Michael Parker who commands the Department's Headquarters (and Information) Bureau is the project manager. He is currently working with Federal, State, local and private entities to gather information and advice in order to initiate a training program that would be POST certified.

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
EDUCATION BASED INCARCERATION

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

LASD Community Transition Unit to increase network with community service groups and local businesses to gain employment opportunities for inmates who have completed the EBI program. This can be achieved by attendance at community service clubs such as Rotary, Kiwanis, and Chamber of Commerce meetings. LASD representatives are encouraged to be proactive and attend these meetings fully prepared with names and experiences of EBI graduates.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) agrees with this recommendation. The recommendation will be discussed at the next EBI committee meeting. If feasible, the LASD Inmate Services Bureau will appoint representatives to identify suitable service clubs and community-based organizations as well as attend meetings to discuss EBI and the experiences of EBI graduates.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Assign LASD community outreach staff to actively and consistently network with corporations to acquire corporate support. In addition to financial contributions, seek to acquire access to corporate inventory of excess computers, training, and equipment and classroom furnishings for use in EBI classrooms. Seek expertise of potential guest speakers and enlist assistance from much needed computer training.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation. The LASD currently has no system in place to accept donations of cash or equipment; however, a nonprofit arm of the LASD, Inmate Services Bureau, is being explored. This recommendation will be discussed at the next EBI committee meetings, and if feasible, the LASD will appoint representatives to identify and "network" with potential vendors. As to the second part of the recommendation, the LASD agrees. It should be noted that the LASD educational programs currently utilize a host of guest speakers, including motivational speakers, Alcoholics Anonymous/Narcotics Anonymous, EBI graduates, and former gang members who qualify for entry in LASD custody facilities.

ATTACHMENT

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

Procure inventory of translation equipment to effectively communicate course content to the Spanish-speaking population and increase the number of Spanish-speaking instructors. Seek funding approval from Board of Supervisors for translation equipment and/or utilize funds from IWC.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation. As the Los Angeles County jail system houses a substantial number of Hispanic inmates, the LASD has made every effort to present the same educational opportunities available to English-speaking inmates. The LASD has a small number of Spanish translation devices which are used to translate instruction in the MERIT and SMART programs. This recommendation will be discussed at the next EBI committee meeting as well as the possibility of requesting IWC funds to purchase additional translation equipment. In the event that IWC funds are unavailable, the EBI committee will explore the possibility of funding from the Board of Supervisors.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

Evaluate effectiveness of the current level of communication with the Board of Supervisors and all local city councils to increase awareness and support of EBI programs. A strong "circle of influence" in local government is imperative for the ongoing success of the EBI program. Consistent exposure is advised through attendance and agenda input at the Board of Supervisors and countywide city council meetings by high level LASD officials. Ensure funding is sought for specific needs such as computers, translation aids, and other classroom equipment.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation. Sheriff Baca has spoken frequently to the Board of Supervisors regarding the importance of EBI. The sheriff has also appeared in print media and local radio programming to espouse the importance of inmate education. The LASD has developed an EBI website containing information regarding recidivism, inmate education, and alternative sentencing strategies and is available for public viewing at <http://www.lasdhq.org/divisions/correctional/ebi/index.html>. Members of the EBI committee have made a number of appearances as well, including a recent workshop by Lieutenant Brian Fitch at the 38th Annual National Association of Blacks in Criminal Justice in St. Louis, Missouri. Representatives, particularly Department executives, will continue to represent EBI at Board of Supervisors meetings, community functions, and conferences. The LASD further agrees with the recommendation to fund specific needs such as computers, translation aids, and other classroom equipment. As stated in the response to recommendation number two, the LASD is working to create a nonprofit arm of the LASD capable of accepting donations of cash or equipment.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Identify and address obstacles that exist in jails that deter inmates from participating in education programs due to gang peer pressure. While it is recognized there is no quick or easy fix, the fact remains that this is a major obstacle to increase participation in this valuable program. LASD should actively enlist support from organizations like Home Boy Industries, Communities in Schools, and other gang experts, i.e., ex-gang members to assist in identifying solutions to this major challenge.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation, specifically with the idea of enlisting ex-gang members to assist in identifying solutions to major challenges. The LASD currently contracts with the Amer-I-Can program which utilizes ex-offenders as teachers. The LASD also partners with former offenders working with the Delancey Street Foundation as well as graduates of the LASD MERIT program and members of Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous. As the CGJ is well aware, because of security concerns, ex-offenders who have been convicted of certain offenses are precluded from entering custody facilities within Los Angeles County. Nonetheless, the LASD believes that ex-offenders can play a critical role in overcoming the peer pressure and other obstacles that may deter inmates from participating in EBI. Additionally, the LASD has formed an EBI steering committee to assist with EBI-related concerns. The committee is comprised of members from higher education (California State University, Dominguez Hills; California State University, Long Beach; California State University, Los Angeles; the University of La Verne; and University of California, Los Angeles) as well as members of the Delancey Street Foundation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

