This document is an extract of a larger publication.

civilgrandjury.org is a project of UnGovr.org, a US-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to government transparency and public accountability.



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AGING OUT: TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH (TAY)

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
Ongoing meetings of the Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs) must be regularly scheduled, with mandatory participation of departments, youth, foster parents, and other interested parties.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been partially implemented and the Department of Children and Family Services' (DCFS) timeline for implementation of scheduling ongoing regular meetings is by January 2024. DCFS, Department of Mental Health (DMH), and Probation have discussed the need for improved collaboration, and discussed various strategies which would assist with better support for Transitional Aged Youth (TAY). Further discussions are needed to determine to what degree departments outside of DCFS can allocate staff to serve as a member of MDTs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2b
DCFS and Probation should ensure that the youth obtain a driver's license or California ID card, a birth certificate, social security card, medical card, and any other pertinent documents.

DCFS and Probation should assist the youth to obtain public and privately funded services. Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) should provide information to the TAY for general relief, CalWORKS, CalFresh, and Medi-Cal. Department of Public Health (DPH) should provide information to access medical services.

DCFS and Probation should provide additional TAY services such as employment, housing, healthcare, and (for male TAYs age 18) registration with the Selective Service System. DCFS should provide training so the youth can open a bank account and apply for admission to colleges.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree due to some of the jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the Social Security Administration. This recommendation has been partially implemented and will be fully implemented. DCFS and Probation already ensure youth obtain a driver's license or California ID card, are provided with their birth certificates, a social security card, medical care, and other pertinent documents. The timeframe for full implementation is estimated for 2024 and contingent upon further discussion with the Social Security Administration in addressing a streamlined and consistent protocol for DCFS to request social security cards for

youth, and other County departments to connect and access services and resources.

DCFS and Probation already ensure that youth obtain any funds available, are referred to DPSS for assistance, and referred for employment preparedness classes, housing, life skills classes, financial literacy classes, which includes information on opening a bank account and assists TAY with completing applications for college.

DCFS and Probation will continue to work with other County departments, such as DPSS and DPH, and continue conversations with the Social Security Administration to promote and facilitate TAY accessing relevant documents.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2c
The Board of Supervisors (BOS) should lobby the state legislature for authorization to extend TAY services to as early as age 14 and as late as age 24.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree. This recommendation requires further analysis regarding the cost and funding of increasing eligibility for TAY services. Also, the BOS has existing policy to support legislation and funding to facilitate successful emancipation, promote self-sufficiency, increase post-secondary achievement, and improve opportunities for TAY, nonminor dependents, and former foster youth and will monitor legislation in 2024 to determine if any bills correspond to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
DCFS and Probation should provide training to foster parents or guardians of TAYs to educate them to the procedures, assistance, and processes to effectively assist TAYs under their care during the transition period.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is expected to be fully implemented by December 1, 2023. DCFS has spoken with the Foster Parent College (FPC) and Foster and Kinship Care Education (FKCE) about adding courses specific to supporting TAY, and they agreed to add it to their fall curriculum. In addition, Probation routinely provides training to resource families through the Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) of Record and the Probation's Youth Development Services' Independent Living Program (ILP) Transition Coordinator (TC). The TC provides information and support to Probation youth and their resource families. Resource families have access to the support services offered to the youth by the DPO of Record, a TC, and Resource DPO who supports foster youth directly and resource families with school related issues. The DPO of Record has the most contact with the resource families and thus provide ongoing training and coaching at each interaction. They ensure resource families are aware of the services available to them and the youth, and how to access them.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3a
DCFS or Probation should require foster parents to receive training and guidance as mandated by the MDT plans. Foster parents and court appointed educational advocates must participate in educational plans with school administration and/or community organizations.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation requires further analysis. The recommendation requires discussion with the California Department of Social Services as there is no mandate that foster parents receive specific trainings and guidance that have been determined by a MDT plan, nor that they are mandated to participate in educational plan meetings. The analysis and discussion should be completed by January 2024.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3b
DCFS or Probation should provide foster parents with pertinent case history upon placement.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented as this is already mandated by DCFS' and Probation's policy and part of practice.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
DMH should provide Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in addition to all other therapy services.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. DMH has clarified that its Juvenile Justice Clinical Team members have and continue to provide Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Dialectical Behavioral Therapy (DBT), and other therapeutic (such as Evidence-based, Promising, and/or Community-Defined) practices which are guided by the Prevention and Early Intervention Plan of the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) to TAY.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Each department should contribute to an Individual Transition Plan. The Individual Transition Plan should be a collaborative effort of all the involved departments, and the implementation should begin when the TAY reaches age 16. DCFS or Probation should develop one cohesive plan, which includes the desires of the youth for continuing their education/training and future goals. All agencies should ensure that TAYs and their foster parents participate in all meetings concerning the TAY's case. The departments must ensure that TAYs are given the opportunity to express themselves without fear of retribution.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been partially implemented and requires further analysis. The recommendation for DCFS implementation with the other departments is targeted for 2024 but is contingent upon further discussion and agreement with other departments. Additionally, DCFS has agreed to create, by

January 2024, a specialized section of staff who will provide intensive services for youth who are transitioning from care. That section of staff will be responsible for supporting TAY who are transitioning from care, including working collaboratively with representatives from other County departments.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) should fully provide $500,000 to Covenant House LA for staffing and operational costs so that 16 youths can move into the additional section.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree. The recommendation has been implemented but at LAHSA's standard reimbursement rate. When LAHSA was approached to provide funding for the additional beds, the request was approved. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023, LAHSA contracted with Covenant House from May 15, 2023 - June 30, 2023, for operations of the 16 beds at the standard rate of $50/bed/night. The start date was mutually determined with Covenant House LA. LAHSA has contracted with Covenant House LA for operations of the 16 beds for the full FY 2023-2024, also at the standard rate of $50/bed/night.

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AGING OUT: TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
Ongoing meetings of the MDTs must be regularly scheduled, with mandatory participation of departments, youth, foster parents, and other interested parties.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been partially implemented and the Department of Children and Family Services' (DCFS) timeline for implementation of scheduling ongoing regular meetings is January 2024. DCFS, DMH and Probation have discussed the need for improved collaboration, and discussed various strategies which would assist with better support for transitional aged youth (TAY). Further discussions are needed to determine to what degree departments outside of DCFS can allocate staff to serve as a member of MDTs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2b
DCFS and Probation should ensure that the youth obtain a driver's license or California ID card, a birth certificate, social security card, medical card, and any other pertinent documents.

DCFS and Probation should assist the youth to obtain public and privately funded services. DPSS should provide information to the TAY for general relief, CalWORKS, CalFresh, and Medi-Cal. DPH should provide information to access medical services.

DCFS and Probation should provide additional TAY services such as employment, housing, healthcare, and (for male TAYs age 18) registration with the Selective Service System. DCFS should provide training so the youth can open a bank account and apply for admission to colleges.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree due to some of the jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the Social Security Administration. This recommendation has been partially implemented and will be fully implemented. DCFS and Probation already ensure TAY obtain a driver's license or California ID card, are provided with their birth certificates, a social security card, medical care and other pertinent documents. The timeframe for full implementation is estimated for 2024 and contingent upon further discussion with the Social Security Administration in addressing a streamlined and consistent protocol for DCFS to request social security cards for TAY, and other County Departments to connect and access services and resources.

DCFS and Probation already ensure that TAY obtain any funds available, are referred to DPSS for assistance, and referred for employment preparedness classes, housing, life skills classes, financial literacy classes which includes information on opening a bank account and assists transition age youth with completing applications for college.

DCFS and Probation will continue to work with other county departments, such as DPSS and DPH, and continue conversations with the Social Security Administration to promote and facilitate TAY accessing relevant documents.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
DCFS and Probation should provide training to foster parents or guardians of TAYs to educate them to the procedures, assistance, and processes to effectively assist TAYs under their care during the transition period.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is expected to be fully implemented by December 1, 2023. DCFS has spoken with the Foster Parent College (FPC) and Foster and Kinship Care Education (FKCE) about adding courses specific to supporting TAY, and they agreed to add it to their fall curriculum. In addition, Probation routinely provides training to resource families through the Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) of Record and the Probation's Youth Development Services' Independent Living Program (ILP) Transition Coordinator (TC). The TC provides information and support to Probation youth and their resource families. Resource families have access to the support services offered to the youth by the DPO of Record, a TC, and Resource DPO who supports foster youth directly and resource families with school related issues. The DPO of Record has the most contact with the resource families and thus provide ongoing training and coaching at each interaction. They ensure resource families are aware of the services available to them and the youth, and how to access them.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3a
DCFS or Probation should require foster parents to receive training and guidance as mandated by the MDT plans. Foster parents and court appointed educational advocates must participate in educational plans with school administration and/or community organizations.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation requires further analysis. The recommendation requires discussion with the California Department of Social Services as there is no mandate that foster parents receive specific trainings and guidance that have been determined by a Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) plan, nor that they are mandated to participate in educational plan meetings. The analysis and discussion should be completed by January 2024.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3b
DCFS or Probation should provide foster parents with pertinent case history upon placement.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented as this is already mandated by DCFS's and Probation's policy and part of practice.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
DMH should provide Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in addition to all other therapy services.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. DMH has clarified that its Juvenile Justice Clinical Team members have and continue to provide Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Dialectical Behavioral Therapy (DBT), and other therapeutic (such as Evidence-based, Promising, and/or Community-Defined) practices which are guided by the Prevention and Early Intervention Plan of the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) to TAY.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Each department should contribute to an Individual Transition Plan. The Individual Transition Plan should be a collaborative effort of all the involved departments, and the implementation should begin when the TAY reaches age 16. DCFS or Probation should develop one cohesive plan, which includes the desires of the youth for continuing their education/training and future goals. All agencies should ensure that TAYs and their foster parents participate in all meetings concerning the TAY's case. The departments must ensure that TAYs are given the opportunity to express themselves without fear of retribution.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been partially implemented and requires further analysis. The recommendation for DCFS implementation with the other departments is targeted for 2024 but is contingent upon further discussion and agreement with other departments. Additionally, DCFS has agreed to create by January 2024 a specialized section of staff who will provide intensive services for youth who are transitioning from care. That section staff will be responsible for supporting TAY who are transitioning from care, including working collaboratively with representatives from other county departments.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
LAHSA should fully provide $500,000 to Covenant House LA for staffing and operational costs so that 16 youths can move into the additional section.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree. The recommendation has been implemented but at LAHSA's standard reimbursement rate. When LAHSA was approached to provide funding for the additional beds, the request was approved. In FY 2022-2023, LAHSA contracted with Covenant House from May 15, 2023 - June 30, 2023, for operations of the 16 beds at the standard rate of $50/bed/night. The start date was mutually determined with Covenant House LA. LAHSA has contracted with Covenant House

LA for operations of the 16 beds for the full FY 2023-2024, also at the standard rate of $50/bed/night.

County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES
510 S. Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90020
(213) 351-5602

BRANDON T. NICHOLS
Director

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
Second District
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
Third District
JANICE HAHN
Fourth District
KATHRYN BARGER
Fifth District

July 25, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Brandon T. Nichols, Director
Department of Children and Family Services

RESPONSE TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Enclosed please find the Department of Children and Family Services' (DCFS) updates to the Civil Grand Jury's recommendation for year 2022-2023. The responses to the recommendations have been prepared for the following Civil Grand Jury report sections titled, "Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth" Recommendations 1.1, 1.2, 1.2a, 1.2b, 1.3, 1.3a, 1.3b, and 1.5.

If you have any questions, please call me or your staff may call Aldo Marin, DCFS Board Liaison, at (213) 371-6052.

BTN:RR:af

Enclosures

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AGING OUT: TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
Ongoing meetings of the Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDT) must be regularly scheduled, with mandatory participation of departments, youth, foster parents, and other interested parties.

RESPONSE
The Department agrees with the recommendation. The recommendation has been partially implemented and the timeline for implementation of scheduling ongoing regular meetings is by January 2024. Mandating participation from other departments is contingent upon their agreement. DCFS has already met with the other departments to discuss the need for improved collaboration, and discussed various strategies which would assist with better support for transition age youth. Further discussions are needed in order to determine to what degree other departments are in agreement and can allocate staff to serve as a member of MDTs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
DCFS and MDTs should carefully monitor the ages of TAY and other beneficiaries so as to make certain that TAY services and TAY planning begin as early as appropriately possible, at ages 14, 16 or other applicable ages.

RESPONSE
The Department agrees with the recommendation. The recommendations will be implemented. The Department plans to implement by 2024. Although, please note response regarding MDTs to recommendation 1.1.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2a
DCFS, Probation and MDTs should carefully monitor the ages of TAYs so as to make certain that TAYs are made fully aware of services available not only until they reach age 18, but also continuing, where appropriate and available, extending TAY transitional services to ages 21 or 24.

RESPONSE
The Department partially disagrees with the findings in that DCFS and Probation currently monitor the ages of transition age youth and begins discussing transition planning with them no later than their 16th birthdays. The timeframe for full implementation is estimated for 2024 and contingent upon further discussion with other departments as noted in the response to recommendation 1.1. These

discussions include informing youth of the services available to them at age 18 through age 21, as well as additional housing options available to them to and after the age of 24.

The Department agrees that all members of the team supporting the youth should have similar discussions either individually and/or during regularly scheduled meetings (see response to recommendation 1.2).

The recommendation relative to all members of the MDT being aware of and sharing information has not yet been implemented because it is contingent upon further discussion with other departments as noted in the response to recommendation 1.1.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2b
DCFS and Probation should ensure that the youth obtain a driver's license or California ID card, a birth certificate, social security card, medical card, and any other pertinent documents.

DCFS and Probation should assist the youth to obtain public and privately funded services. DPSS should provide information to the TAY for general relief, CalWORKS, CalFresh, and MediCal. DPH should provide information to access medical services.

DCFS and Probation should provide additional TAY services such as employment, housing, healthcare, and (for male TAYs age 18) registration with the Selective Service System. DCFS should provide training so the youth can open a bank account and apply for admission to colleges.

RESPONSE
The Department partially disagrees with the recommendation in that DCFS and Probation already ensure youth obtain a driver's license or California ID card, are provided with their birth certificates, a social security card, medical care and other pertinent documents. The timeframe for full implementation is estimated for 2024 and contingent upon further discussion with the Social Security Administration in addressing a streamlined and consistent protocol for DCFS to request social security cards for youth, and other County departments to connect and access services and resources.

DCFS and Probation already ensure that youth obtain any funds available, are referred to DPSS for assistance, and referred for employment preparedness classes, housing, life skills classes, financial literacy classes which includes information on opening a bank account and assists transition age youth with completing applications for college.

The Department will continue to work with other county departments such as DPSS and DPH and continue conversations with the Social Security Administration to promote and facilitate transition age youth accessing relevant documents.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
DCFS and Probation should provide training to foster parents or guardians of TAYs to educate them to the procedures, assistance and processes to effectively assist TAYs under their care during the transition period.

RESPONSE
The Department partially agrees with the recommendation. This recommendation is expected to be implemented by January 2024. DCFS has reviewed the courses available to Resource Parents on both the Foster Parent College (FPC) and Foster Kinship Care Education (FKCE) website and found numerous courses related to working with youth who are in their transitional period. While there are numerous trainings available and course availability changes throughout the year, there is an opportunity to explore with FPC and FKCE to see if their course listings can be presented in a way that consolidates the courses under a TAY heading to make it easier for Resource Parents caring for TAY and/or are interested in the topic to easily find. DCFS anticipates having the discussion by November 2023 and implementation in 2024 to be contingent upon the agreement by FPC and FKCE.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3a
DCFS or Probation should require foster parents to receive training and guidance as mandated by the MDT plans. Foster parents and court appointed educational advocates must participate in educational plans with school administration and/or community organizations.

RESPONSE
The Department agrees with the recommendation. This recommendation requires further analysis. The analysis and discussion should be completed by January 2024. The recommendation requires further analysis and discussion with the California Department of Social Services as there is no mandate that foster parents receive specific trainings and guidance that have been determined by a MDT plan, nor that they are mandated to participate in educational plan meetings.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3b
DCFS or Probation should provide foster parents with pertinent case history upon placement.

RESPONSE
The Department agrees with the recommendation. The recommendation has been implemented as this is already mandated by DCFS policy and part of practice.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Each department should contribute to an Individual Transition Plan. The Individual Transition Plan should be a collaborative effort of all the involved departments, and the implementation should begin when the TAY reaches age 16. DCFS or Probation should develop one cohesive plan, which includes the desires of the youth for continuing their education/training and future goals. All agencies should ensure that

TAYs and their foster parents participate in all meetings concerning the TAY's case. The departments must ensure that TAYs are given the opportunity to express themselves without fear of retribution.

RESPONSE

The Department agrees with the recommendation. The recommendation has been partially implemented and requires further analysis. The recommendation for implementation with the other departments is targeted for 2024 but is contingent upon further discussion and agreement with other departments. Additionally, DCFS has agreed to create by January 2024 a specialized section of staff who will provide intensive services for youth who are transitioning from care. That section staff will be responsible for supporting transition age youth who are transitioning from care, including working collaboratively with representatives from other County departments.

County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES
12860 CROSSROADS PARKWAY SOUTH • CITY OF INDUSTRY, CALIFORNIA 91746
Tel (562) 908-8400 • Fax (562) 695-4801

JACKIE CONTRERAS, Ph.D
Director

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
Second District
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
Third District
JANICE HAHN
Fourth District
KATHRYN BARGER
Fifth District

July 20, 2023

Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Office
745 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Ms. Davenport:

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Enclosed is the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services' (DPSS) response to the one DPSS-related recommendation identified in the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report. As listed in the Department's response, DPSS agrees with Recommendation 1.2(b).

Please let me know if you have any questions, or your staff may contact Sheila Early, Division Chief, Research, Evaluation and Quality Assurance Division, at (562) 908-5879.

Sincerely,

Jackie Contreras, Ph.D.
Director

JC:lb

Enclosure

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AGING OUT: TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2(b)
DCFS and Probation should assist the youth to obtain public and privately funded services. Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) should provide information to the TAY for General Relief, CalWORKs, CalFresh, and Medi-Cal.

RESPONSE
The Department agrees and supports Recommendation 1.2(b). The Recommendation will be implemented within six months in collaboration with DCFS and the Probation Department to provide the TAY population with information on how to apply for General Relief, CalWORKs, CalFresh, and Medi-Cal services. Additionally, we will provide DCFS and Probation with outreach material on departmental programs and services.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Public Health

BARBARA FERRER, Ph.D., M.P.H., M.Ed.
Director

MUNTU DAVIS, M.D., M.P.H
County Health Officer

MEGAN McCLAIRE, M.S.P.H.
Chief Deputy Director

313 North Figueroa Street, Suite 806
Los Angeles, CA 90012
TEL (213) 288-8117 • FAX (213) 975-1273

www.publichealth.lacounty.gov

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis
First District

Holly J. Mitchell
Second District

Lindsey P. Horvath
Third District

Janice Hahn
Fourth District

Kathryn Barger
Fifth District

July 31, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Office
713 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attention: Cheri Thomas

FROM: Barbara Ferrer, Ph.D., M.P.H., M.Ed.
Director

SUBJECT: **2022-23 Civil Grand Jury Recommendations Response For: Aging Out of Transitional Aged Youth, Zero Emissions and Air Quality Monitoring, Have We M.E.T Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work**

Attached for your consideration is the Department of Public Health's response to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury report, as required by California Penal Code sections 933(c). Please note that Pub5c Health's Toxicology and Environmental Assessment Branch has been folded into the new Office of Environmental Justice and Climate Health. Please contact Joshua Bobrowsky at jbobrowsky@ph.lacounty.gov if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Attachment
BF:nq:lf

cc. Chief Executive Officer
Acting County Counsel
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Internal Services Department

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AGING OUT: TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2b
DCFS and Probation should ensure that the youth obtain a driver's license or California ID card, a birth certificate, social security card, medical card, and any other pertinent documents. DCFS and Probation should assist the youth to obtain public and privately funded services. DPSS should provide information to the TAY for general relief, CalWORKS, CalFresh, and MediCal. DPH should provide information to access medical services. and Probation should provide additional TAY services such as employment, housing, healthcare, and (for male TAYs age 18) registration with the Selective Service System. DCFS should provide training so the youth can open a bank account and apply for admission to colleges.

RESPONSE
Agree, this recommendation has been implemented. Currently, Public Health's role in this process is to ensure that other entities within the child welfare system, like DCFS, Probation and the Courts, have adequate medical access information that they can share with their transition-aged clients.

When Public Health begins implementing Enhanced Care Management for transitional aged youth in the child welfare system, we will be able to deliver medical access information directly to clients. We anticipate the implementation to begin before the end of FY 23-24.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

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

Guillermo Viera Rosa
Interim Chief Probation Officer

July 24, 2023

TO: Fesia Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Guillermo Viera Rosa
Interim Chief Probation Officer

SUBJECT: PROBATION RESPONSES TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORTS: AGING OUT TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH AND JUVENILE JUSTICE CYA

The 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) convened committees to address two issues affecting system-involved youth. The first committee report addressed systemic factors contributing to homelessness of youth who age out of the foster care and Probation systems. Based upon their findings, the CGJ Aging Out Committee report identified specific recommendations for each department and entity that funds, supports, or provides direct services to system involved transitional aged youth in Los Angeles County. The Probation responses to those recommendations are in Attachment A. The second committee report addressed Juvenile Justice issues affecting youth after the closure of the California Youth Authority (CYA), the creation of the Department of Juvenile Justice and its subsequent closure because of SB823. The Probation Department responses to the recommendations on juvenile justice are in Attachment B.