Review the usage of the IWF expenditures to determine what portion is currently being used for EBI versus other jail expenditures such as capital expenditures. Is there a clearly defined budget allocated for educating inmates and providing recovery programs? Is it being adhered to? Is an appropriate level of funding being allocated to external agencies which can aid in bridging communication gaps that may exist between inmates and uniformed personnel? Ensure adherence to California Penal Code Section 4025 as it relates to the expenditures of the approximate \$47 million in the Inmate Welfare Fund.

RESPONSE

The LASD agrees with this recommendation in theory. The LASD adheres strictly to guidelines of Penal Code Section 4025. Currently, IWC funds are allocated as follows: 51 percent to inmate programs and education; 49 percent to maintenance of county jail facilities. As a result of the LASD's reduced jail population (currently about 15,000 inmates countywide), contracts with LA Works for vocational instruction and start-up funds for the HOPE Leadership Charter High School, the IWC funds are rapidly being

ATTACHMENT

depleted. This includes future moneys which have already been allocated for inmate education through the Inmate Services Bureau, including the Community Transition Unit. The primary purpose of the Inmate Services Bureau as well as the Community Transition Unit is to provide services, training, and resources aimed at improving the quality of life for the inmate population, reducing recidivism through education, and bridging the gap between uniformed personnel and members of the inmate population as well as providing post-release services aimed at improving quality of life and reducing the possibility of future arrest.

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT – CUSTODY
OPERATIONS DIVISION

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
THE SIX PODS OF MODULE 172

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The CGJ recommends that the Board of Supervisors considers both the Sheriff's Proposal along with the CGJ's Report and approve cameras – beginning with the Pods of Module 172.

RESPONSE

The Sheriff's Department concurs with the CGJ's recommendation. A site analysis has been completed and submitted to the Department's Facility's Services Bureau. The installation of cameras into Module 172 will increase safety not only for inmates, but for staff as well. Additionally, the Department believes the installation will also help reduce liability and mitigate the cost of civil defense claims and lawsuits.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The CGJ recommends that pilot programs for new technologies (Transmission Imaging and RFID) be implemented.

RESPONSE

The Sheriff's Department concurs with the CGJ's recommendation. Department members recently conducted a site visit to multiple correctional institutions using Transmission Imaging technology and found it to be a viable solution to curbing contraband. The Division Chief is actively seeking a solution to fund the purchase of the Transmission Imaging units.

The Department is also a proponent to Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology. Staff is in the process of developing a pilot project to test the technical aspects of the application.

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: 2010-2011 GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
JAILS COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Long Beach Courthouse lockup facility –

- a. Establish a cleaning schedule for the Courthouse jail.
- b. Establish a checklist to ensure that areas are cleaned effectively

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department agrees with this recommendation. The Internal Services Department (Janitorial service provider) was contacted and an appropriate check list and schedule was established for the lock up area. Follow up to the daily cleaning schedule will be documented and reviewed by a supervisor in the Title 15 Lock Up book.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Pasadena Courthouse lockup facility -

- a. Establish a process to identify areas in the facility that require painting.
- b. Establish a checklist to ensure that areas are cleaned regularly.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department agrees with this recommendation. The Internal Services Department (Janitorial service provider) was contacted and an appropriate check list and schedule was established for the lock up area. Additionally, Sheriff's Facilities Services Bureau has been contacted and has identified the areas requiring painting which include the holding areas, lock up doors, wire mesh, lock up ramps, and the Sheriff's office. Since the responsibility for maintaining all courthouse buildings (including lock ups) in Los Angeles County has been transferred to the State we have submitted a request to the State to secure funding for the painting project.