California Penal Code Sections 933(c) and 933.05 require a written response to all recommendations contained in this report. Responses by elected county officials and agency heads shall be made no later than sixty (60) days after the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury publishes its report and files with the Clerk of the Court. Responses by the governing body of public agencies shall be ninety (90) days after the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury publishes its reports and files with the Clerk of the Court. Responses shall be made in accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05 (a) and (b).

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AGING OUT: TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
Ongoing meetings of the MDTs must be regularly scheduled, with mandatory participation of departments, youth, foster parents, and other interested parties.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Probation routinely holds Child and Family Team (CFT) meetings for all probation placement youth and non-minor dependents (those in extended foster care). Foster parents are now legally known as "resource families" or "resource parents". Probation holds ongoing CFT Meetings which can include, but not limited to, service providers, trusted community members, professionals, and others with the goal of providing safety and stability for the identified youth. The CFT process uses a proven tool known as the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS) tool; the team works together to address any challenges the youth faces and to develop a plan for the youth's success. In Probation, the youth's resource families are mostly family members or sometimes non-related extended family members. The CFT Meeting process is detailed and prescribed and consistent with the California Department of Social Services Continuum of Care Reform pursuant to Assembly Bill 403 which provides the statutory and policy framework to ensure services and supports provided to the youth are tailored toward the ultimate goal of maintaining a stable permanent family.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2(a)
DCFS, Probation and MDTs should carefully monitor the ages of Transitional Aged Youths (TAY) so as to make certain that TAYs are made fully aware of services available not only until they reach age 18, but also continuing, where appropriate and available, extending TAY transitional services to ages 21 or 24.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Probation actively monitors the age of Probation youth; youth are considered to be TAY starting at age 16 when they become eligible for Independent Living Program Services and extends to the 21st birthday. Probation also monitors 18-year-old youth in foster care settings, as they are eligible for extended foster care services until their 21st birthday. Probation ensures that TAY 21 years old and older (to age 24) are not released without appropriate housing and supportive services. The youth's DPO of Record provides referrals and connections to county-wide and Service Planning Area (SPA) specific coordinated entry system agencies which provide a range of housing and other supportive services.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2(b)
DCFS and Probation should ensure that the youth obtain a driver's license or California ID card, a birth certificate, social security card, medical card, and any other pertinent documents.

DCFS and Probation should assist the youth to obtain public and privately funded services. DPSS should provide information to the TAY for general relief, CalWORKS, CalFresh, and MediCal. DPH should provide information to access medical services.

DCFS and Probation should provide additional TAY services such as employment, housing, healthcare, and (for male TAYs age 18) registration with the Selective Service System. DCFS should provide training so the youth can open a bank account, and apply for admission to colleges.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Probation ensures youth obtain all pertinent legal documents they will need to function and integrate into the community when they are released from Probation supervision. Ensuring youth receive these essential documents is part of the case management services provided by the DPO of Record. They are responsible for assisting youth with applying for and receiving either a driver's license or California Identification card, birth certificate or legal residency card, their medical card, and any other pertinent documents. They also ensure male TAY register with the Selective Service System as required. Each SPA has a designated housing coordinator. Probation actively works with the respective SPA housing coordinator to ensure no youth is released without having secured housing.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
DCFS and Probation should provide training to foster parents or guardians of TAYs to educate them to the procedures, assistance and processes to effectively assist TAYs under their care during the transition period.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Probation routinely provides training to resource families through the DPO of Record and the Probation's Youth Development Services' Independent Living Program (ILP) Transition Coordinator (TC). The TC provides information and support to Probation youth and their resource families. Resource families have access to the support services offered to the youth by the DPO of Record, a TC, and Resource DPO who supports foster youth directly and resource families with school related issues. The DPO of Record has the most contact with the resource families and thus provide ongoing training and coaching at each interaction. They ensure resource families are aware of the services available to them and the youth, and how to access them.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3(a)
DCFS or Probation should require foster parents to receive training and guidance as mandated by the MDT plans. Foster parents and court appointed educational advocates must participate in educational plans with school administration and/or community organizations.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Resource parents are required by Probation to receive training and guidance as mandated by the youth's Child and Family Team (CFT) plan developed through the CFT meeting process. Resource parents are provided with support through the DPO of Record, ILP TC and a Foster Youth liaison at the youth's "home school", the school the youth returns to in the community. Probation provides information and informal support to resource parents. The CFT process does not mandate school administrators to participate in CFT meetings, however, school officials are encouraged to do so and many commonly do participate.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3(b)
DCFS or Probation should provide foster parents with pertinent case history upon placement.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Probation consistently provides thorough and accurate information to resource families about the youth to be placed with them. Informing resource parents of the youth's case history better prepares them to care for and address the youth's needs. The DPO of Record is responsible for providing the pertinent case history. As previously noted, unlike DCFS youth, most Probation youth are placed with family members or non-related extended family members. Given their relationship, these resource families are more likely to know the youth's family and behavioral history, having followed the youth's court case. Regardless of the resource parents' knowledge of the youth, the DPO provides all relevant information to the resource parents prior to and upon placement.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Each department should contribute to an Individual Transition Plan. The Individual Transition Plan should be a collaborative effort of all the involved departments, and the implementation should begin when the TAY reaches age 16. DCFS or Probation should develop one cohesive plan which includes the desires of the youth for continuing their education/training and future goals. All agencies should ensure that TAYs and their foster parents participate in all meetings concerning the TAY's case. The departments must ensure that TAYs are given the opportunity to express themselves without fear of retribution.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Probation provides ongoing case planning and transition planning throughout the continuum of care and the CFT process. Through the CFT Meeting process, an individualized plan is developed

which includes the youth's desire for continuing education or training and future goals. The youth's rights include deciding for themselves who receives information about their services and other private information, consulting with their attorney before giving permission to release the information and seeking and or agreeing to treatment and services. Probation youth are encouraged and supported to speak their truth or express themselves without fear of retribution. Youth are encouraged to discuss their concerns with their DPO of Record. All youth are provided resources to file a complaint with Probation's Ombudsman's Office, and now the newly established Ombudspersons unit at the State's Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR). If youth feel they have been retaliated against or if they have any other complaint and do not feel comfortable discussing it with their DPO, they are provided with these resources and information to file a complaint with either or both Ombudsman' Offices.

DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

hope. recovery. wellbeing.

LISA H. WONG, Psy.D.
Director

Curley L. Bonds, M.D.
Chief Medical Officer

Connie D. Draxler, M.P.A.
Acting Chief Deputy Director

July 20, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Lisa H. Wong, Psy.D.
Director

SUBJECT: **RESPONSES TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT**

Attached please find the responses to the Civil Grand Jury's final report from the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health. The responses pertain to audit sections: *"AGING OUT – Transitional Aged Youth"* and *"HAVE WE M.E.T.? – Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work."*

Please let me know if you need additional information.

LHW:tld

Attachments (2)

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AGING OUT: TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
Ongoing meetings of the MDTs must be regularly scheduled, with mandatory participation of the departments, youth, foster parents, and other interested parties.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. DMH Personnel participate in the MDT meetings when we are in receipt of the invitation. It is not a meeting which we schedule as a lead department but will participate and attend when the invitation is extended to us.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
DMH should provide Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in addition to all other therapy services.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. It is important to clarify that our DMH Juvenile Justice Clinical Team members have and continue to provide CBT, DBT, and other therapeutic (such as Evidence-based, Promising, and/or Community-Defined) practices which are guided by the Prevention and Early Intervention Plan of the MHSA to TAY.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Each department should contribute to an Individual Transition Plan. The Individual Transition Plan should be a collaborative effort of all the involved departments, and the implementation should begin when the TAY reaches age 16. DCFS or Probation should develop one cohesive plan which includes the desires of the youth for continuing their education/training and future goals. All agencies should ensure that TAYs and their foster parents participate in all meetings concerning the TAY's case. The department must ensure that TAYs are given the opportunity to express themselves without fear of retribution.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. DMH will continue to actively participate and contribute to the Individual Transition Plans. DMH will readily accept invitations from DCFS or Probation to engage collaboratively in the process to develop a cohesive plan.

KAREN BASS
MAYOR

October 6, 2023

Samantha P. Jessner
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
Report by the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

Dear Honorable Judge Samantha P. Jessner:

The City of Los Angeles acknowledges receipt of the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report regarding Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth, its findings and recommendations. The City respectfully submits this response.

Recommendation No. 1.6 - LAHSA should fully provide $500,000 to Covenant House LA for staffing and operation costs so that 16 youths can move into the additional section.

Response - LAHSA is a legal entity distinct from the City of Los Angeles. Whether LAHSA funds Covenant House LA is a matter for LAHSA to address. We note that the Civil Grand Jury has requested LAHSA to respond to recommendation 1.6.

For additional questions or comments, your staff may contact Jenna Hornstock, Deputy Mayor of Housing, at jenna.hornstock@lacity.org.

Karen Bass

KAREN BASS
Mayor

Paul Krekorian

PAUL KREKORIAN
City Council President

Los Angeles County Office of Education

Serving Students ▪ Supporting Communities ▪ Leading Educators

August 25, 2023

Debra Duardo
Superintendent

Los Angeles County
Board of Education

Yvonne Chan
President

Stanley L. Johnson, Jr.
Vice President

James Cross

Andrea Foggy-Paxton

Betty Forrester

Theresa Montaño

Monte E. Perez

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Folts Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: **AGING OUT: Transitional Aged Youth**
2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

To the Presiding Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court:

On behalf of the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), attached is the response to the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report. The report requires responses from LACOE to Recommendations 1.1, 1.3b, and 1.5.

Sincerely,

Debra Duardo

Debra Duardo, M.S.W., Ed.D.
Superintendent

MR: to
Enclosure

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1

Ongoing meetings of the MDTs must be regularly scheduled, with mandatory participation of departments, youth, foster parents, and other interested parties.

RESPONSE

On the basis of the findings, LACOE (Los Angeles County Office of Education) is in agreement with this recommendation largely because there has been and continues to be a need for constant coordination between departments having to do with the care/or involved in servicing of not just foster youth, but all youth that have been detained.

When the youth are with us, attending LACOE Juvenile Court Schools (JCS), there are a minimum of 3 MDTs (Initial, Mid-Review, Transition) coordinated by Probation that we participate in during the course of their stay. An initial MDT is held to discuss programming, programming needs, and services that the youth may want to participate or have access to during the course of their time with us. The Mid-Review MDT is to discuss the progress of the programming they are participating in, discuss any adjustments to programming that may be needed, and begin the planning process for transition services. The Transition MDT is to finalize the planning of services and educational needs for the youth once they return to their community.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3b

DCFS or Probation should provide foster parents with pertinent case history upon placement.

RESPONSE

On the basis of the findings, LACOE partially agrees with this recommendation so long as it does not violate Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) law which provides access to education records and afforded to the Educational Rights Holder until the youth reaches the age of 18, unless otherwise advised by the court.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5

Each department should contribute to an Individual Transition Plan. The Individual Transition Plan should be a collaborative effort of all the involved departments, and the implementation should begin when the TAY reaches age 16. DCFS or Probation should develop one cohesive plan which includes the desires of the youth for continuing their education/training and future goals. All agencies should ensure that TAYs and their foster parents participate in all meetings concerning the TAY's case. The departments must ensure that TAYs are given the opportunity to express themselves without fear of retribution.

RESPONSE

On the basis of the findings, LACOE agrees with this recommendation largely because this is the current practice. For every youth that is housed within a Probation facility for more than 20 days, we work collaboratively with the youth and our partner agencies to develop a comprehensive Transition Plan and Individualized Learning Plan (ILP). The ILP consists of the youth developing academic goals, behavior goals, as well as post-secondary goals that the team will begin working on with the student while in LACOE care. Each LACOE JCS/CCS School has a transition counselor that works with the students in conjunction with the educational rights holder, probation, and the student's District of Residence to devise a realistic and specific education transition plan for the youths' return to their community. Once the student returns to the community, the transition counselors follow up with the student and various stakeholders (Probation, parents, local LEA) on a consistent basis (3, 30, 60, and 90 days after exit) to ensure all is going according to plan and identify any additional resources that may be needed. Moreover, LACOE has a developed Parent Education Program which conducts outreaches to parents in their effort to teach parents and caregivers how to stress the importance of schooling and how to become more involved to support their child's academic journey. Additionally, LACOE's School Counselors and Field Transition Counselors assist all youth in achieving the goals developed by the youth and documented in their ILP.

707 Wilshire Blvd., 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Ph: 213 683.3333
Fax: 213 892.0093
TTY: 213 553.8488
www.lahsa.org

MEMO

To: Fesia A. Davenport, Chief of Los Angeles County

From: Dr. Valencia Adams Kellum, CEO

Date: July 28, 2023

CC: Dr. Holly Henderson, Director Risk Management; Nathaniel VerGow Deputy, Chief of Systems Officer; Rachel Johnson, Chief of Staff; Tifara Monroe, Deputy Chief/Sr. Advisor; Kristina Dixon Chief Financial Officer and Administrative Officer; Jeffrey Samson Deputy Chief Financial & Administration Officer

Re: LAHSAs response 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Letter

Attached are the responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Reports, Aging Out Youth and Lack of Housing recommendations.

Sincerely,

Va Lecia Adams Kellum

Dr. Va Lecia Adams Kellum
Chief Executive Officer

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY (LAHSA)

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AGING OUT: TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
LAHSA should fully provide $500,000 to Covenant House LA for staffing and operational costs so that 16 youth can move into the additional section.

RESPONSE
LAHSA partially disagrees with recommendation 1.6 and has partially implemented as: (1) LAHSA did not have a contractual agreement prior to the expansion of the Covenant House LA site to provide the operational funding for the 16 additional beds; (2) When LAHSA was approached to provide funding for the additional beds, the request was approved and funding has been provided since May 15, 2023, for operations of the 16 beds. In FY 2022-2023, LAHSA contracted with Covenant House from May 15, 2023 - June 30, 2023, for operations of the 16 beds at the standard rate of $50/bed/night. The start date was mutually determined with Covenant House LA. In FY 2023-2024, LAHSA is contracting with Covenant House LA for operations of the 16 beds for the full year, again at the standard rate of $50/bed/night.

ALL ABOARD!
IS METRO RAIL ON TRACK?
Safety, Sanitation, and Rider Experience in L.A. County



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
ALL ABOARD! IS METRO ON TRACK?

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (BOS) is not the governing board of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and makes no representations or commitments on behalf of Metro. The responses below reflect the BOS' understanding, based on information available to it, of actions Metro has taken or will take relevant to the Civil Grand Jury's recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
Metro's TSO force should be increased from its current figure of 213 to allow the agency to better enforce fare compliance and Code of Conduct (COC) and give the agency greater control and accountability with security.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Metro has made significant progress in strengthening safety across the public transit system. Recognizing the crucial role played by Transit Security Officers (TSOs) in the comprehensive safety strategy, Metro has taken proactive steps to augment their presence. In March 2023, Metro's Board of Directors approved the addition of 47 more TSOs, and an additional 48 officers are scheduled to join in Fiscal Year (FY) 2024. This 45 percent increase has boosted the TSO force to a current total of 308 officers.

These newly recruited officers will undergo comprehensive training, equipping them to ensure the safety and well-being of our valued riders, employees, and the protection of our vital transit infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
Keep fares at the current rate and improve access to discount or free fares offered to low-income riders, students, and seniors through programs such as LIFE and GoPass, including free transfers.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Metro has some of the lowest fares in the country and is committed to maintaining an equitable and affordable fare system for all riders in Los Angeles. In July 2023, Metro launched a new fare structure and fare capping to make paying transit fare more affordable and convenient for riders. And as noted in the report, Metro also offers several discount programs, including GoPass, which offers free fares for students; Reduced Fares for seniors and customers with disabilities; and a low-income discount program called LIFE. These programs and the recent changes to the fare structure are designed to provide affordable transit for all riders, especially customers who ride frequently.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10
(A) Install turnstiles or other physical impediments that would discourage non-paying riders.

(B) Station TSOs at high trafficked stations to re-enforce fare paying.

RESPONSE
(A) Agree. This recommendation is in progress. Metro is presently working to enhance the fare gates for access control improvements, and Westlake/MacArthur Park station is the first station to implement.

(B) Agree. The recommendation is in progress. TSOs have been strategically stationed at high-trafficked locations. Their primary responsibilities include enforcing the Code of Conduct (COC), ensuring fare compliance, and enhancing overall visibility for a safer environment. In collaboration with Operations, System Security and Law Enforcement are conducting a pilot project at Westlake/MacArthur Park station involving reinforced turnstiles. The objective of this pilot is to assess its effectiveness in reducing access for non-paying riders, and if successful, the initiative may be extended to other stations in the future.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.12
(A) More restrooms are needed for the Metro system. Metro should consider installing public bathrooms at its Customer Centers where staff is available to supervise their use.

(B) The Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) should work with cities to share the costs of building and maintaining new restrooms, similar to the Long Beach model.

RESPONSE
(A) Agree. This recommendation requires further analysis. Metro fully recognizes the significance of having accessible restrooms for our riders. However, they must carefully consider safety and liability concerns associated with providing public restrooms. Although Metro cannot open employee-accessible restrooms to customers, they are proactively exploring different approaches through pilot programs. To this end, Metro is preparing for a pilot project scheduled to launch in the fall 2023, wherein restrooms will be introduced at key stations. This initiative will enable Metro to evaluate the feasibility and implications of offering public restrooms while prioritizing the safety and convenience of our valued passengers.

(B) Agree. This recommendation requires further analysis. Metro will certainly explore this possibility. Metro is committed to finding practical and sustainable solutions that benefit our riders and the communities we serve.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.13
Maintenance and cleaning resources should be increased on the Red (B) Line, commensurate with its level of ridership – cleaning schedules should reflect the number of boardings, not just the time of day.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Rail Vehicle Cleaning has received additional resources to enhance its operations. Presently, on the Red Line, teams of five service attendants are dispatched from the division daily to conduct End-of-Cleaning activities. These tasks involve trash pick-up and addressing minor spills, necessitated by car schedule constraints.

Moreover, Rail Custodial Services have made a significant increase in their budgeted positions, going from 213 to 234, which amounts to an increase of 21 Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs). This augmented workforce is instrumental in supporting the implementation of the Rail Custodial Services Cleanliness Plan. The plan encompasses several vital aspects, such as the realignment of cleaning personnel, dedicated staffing at hot spot stations, intensification of pressure washing and floor care at these stations, the establishment of detailed cleaning programs, and the introduction of measures for odor neutralization.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.14
(A) Hire more custodians and have their workload be concentrated to smaller areas for more thorough cleaning.

(B) Encourage riders to report custodial and maintenance incidents through the website metro.net or the Transit Watch App, or by reporting incidents to an Ambassador.

RESPONSE
(A) Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Rail Custodial Services have raised their budgeted positions from 213 to 234, resulting in an increase of 21 FTEs. This expansion in staffing is aimed at bolstering the Rail Custodial Services Cleanliness Plan. The plan encompasses several key components, such as the realignment of cleaning personnel, dedicated staffing at hot spot stations, intensified pressure washing and floor care at these stations, the implementation of detailed cleaning programs, and the incorporation of odor neutralization measures.

(B) Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Metro does encourage customers to report cleanliness issues. Metro Ambassadors also regularly report cleanliness issues.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.16
Expand the "Cleaned By" program to all the rail lines, which would foster greater accountability and transparency by the maintenance crews.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The pilot project on the C-Line did not yield the desired results and was subsequently discontinued. Nevertheless, Rail Fleet Services has implemented a robust cleaning program with a detailed logging system. This program includes various cleaning measures to ensure the cleanliness of the trains.

During the first and second shifts, end-of-the-line cleaning is conducted to address trash, spills and perform spot cleans. Additionally, mid-shift crews carry out daily interior cleans, which involve tasks like trash removal, sweeping, mopping, and cleaning high-touch surfaces in pull-in cars. Other shifts follow up to complete any remaining work.

Going beyond the daily cleaning, deep cleaning is performed periodically, involving a thorough scrub of both the interior and exterior of the trains. To maintain quality, all cleaning crews are supervised daily by Rail Fleet Services Supervision, and they are spot checked for their end-of-the-line, daily, and deep cleaning tasks.

To ensure proper cleaning, Rail Fleet Services supervisors use established cleaning criteria to rate the work activities of the cleaning crews. Monthly audits are also conducted using a comprehensive scoring system for the rail vehicles' cleanliness. The results of these audits are shared with Metro leadership, allowing adjustments to cleaning protocols if necessary.

Detailed documentation of the cleaning process is maintained at the divisions, which includes information on when the interiors, end cabs, and exteriors were last cleaned and by whom. This helps track the cleanliness status and ensures accountability throughout the cleaning procedures.

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza,
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Stephanie N. Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer
213.922.7599 Tel
213.922.7447 Fax
wigginss@metro.net

Metro

July 23, 2023

Fesia Davenport, CEO

Los Angeles County

500 W. Temple Street,

Room 713
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: Civil Grand Jury Responses

Dear Mrs. Davenport:

I am writing in response to the *All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track* report, prepared by the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury, as requested in your letter dated July 3, 2023. Following a comprehensive review of the report and as required by Section 933(c) of the California Penal Code, Metro has prepared responses to each recommendation, which are included herein.

Public transit is a vital lifeline to LA County, bolstering economic growth and promoting environmental sustainability. Ensuring it is safe, clean, and reliable continues to be our steadfast goal. With a customer-centric approach, we seek to provide a public transit system that fosters seamless connectivity, accessibility, and sustainable mobility for all residents and visitors in LA County.

I appreciate the diligent work of the Civil Grand Jury to help enhance the accountability, transparency, and efficiency of Metro through their recommendations in the report. It is worth noting that for many recommendations related to safety, cleanliness, and customer experience, Metro has already implemented strategies or addressed the concerns. Metro's commitment to these critical facets of our service underscores our dedication to delivering the highest quality of transit service for Los Angeles County.

Metro welcomes the opportunity to improve and evolve, and I view the recommendations as an integral part of this process. Should there be any questions regarding the responses, kindly reach out to my Chief of Staff, Nicole Englund, at 213-922-7950.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer

Attachment: Response to the Civil Grand Jury Final Report

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (METRO) AND METRO BOARD OF DIRECTORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
ALL ABOARD! IS METRO ON TRACK?

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
Require contracted law enforcement agencies (LAPD, LASD, LBPD) to assign more officers to ride the trains.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. In 2022, Metro initiated a new comprehensive public safety approach by adopting a multi-layer safety program to address the different aspects of public safety and security. Each layer of this safety ecosystem contributes to the overall security of the Metro system, moving beyond a single-strategy reliance to a layered approach. This strategy deploys the optimal resources to tackle specific safety concerns, with law enforcement contract services as a key element within the multi-layered approach.

For FY 2024, Metro has ramped up the presence of law enforcement staff on buses and trains. Metro recently negotiated a contract extension with each of our law enforcement partners and now has the right to direct the specific deployment or redeployment of existing resources to meet the agency's needs. To ensure the effective deployment of these resources, Metro's System Security & Law Enforcement (SSLE) department audits the daily deployment schedules and the Metro Transit Access Pass reports.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
Metro's TSO force should be increased from its current figure of 213 to allow the agency to better enforce fare compliance and Code of Conduct (COC) and give the agency greater control and accountability with security.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Metro has made significant strides in bolstering safety throughout our public transit system. Recognizing the pivotal role TSOs play in our multi-layered safety approach, Metro has taken proactive measures to enhance their presence. In March 2023, Metro's Board of Directors approved the addition of 47 more TSOs, and an additional 48 officers are slated to join in Fiscal Year (FY) 2024. With a 45 percent increase in TSOs, Metro has expanded the force to a current number of 308 officers.

These new officers will undergo comprehensive training and be equipped to ensure the well-being of our riders, employees, and the protection of our transit infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
COC violations should be enforced, and frequent violators subject to fines or banishment from the Metro system.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Metro's COC is an important tool to protect the health and safety of riders, protect transit equipment and facilities used to provide transit service to all of LA County and promote a desirable transit experience. Metro TSOs are responsible for ensuring COC compliance. To strengthen our efforts further, Metro's Board approved the addition of more TSO positions in March 2023 and for FY 2024. TSOs actively patrol the system, enhancing COC compliance, including fare compliance. Our commitment to enforcing the COC across the system remains unwavering as Metro strives to create a safe and respectful environment for all our riders.

Metro's COC, which has been in effect since 2010, outlines the penalty schedule of administrative penalties, which includes fines and other penalties such as ejections and exclusion from the system in the most serious of cases. programs like Transit School, community service assignments, fines, and, in severe cases, ejection and exclusion from the Metro system.

More recently, effective July 2023, the COC was changed to be more equitable, customer friendly (clear and concise language), and applicable (items were deleted from the code that are covered under the penal code, which is the responsibility of Law Enforcement.) To ensure riders are aware of these changes, and furthermore, to emphasize the importance of compliance with the Code, Metro will be engaging with the community on the recent changes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
Encourage greater coordination among the agencies involved with Metro Rail, including a standardized method of reporting crime statistics.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is being implemented. In July 2023, Metro began a new safety deployment strategy. Metro will regularly convene with partners to discuss issues, concerns, and successes. This collaborative approach allows us to identify and address any problems promptly. Metro will adjust communication protocols as needed, discuss flexibility in deployment based on crime trends or areas of vulnerability, and continually validate our accountability process to ensure its effectiveness. The enhanced systemwide deployment approach aims to enhance public safety through a streamlined strategy. The agency is committed to continual improvement, effective resource allocation, and proactive engagement while working collaboratively with ecosystem partners to create a safer transit experience for our riders.

To further enhance coordination and reporting, Metro staff has developed a standardized template for crime statistics reporting. This template will be shared with the relevant contracted law enforcement agencies to ensure data is provided in a concise and consistent manner moving forward.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Establish clear benchmarks for determining the success of the Ambassador program. Monitor and collect data to better focus the program. Make it publicly available on the Metro.net website.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is being implemented. The main goal of the Metro Ambassador Pilot Program is to improve the overall customer experience for our riders. The Ambassadors are responsible for enhancing the customer experience through visibility and aiding riders with wayfinding and general assistance. In addition to providing information and support, they are the "eyes and ears" of the system, reporting maintenance, cleanliness, and safety issues that need to be addressed.

Key performance indicators are being assessed as Metro works on developing an evaluation survey which will include feedback from our customers and other stakeholders. Once complete, the results will be shared with the Metro Board and the public.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
Metro should create opportunities for Ambassadors to interact with the other security agencies to raise awareness and build trust.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is being implemented. Metro is dedicated to creating meaningful opportunities for our Ambassadors to interact with other security agencies, fostering awareness, and building trust within the public safety ecosystem.

Metro Ambassadors play a crucial role in our multi-layered approach to enhancing public safety. They are actively engaged in the transit system, providing customer service, aiding riders, and acting as a visible presence to deter potential issues. As part of their duties, Metro Ambassadors already work closely with a team that includes Metro Transit Security, Contract Security, and Law Enforcement partners currently operating within the system. These collaborative efforts can help to improve teamwork and reinforce the shared commitment to ensuring a safe and secure transit environment for all passengers.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
Analyze security data on a regular basis and obtain up-to-date numbers on non-transportation riders using the system.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is in process. Public safety analytics is a tool for improving public safety outcomes. By leveraging data and technology, staff can better understand the nature and scope of public safety challenges and develop more effective strategies and interventions to address them. SSLE's data analysts will collaborate with various departments within Metro to gather various data points, such as rider surveys, Transit Watch App reports, fare enforcement data, etc. SSLE partners with the Homeless Outreach Department to share current information on non-transportation riders, enabling strategic outreach service deployment.

As part of the Board approved Public Safety Analytics policy in March 2023, Metro is currently working on a public safety dashboard to provide regular updates on statistics and trends utilizing data collected by Metro and crime data provided by law enforcement partners. The policy's purpose is to remove bias from public safety analytics by ensuring that the data being used is of high quality - that is accurate, complete, consistent, reliable, and up to date. Equally important is ensuring the data has context, which limits assumptions and biases that could adversely impact the quality of the data. In addition, Metro will be trained to recognize and avoid biases in the analysis. The policy will ensure to the public that our analytics efforts are fair and equitable and that they promote public safety for all members of the community.

The policy and dashboard emphasize transparency and accountability while affirming the agency's commitment to ensuring the collection and use of all data is conducted in a bias-free, non-discriminatory manner consistent with Metro's policies.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
Encourage riders to use the Transit Watch App to report security, sanitation, and other problem and help riders to install the Transit Watch App. Deploy mobile training booths to show riders how to install and use the app.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Metro Ambassadors continue to encourage customers to download the Transit Watch App to report suspicious activity and safety issues. The Transit Watch App. was revamped as a public reporting tool in recent years. However, there has been a significant increase in reporting cleanliness issues since October 2022 to the present, upon the onset of the Metro Ambassador program. Metro Ambassadors are available to assist customers with downloading the Transit Watch App.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
Keep fares at the current rate and improve access to discount or free fares offered to low-income riders, students, and seniors through programs such as LIFE and GoPass, including free transfers.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Metro has some of the lowest fares in the country and is committed to maintaining an equitable and affordable fare system for all riders in Los Angeles. In July 2023, Metro launched a new fare structure and fare capping to make paying transit fare more affordable and convenient for riders. And as noted in the report, Metro also offers several discount programs, including GoPass, which offers free fares for students; Reduced Fares for seniors and customers with disabilities; and a low-income discount program called LIFE. These programs and the recent changes to the fare structure are designed to provide affordable transit for all riders, especially customers who ride frequently.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10
(A) Install turnstiles or other physical impediments that would discourage non-paying riders.

(B) Station TSOs at high trafficked stations to re-enforce fare paying.

RESPONSE
(A) Agree. This recommendation is in progress. Metro is presently working to enhance the fare gates for access control improvements, and Westlake/MacArthur Park station is the first station to implement.

(B) Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Through the new deployment plan referenced previously, TSOs are positioned at high-trafficked locations to enforce the COC, inclusive of fare compliance, and provide high visibility. System Security and Law Enforcement is working with Operations to pilot reinforced turnstiles at Westlake/MacArthur Park station to gauge success in limiting the ability of nonpaying riders to access the system that can be expanded to other stations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.11
(A) Instead of the lengthy COC, create an abridged "Metro Manners" that gives riders a quick guide to the most important regulations.

(B) Highlight Metro Manners in stations, train cars, and create an ad campaign for bus benches and across various social media platforms.

RESPONSE
(A) Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Effective July 2023, the COC was changed to be more equitable, customer friendly (clear and concise language), and applicable (items were deleted from the code that is fully covered under the penal code, which is the responsibility of Law Enforcement.)

The revised version was crafted with input from Metro's safety partners and the Public Safety Advisory Committee that focused on critical areas that support or interfere with the user experience and safety.

(B) Agree. This recommendation is in progress. To ensure riders are aware of these changes, and furthermore, to emphasize the importance of compliance with the Code, Metro will be engaging with the community on the recent changes. Metro has created a one-page riders guide to describe the key elements of the Customer COC to distribute across the system to our customers.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.12
(A) More restrooms are needed for the Metro system. Metro should consider installing public bathrooms at its Customer Centers where staff is available to supervise their use.

(B) The MTA should work with cities to share the costs of building and maintaining new restrooms, similar to the Long Beach model.

RESPONSE
(A) Agree. This recommendation requires further analysis. Metro understands the importance of having restrooms available for our riders. Safety and liability concerns are crucial factors to consider when providing public restrooms. While Metro can't open employee-accessible restrooms to customers, the agency is actively working on finding solutions by piloting various strategies. Metro is planning a pilot project to introduce restrooms at key stations starting in Fall 2023. This will allow us to assess the feasibility and impact of providing public restrooms while ensuring the safety and convenience of our passengers.

(B) Agree. This recommendation requires further analysis. Metro will certainly explore this possibility. The agency is committed to finding practical and sustainable solutions that benefit our riders and the communities we serve.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.13
Maintenance and cleaning resources should be increased on the Red (B) Line, commensurate with its level of ridership – cleaning schedules should reflect the number of boardings, not just the time of day.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Additional resources have been deployed for Rail Vehicle Cleaning. The Red Line currently dispatches teams of five service attendant crews from the division every day to perform End-of-Cleaning activities, which includes trash pick-up and minor spills due to car schedule constraints.

Rail Custodial Services have also increased their budgeted positions from 213 to 234, an increase of 21 FTE's. The increase in staffing supports the Rail Custodial Services Cleanliness Plan. The Cleanliness Plan includes realignment of cleaning personnel, dedicated staffing at hot spot stations, increased pressure washing/floor care at hot spot stations, detailed cleaning programs, and odor neutralization.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.14

(A) Hire more custodians and have their workload be concentrated to smaller areas for more thorough cleaning.

(B) Encourage riders to report custodial and maintenance incidents through the website metro.net or the Transit Watch App, or by reporting incidents to an Ambassador.

RESPONSE

(A) Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Rail Custodial Services have increased their budgeted positions from 213 to 234, which is an increase of 21 FTE's. The increase in staffing supports the Rail Custodial Services Cleanliness Plan. The Cleanliness Plan includes realignment of cleaning personnel, dedicated staffing at hot spot stations, increased pressure washing/floor care at hot spot stations, detailed cleaning programs, and odor neutralization.

(B) Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Metro does encourage customers to report cleanliness issues. Metro Ambassadors also regularly report cleanliness issues.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.15

Metro should schedule several daily brief cleaning sessions at tail track stops, especially for the heavily used B (Red) Line and A (Blue) Line.

RESPONSE

Partially agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Metro understands the importance of maintaining a clean and pleasant environment for all our passengers, especially on heavily used lines.

All rail cars are thoroughly cleaned every day at the divisions before they are put into service. Our dedicated cleaning crews receive daily briefings and coordinate with the Rail Operations Center and Security through Rail Fleet Services Supervision to ensure efficient cleaning procedures.

Additionally, Metro performs End-of-Line cleaning for all of Metro's rail lines, including A, B/D, C, E, and L. However, due to time constraints within the car schedule, the cleaning consists of trash pick-up and light spill cleaning.

Rail cars requiring major cleaning are promptly taken out of service to be thoroughly addressed. In such cases, they are replaced with spare trains to minimize any disruptions to our riders. These out-of-service trains are then cleaned at tail tracks if available on the lines or returned to the divisions for cleaning.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.16

Expand the "Cleaned By" program to all the rail lines which would foster greater accountability and transparency by the maintenance crews.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The pilot performed on the C-Line did not result in the desired outcomes and was discontinued. However, Rail Fleet Services has a comprehensive cleaning program and logging system, such as end of the line cleaning during 1st and 2nd shifts to address trash, spills, and spot cleans. Mid-shift crews also perform daily interior cleans (e.g., trash removal, sweeping, spills, mopping, and cleaning high-touch surfaces) on pull-in cars, with the other shifts following up behind to complete the work. In addition, deep cleaning take the daily cleans a step further by doing a complete scrub of the interior and exterior of the trains. All cleaning crews are supervised on a daily basis by Rail Fleet Services Supervision and spot checked for end of the line cleaning, daily cleaning, and deep cleaning. Work activities of cleaning crews are also rated by the Rail Fleet Services supervisors using established cleaning criteria to ensure the cleaning is performed properly. This includes monthly audits that are conducted using a comprehensive scoring of the rail vehicles, which are then shared with leadership so adjustments to cleaning protocols can be made if necessary. Documentation for this process is kept at the divisions, which depicts the last time interiors, end cabs, and exteriors were cleaned and by whom.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.17
Metro should promote and encourage vendor presence in stations, including help with the lengthy permit process.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is being implemented. The presence of vendors in and around Metro transit stations can provide amenities to patrons and activate stations and plazas in a manner that improves safety and overall customer experience. Over the years, there have been numerous instances in which Metro has permitted entrepreneurs to vend on Metro property. Vending is not permitted on Metro platforms, trains, or buses. In December 2022, the Metro Board of Directors approved a new Economic Development Program, which includes a Station Activation component to promote commercial activity and support small businesses on Metro property and station plazas. Several pilot programs are being developed through the Station Activation program, including a restructuring and relaunch of a vendor market at the Westlake/MacArthur Park Station, a small-scale retail pilot program to occupy commercial space at the Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Station, as well as efforts to support farmer's markets, coffee carts and other forms of vending at key locations in the Metro system. Metro is in the early stages of coordination on various aspects of these pilot initiatives, including facilities and maintenance considerations such as trash management. As part of the Station Activation program, Metro will also be exploring opportunities to streamline the permitting process to remove barriers to entry for small businesses and entrepreneurs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.18
Respect the Ride should be adapted, expanded, and implemented as a pilot program on the entire line.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The Respect the Ride pilot program was launched in April 2022 at the 7th and Metro Station and was expanded across seven stations along the B/D (Red/Purple) Line – the line with the greatest need. Those stations include Pershing Square, Union Station, North Hollywood, Universal City, Westlake/MacArthur Park, Hollywood/Highland, and Wilshire/Vermont. The pilot program concluded in early 2023 and has evolved into a new multi-layered deployment that launched in July 2023. The lessons learned, successes, and data of the Respect the Ride pilot were applied to the new deployment.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.19
Institute a nightly "lock-down"' procedure for either custodial staff and/or TSOs to secure elevators and escalators along all lines.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation has been implemented where feasible. System Security & Law Enforcement and Operations work together to close the stations every night at approximately 12:30 a.m. Signage of station closures is posted, and gates are closed to inform individuals that they are not to enter the premises during closing hours. TSOs walk through the entire station, inclusive of the ancillary areas, to ensure all patrons have exited the station. Upon clearing out the stations, maintenance staff clean the stations, platforms, and elevators to ensure they are ready for service the following day.

All light rail (open air) stations cannot be physically closed. The escalators remain running, and the elevators do not have the ability to be easily turned on and off. Additionally, the open-air stations do not have any physical barriers to keep anyone from using stairs to access the platform/mezzanine. However, there are signs to the effect that you may be subject to an arrest or removal from the premises during non-revenue service. All open-air stations are continuously patrolled by law enforcement and/or contract security.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.20
The Make Metro Clean Program should be expanded to include the rail system.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Make Metro Clean Program has been an impactful program to supplement our overall cleaning program. To address the cleanliness concerns on the rail system, Metro has taken significant steps to enhance our cleaning efforts. In FY 2024, Metro allocated a 13 percent budget increase, amounting to $23,645,165, which has allowed us to add 24 new custodian positions at existing rail stations. Metro is in the process of filling these positions to bolster our cleaning efforts. Additionally, the agency added 46 new Service Attendant positions as part of the FY 2023 budget, which is evenly split between bus and rail. These Service Attendants play a crucial role in maintaining cleanliness and ensuring a pleasant experience for our riders. The agency made

significant progress in upgrading seating comfort by replacing cloth seats with vinyl seats on buses and trains.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.21
The Westlake/MacArthur Park station initiatives should be implemented at other stations.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented. The improvements at Westlake/MacArthur Park station demonstrate our commitment to actively listening to our customers and implementing meaningful changes to enhance their experience within our transit system. Metro remains dedicated to continuously improving our services and addressing the evolving needs of our valued customers. Metro will continue to build on the momentum of the Westlake/MacArthur Park station interventions by developing longer-term recommendations for this station and identifying elements that could be implemented at other key stations experiencing significant ridership with safety and customer experience challenges. While much of the illicit and anti-social activity occurring within the Metro system is reflective of larger societal challenges, Metro recognizes it must take proactive interventions to provide conditions at stations that meet customer expectations of a safe and reliable Metro transit system.

Metro is currently developing recommendations for expanding effective improvement elements to enhance customer experience and safety at other stations. The next stations Metro proposes to develop and implement intervention plans for are Metro's busiest station at 7th Street/Metro Center, serving Metro's B/D subway lines and A/E light rail lines, and Pershing Square station, served by the B/D subway lines. This expansion is with the understanding that there is not a one-size-fits-all solution for the entire system, as each station is uniquely designed and they vary in size, with potentially different challenges to address the needs of the communities they serve.

Metro is aiming to roll out these efforts in FY 2024 once a plan has been developed and funding has been allocated. Metro will be considering a range of criteria for future station deployments that includes ridership, public safety data, cleanliness/functionality data, homeless outreach data, frontline employee feedback, and customer/stakeholder input.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

HALL OF JUSTICE

ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF

August 7, 2023

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

Dear Supervisors:

RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORTS OF THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

Attached is the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Department) response to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Report (CGJ) recommendations. The CGJ's areas of interest specific to the Department included:

- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track (Attachment C)
- Have we M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Team and How They Work (Attachment D)
- Sheriff's Operations: An Erosion of Trust. Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Attachment E)
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, and the Justice System (Attachment F)

Should you have questions regarding our response, please contact Division Director Conrad Meredith, Administrative Services Division, at (213) 229-3310.

Sincerely,

R. Luna

ROBERT G. LUNA
SHERIFF

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
ALL ABOARD: IS METRO RAIL ON TRACK

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
1.1. Require contracted law enforcement agencies (LAPD, LASD, LBPD) to assign more officers to ride the trains.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented.

The LASD's Transit Services Bureau (TSB) has directed law enforcement personnel to ride the trains more frequently. This has been established through increasing the volume of train rides by deputy personnel to conduct daily duties.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
Encourage greater coordination among the agencies involved with Metro Rail, including a standardized method of reporting crime statistics.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented.

Metro has developed an analytical group that will be responsible for receiving their contract agencies' crime statistics. They created a standard form for reporting crime statistics for their contract law enforcement agencies. The standard method of reporting crime statistics was implemented on July 20, 2023.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
Metro should create opportunities for Ambassadors to interact with the other security agencies to raise awareness and build trust.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside of the LASD. The Ambassadors program lies within the jurisdiction of Metro.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
Analyze security data on a regular basis and obtain up-to-date numbers on non-transportation riders using the system.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside of the LASD. Metro is the employer of Metro security and responsible for analyzing their data on a regular basis.

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

MICHEL R. MOORE
Chief of Police

KAREN BASS
Mayor

P. O. Box 30158
Los Angeles, Calif. 90030
Telephone: (213) 486-0150
TDD: (877) 275-5273
Ref #.: 8.1

RECEIVED

AUG 29 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
CRIMINAL GRAND JURY

August 8, 2023

Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, California 90012

Your Honor:

The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) is providing a written response, as required per California Penal Code Sections 933 (c) and 933.05, to the Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, relative to a 2022 to 2023 Metro Rail Committee, Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury, that investigated the problems currently afflicting Metro Rail and its plans to solve them in a report, titled "*All Aboard! Is Metro Rail on Track? Safety, Sanitation, and Rider Experience in LA County*" which had been posted as of July 1, 2023, on its website:
http://grandjury.co.la.ca.us/pdf/2022-23%20Los%20Angeles%20County%20Civil%20Grand%20Jury%20Final%20Report.pdf

Note: The required responses from the LAPD delineated on Page 36 of this report indicated that the LAPD had been required to respond to the Recommendations 2:1, 2:4, 2:6, and 2:7 that were referenced to be within the aforementioned pages; however, there were no Recommendations that reflected these numbers throughout the report.

There were Recommendations 1:1, 1:4, 1:6, and 1:7 that were listed on Page 33.
On July 28, 2023, Lieutenant David Koeh, Transit Services Bureau, LAPD, telephonically contacted Ms. Natalie Rascon, Court Services Assistant, 222 S. Hill St, Los Angeles, (213) 213 893-0411. Lieutenant Koeh explained to Ms. Rascon that the LAPD's Office of the Chief of Police received a request for a response to this Civil Grand Jury report. Lieutenant Koeh requested Ms. Rascon to review this report's discrepancies between the Recommendations on Page 36, which required the LAPD's responses, compared to the incorrect Recommendations on Page 33.


Ms. Rascon concurred that the Recommendations required for the LAPD's responses on Page 36 were not located within this report. Ms. Rascon opined that there was an error relative to the Recommendations listed sections required for the LAPD to answer, compared to the actual Recommendations referenced on Page 33.

Ms. Rascon advised Lieutenant Koeh that this civil grand jury had concluded its required duty to investigate and complete this report, and therefore, the former members of this civil grand jury cannot be contacted by the LAPD for clarification. Ms. Rascon stated that this is the only published report relative to this civil grand jury investigation. Therefore, the LAPD has provided its responses to the Recommendations 1:1, 1:4, 1:6, and 1:7 within the enclosure of this report, in good faith, realizing that there was the possibility that the civil grand jury had inadvertently misnumbered the Recommendations for the LAPD to answer on Page 36.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Lieutenant David Koeh, Transit Services Bureau, at (213) 922-3614.

Respectfully,

MICHEL R. MOORE
Chief of Police



DONALD R. GRAHAM, Jr., Deputy Chief
Commanding Officer
Transit Services Bureau

Enclosure

FACT SHEET

Los Angeles Police Department Response to Recommendations from the Civil Grand Jury Report, titled *All Aboard! Is Metro Rail on Track? Safety, Sanitation, and Rider Experience in LA County*
August 10, 2023

The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) has provided its four required responses to Recommendations 1:1, 1:4, 1:6, and 1:7 to this civil grand jury's report, as required per California Penal Code Sections 933 (c) and 933.05.

I. **Recommendation 1:1**. Require contracted law enforcement agencies (LAPD, LASD, LBPD) to assign more officer to ride the trains.

Response: The LAPD has contracted with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), which has required the LAPD to provide its primary responsibility of public safety with the LACMTA; however, this is determined by the contract. Any increases of funding to hire more off-duty, overtime LAPD officers are decided by the LACMTA as the lead entity to concur with this in contract negotiations.

The current daily deployment of officers consists of 193 sworn officers and supervisors, of which one supervisor and 10 officers are assigned to the bus lines, while the remainder are deployed to the trains; therefore, 94% of these daily officers and supervisors are assigned to the trains. A sworn watch commander supervisor for a shift and officer assigned to the kitroom for equipment are designated to support train deployment.

II. **Recommendation 1:4**. Encourage greater coordination among the agencies involved with Metro Rail, including a standardized method of reporting crime statistics.

Response: The LAPD currently engages in weekly meetings with executive manager staff from the LACMTA, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD), and Long Beach Police Department (LBPD) to discuss methods relative to improve high-level policies, inter-agency cooperation, and strategic planning relative to violent and property crimes.

A virtual operations meeting is conducted every Tuesday involving operational and investigative staff from the various agencies, the LACMTA Ambassadors, Homeless Outreach and Proactive Engagement, contract security, and LACMTA security to share information and develop weekly strategies based on crime statistics and trends to review personnel deployment, and refine crime strategies.

The LACMTA recognized the deficiencies relative to independent crime data collection from the LAPD, LASD, and LBPD. The LACMTA is in the process of developing a standardized data reporting protocol. All three agencies are in the process of converting their information gathering into this system.

III. **Recommendation 1.6**. Metro should create opportunities for Ambassadors to interact with the other security agencies to raise awareness and build trust.

Response: The LAPD concurs with this recommendation. The LAPD's contacts with Ambassadors during daily deployments are incidental and not planned. The LAPD participates in training new ambassadors with a one-hour block of instruction to discuss roles and expectations with them.

Interactions with LACMTA Ambassadors occur during Tuesday strategy meetings. The LAPD is amenable to participate in increased in-service training exercises with the Ambassadors for new employees, along with inviting Ambassadors as guests during daily roll calls with sworn LAPD officers to build a continuous constructive rapport and trust between the officers and Ambassadors.

IV. **Recommendation 1.7.** Analyze security data on a regular basis and obtain up-to-date numbers on non-transportation riders using the system.

Response: The LAPD currently manages this within its own crime control system and distributes this information with the LACMTA; however, the LAPD does not receive the compiled data from the LASD, LBPD, and MTS via a shared application. The agencies share crime statistics at the aforementioned Tuesday strategy meetings; however, a comprehensive document would be much more constructive to benefit information-sharing with all of the entities involved in this symbiotic endeavor to protect and serve the public who ride the LACMTA trains.

CITY OF
LONG BEACH

Office of the Chief of Police
400 West Broadway Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 570-7301

Ref 5.0

August 1, 2023

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Presiding Judge,

Thank you for notifying us of the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury findings in the report titled, "All Aboard: Is Metro Rail On Track?" This letter serves as a response to the findings and recommendations as required by California Penal Code Sections 933 (c) and 933.05.

Finding 1.1: *There are not enough law enforcement officers on trains. They are most often on platforms, patrol cars, or in "hot spot" stations.*

Recommendation: *Require contracted law enforcement agencies (LAPD, LASD, LBPD) to assign more officers to ride the trains.*

Response: Metro contracts with Long Beach Police Department (LBPD) to deploy one sergeant and five officers on non-overlapping shifts that cover twenty hours a day. Metro and LBPD have agreed in their Scope of Work to deploy police officers on the trains and platforms for 75% of their shift.

LBPD currently participates in a multi-layered approach to public safety. This approach was created to coordinate Law Enforcement, Transit Security Officers, Transit Ambassadors, Homeless Outreach, and Contract Security with the goal to deter crime, increase safety and gain compliance through education and services.

LBPD currently supports Metro-driven initiatives at strategic locations predetermined by Metro. Two of the five deployed police officers are assigned to support two Transit Security Officers (TSO) during Metro fare enforcement operations. Two other police officers ride the trains and provide security checks at platforms where higher instances of criminal activity have occurred. One remaining officer is on patrol in a vehicle to rapidly assist the others as needed.

Finding 1.4: *There is a lack of coordination and communication among the contract security agencies and no standardized method of recording crime statistics.*

Recommendation: *Encourage greater coordination among the agencies involved with Metro Rail, including a standardized method of reporting crime statistics.*

Response: There are several methods of communication between the contract security agencies. The first is a Weekly Chief Executive Meeting which is attended by Executives from Metro and by representatives from each of the three contracted law enforcement agencies. This meeting is designed to discuss policy, crime trends, and responses to those trends.

The second method is the Weekly Coordination meeting which is attended by supervisors and detectives of the three law enforcement agencies and LA Metro. The goal is to discuss any similar modus operandi of the past week's crimes across the entire system and determine if there are any similar suspects and crime trends.

The third method is the creation of the Multi-Layered Approach. We meet daily to determine its effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses, and if any adaptions are needed.

Metro requests crime statistics monthly, which we provide. In addition, we provide crime statistics weekly at the coordination meeting and make prompt notification to Metro on higher level crime incidents that require immediate attention. We are working with Metro and our law enforcement partners to standardize crime statistics reporting with all agencies.

Finding 1.6: *Law enforcement agencies involved with Metro have expressed skepticism about the Ambassador program and confusion about their relationship with the Ambassadors*

Recommendation: *Metro should create opportunities for Ambassadors to interact with the other security agencies to raise awareness and build trust.*

Response: LBPD currently has no data to support this finding. LBPD appreciates the work Transit Ambassadors perform as they assist riders with information about the system while also providing a layer of security. They contact the Metro security operations center to report any crimes occurring on the system to initiate a law enforcement response. We continue to work on strategies to strengthen the working partnership between the Metro Ambassadors and LBPD officers working the rail.

Finding 1.7: *The lack of accurate, timely data inhibits Metro's ability to deal with the scope of its problems with security and fare evaders*

Recommendation: *Analyze security data on a regular basis and obtain up-to-date numbers on non-transportation riders using the system.*

Response: LBPD provides Metro with daily reports, weekly and monthly crime data, and prompt notification on higher level crime incidents. However, all crime reports must be reviewed to ensure accuracy. After an initial crime report is taken by an officer, the report is investigated by a detective. Statements made by the victim, witness(es), or suspect(s) are reviewed along with any video or other evidence collected. The detective determines the appropriate crime class to be presented to the District Attorney's Office or the City Prosecutor's Office for a criminal filing.

If we can be any further assistance, please contact me or my Chief of Staff, Commander Michael Solomita, at (562) 570-7301.

Sincerely,

Wally Hebeish
Chief of Police

CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION PATHWAY

The Road Less Traveled



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

Los Angeles County Office of Education

Serving Students ▪ Supporting Communities ▪ Leading Educators

November 30, 2023

Debra Duardo
Superintendent

Los Angeles County
Board of Education

Yvonne Chan
President

Stanley L. Johnson, Jr.
Vice President

James Cross

Andrea Foggy-Paxton

Betty Forrester

Theresa Montaño

Monte E. Perez

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Folts Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Rom 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: **Career Technical Education: The Road Less Traveled**
2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

To the Presiding Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court:

On behalf of the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), attached is the response to the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report. The report requires responses from LACOE to Recommendations 1.2a, 1.4a, 1.5, 1.7a, 1.8a, 1.9a, 1.10a, 1.11a, 1.12a.

Sincerely,

Debra Duardo

Debra Duardo, M.S.W., Ed.D.
Superintendent

Enclosure

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2a

LACOE should acknowledge and celebrate students in CTE programs.

RESPONSE

On the basis of the findings, LACOE (Los Angeles County Office of Education) is in agreement with this recommendation. LACOE currently celebrates students in CTE programs by highlighting current and former CTE students in professional development symposiums and panel discussions. In addition, our office has supported scholarship programs for CTE students and promotes involvement in CTE competitions which include student recognition.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4a

LACOE should ensure school districts have a robust description of their CTE programs in their Local Control and Accountability Plans.

RESPONSE

On the basis of the findings, LACOE recommends the description of CTE programs be included in school-based documents (such as the School Accountability Report Card or WASC report). Further, LACOE recommends district include actions related to providing students access to high quality CTE pathways should the data and educational partner input lead to CTE related actions and services.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5

LACOE should coordinate with all community college districts to develop collaborative partnerships with high schools within their community college districts.

RESPONSE

On the basis of the findings, LACOE agrees with this recommendation. Currently, LACOE is active in promoting dual enrollment and articulation agreements between community colleges and Local Education Agencies (LEAs). LACOE CTE Unit sits on several committees with community college and community based organizations to promote collaboration between community colleges and schools to enhance CTE pathways.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7a

LACOE should encourage school districts to hire additional counselors to reduce their student-to-counselor ratio.

RESPONSE
On the basis of the findings, LACOE agrees with this recommendation. Counselors serve an important role in supporting the academic, behavioral and social-emotional development of students. As LACOE works with LEAs in continuous improvement, we encourage them to analyze the adequacy of supports for students, including the availability of qualified counseling staff.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8a

LACOE should encourage school districts to inform students of local apprenticeship programs.

RESPONSE
On the basis of the findings, LACOE agrees with this recommendation. LACOE CTE serves as the LEA for multiple program sponsors and their Apprenticeship Programs. These programs are shared with local school districts that have related pathways, along with resources and information to assist student enrollment in apprenticeship programs. LACOE would add efforts on behalf od the state division of apprenticeship standards to this item.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9a

LACOE should encourage school districts to accommodate students who desire to participate in CTE programs by adding before school and/or after school opportunities.

RESPONSE
On the basis of the findings, LACOE agrees with this recommendation. LACOE CTE Unit provides professional development to district CTE Directors that includes information on utilizing after school programs to enhance CTE opportunities. Districts with established programs are highlighted at events.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10a

LACOE should encourage school districts to aggressively pursue CTE Incentive Grants.

RESPONSE

On the basis of the findings, LACOE agrees with this recommendation. LACOE CTE Unit regularly advertises the multiple grants available to support CTE programs. To further support LEAs, the CTE Unit provides technical assistance in writing CTE grants and required reports.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.11a

LACOE should encourage school districts to offer more competitive salaries for CTE instructors, equal to their academically credentialed counterparts.

RESPONSE

On the basis of the findings, LACOE agrees with this recommendation. LACOE serves as an advocate for all educators. Efforts to increase funding for CTE programs have been spearheaded by LACOE. In addition, LACOE CTE offers credentialing services to enable CTE instructors to have the credentials necessary to receive full compensation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.12a

LACOE should encourage school districts to encourage recruitment for CTE instructor positions.

RESPONSE

On the basis of the findings, LACOE agrees with this recommendation. LACOE CTE Unit provides credentialing services to ensure there is a qualified workforce. Connecting qualified candidates to available positions is an area for enhancement.

Los Angeles Unified School District
Administrative Offices

333 S. Beaudry Avenue, 24th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Phone (213) 241-7000

Alberto M. Carvalho
Superintendent

Members of the Board

Jackie Goldberg, President
Scott M. Schmerelson, Vice President
Dr. George J. McKenna III
Dr. Rocío Rivas
Nick Melvoin
Kelly Gonez
Tanya Ortiz Franklin

December 1, 2023

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: CIVIL GRAND JURY – LAUSD CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION PATHWAY: THE ROAD LESS TRAVELED

Dear Presiding Judge:

This letter serves as the response to the Civil Grand Jury recommendations to the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) in the report titled "Career Technical Education Pathway: The Road Less Traveled."

- **Grand Jury Recommendation 1.2b:** LAUSD should acknowledge and celebrate students in Career Technical Education (CTE) programs.

  Response to Recommendation 1.2b: LAUSD will continue to acknowledge and celebrate students who have completed a CTE course sequence with graduation programs as well as with graduation cords or a sash and diploma seal. Additionally, LAUSD will continue to hold parent outreach town halls that destigmatize and stress the rigor and importance of CTE education.

- **Grand Jury Recommendation 1.4b:** LAUSD should include a robust description of their CTE programs in their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAP).

  Response to Recommendation 1.4b: The LAUSD LCAP currently has two CTE and Linked Learning goals and narratives with a total of six progress monitoring measures. Under the first LCAP Goal of Academic Excellence, LAUSD has committed to increase the number of students who complete a CTE course sequence and graduation rate. Secondly, LAUSD has committed to increasing the number of silver and gold certified Linked Learning Schools as well the graduation rate of Linked Learning students. The LCAP is posted publicly on the LAUSD website.

- **Grand Jury Recommendation 1.7b:** LAUSD should hire additional counselors to reduce their student-to-counselor ratio.

  Response to Recommendation 1.7b: LAUSD provides schools with funding flexibility to hire additional counselors with school funds. The new contract between LAUSD and United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) outlines plans to reduce student to counselor ratios and provide an additional college counselor to high schools with 900 students or more. Lastly, LAUSD is in the second year of piloting the adoption of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) model for counseling which incorporates college and career readiness for all, along with lower student to counselor ratios.

- **Grand Jury Recommendation 1.8b:** LAUSD should inform students of local apprenticeship programs.

  Response to Recommendation 1.8b: The CTE Linked Learning department is working on a master list of apprenticeship programs that will be published on our website by industry sector during the 2023-24 school year. LAUSD is committed to increasing apprenticeship opportunities for its students. There's an overlap between our pre- apprenticeship programs for secondary high school students and adult-ed apprenticeship programs to support attractive pathways for students.

- **Grand Jury Recommendation 1.9b:** LAUSD should accommodate students who desire to participate in CTE programs by adding before school and/or after school opportunities.

  Response to Recommendation 1.9b: LAUSD currently has a lot of success with synchronous CTE dual enrollment courses after school. The CTE Linked Learning department can add support for schools who are interested in a 7 or 8 period schedule to accommodate CTE courses. LAUSD also offers some zero period CTE courses prior to the school day. LAUSD is committed to offering CTE opportunities during the school day to address equity and access issues with before school and after school programs.

- **Grand Jury Recommendation 1.10b:** LAUSD should aggressively pursue CTE Incentive Grants.

  Response to Recommendation 1.10b: LAUSD currently engages in this work. Our CTE Linked Learning department includes a dedicated team of full-time grants and funding staff.

- **Grand Jury Recommendation 1.11b:** LAUSD should encourage school districts to offer more competitive salaries for CTE instructors, equal to their academically credentialed counterparts.

  Response to Recommendation 1.11b: LAUSD regularly engages with labor union leaders in contract negotiations where K-12 CTE incentives and compensation are discussed. LAUSD K-12 CTE teachers receive the same one hour per day of paid

preparation time as their academic counterparts and received a 22.9% raise when compounded from July 1, 2022, through January 1, 2025.

- **Grand Jury Recommendation 1.12b:** LAUSD should recruit for CTE instructor positions.

  Response to Recommendation 1.12b: LAUSD's CTE Linked Learning department currently recruits CTE instructors on Indeed and works with college partners to encourage adjunct professors to pursue a CTE credential. Our Human Resources Division (HR) will add K-12 CTE teacher recruitment to their general K-12 teacher recruitment events, connect candidates to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), and assist with onboarding. HR will coordinate with the Personnel Commission to provide information to potential CTE teacher candidates when interviewing for positions that align to CTE sectors in order to create CTE teacher pipelines.

If you have any further questions, please contact my office at 213-241-7000 or via email at superintendent@lausd.net.

Sincerely,

Alberto M. Carvalho
Superintendent

LONG BEACH
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity

BOARD OF EDUCATION OFFICE
1515 Hughes Way, Long Beach, CA 90810

September 21, 2023

The Honorable Samantha P. Jessner, Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Carla Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Civil Grand Jury Report, "Career Technical Education Pathway - The Road Less Traveled"

Dear Honorable Presiding Judge Samantha P. Jessner,

Long Beach Unified School District ("LBUSD") received the County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury report entitled, "Career Technical Education Pathway – The Road Less Traveled" on June 21, 2023. Pursuant to California Penal Code sections 933(c) and 933.05, LBUSD submits this written response to the recommendations made to it that are contained in the Grand Jury report.

RECOMMENDATION 1.2b: "... LBUSD should acknowledge and celebrate students in CTE programs."

Currently, LBUSD celebrates our Career Technical Education ("CTE") students who have completed their high-quality CTE sequence each year by centrally providing medallions to be worn at graduation to recognize their specific achievement. Additionally, our pathways, most of which contain a CTE course sequence and are themed around that sequence, hold end of the year celebrations and recognition ceremonies at their sites.

RECOMMENDATION 1.4b: "... LBUSD should include a robust description of their CTE programs in their Local Control and Accountability Plans."

Currently CTE program completion is included in the Local Control and Accountability Plan ("LCAP") as part of the metrics to achieve goal four, college and career readiness. In future iterations of the LCAP we can work to add a more robust description of the Career Technical Education programs offered in the district.

RECOMMENDATION 1.7b: "... LBUSD should hire additional counselors to reduce their student-to-counselor ratio."

The LBUSD Superintendent, senior team, and Board of Education regularly consider the student-to counselor ratio along with all other fiscal needs and requirements when the Board annually approves the LCAP and District budget in June.

RECOMMENDATION 1.8b: "... LBUSD should inform students of local apprenticeship programs."

We currently have several channels of communication around internship programs but need to build out our programming and communication around apprenticeship. LBUSD has plans to develop this body of work in the coming year(s).

RECOMMENDATION 1.9b: "... LBUSD should accommodate students who desire to participate in CTE programs by adding before school and/or after school opportunities."

Currently our CTE aligned before and after school offerings would come in the form of clubs and related activities such as Robotics, Skills USA, Solar boats, and Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) clubs. Other before and after school activities available to students are in the form of Work-Based Learning related opportunities. In the future we plan to explore how we might leverage Dual Enrollment in this effort.

RECOMMENDATION 1.10b: "... LBUSD should aggressively pursue CTE Incentive Grants."

LBUSD applies each year for the Career Technical Education Incentive Grants offered by the state at the maximum dollar amount that is available. We also apply each year for the Strong Workforce Program grants that also help support our CTE programs.

RECOMMENDATION 1.11b: "... LBUSD should encourage school districts to offer more competitive salaries for CTE instructors, equal to their academically credentialed counterparts."

According to the Annual Los Angeles County District Salary Survey of Certificated Employees, LBUSD salaries across certificated positions are regularly within the top range of salaries offered in the county. At LBUSD, CTE teachers are on the same salary schedule as their academically credentialed counterparts. Additionally, CTE teacher can present verification of previous work experience in their field for up to four (4) years of salary credit.

RECOMMENDATION 1.12b: "... LBUSD should recruit for CTE instructor positions."

LBUSD recruits for all certificated positions, including CTE. Current vacancies are posted on the LBUSD website, EdJoin, and through social media platforms such as LinkedIn, Instagram, Facebook, and X (formerly Twitter). Additionally, flyers for vacant positions are sent out to professional organizations and universities for posting. LBUSD analysts and managers regularly work together to consider other possible advertisement options for specific jobs. For example, LBUSD staff worked together to create and deliver flyers to professional organizations for the CTE Engineering position, historically a difficult position to fill. LBUSD sent the flyers to the Los Angeles Council of Black Professional Engineers, CSULB, LBCC, City of Long Beach Workforce Development, among others.

The District thanks the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury for their work in the important area of CTE and we look forward to a bright future for our students in our CTE programs.

Diana Craighead
President
Board of Education

CIVIL GRAND JURY COMPENSATION

2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
CIVIL GRAND JURY COMPENSATION

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
The BOS should increase the Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) per diem to $100.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation requires further analysis and evaluation of resource needs. Recommendations for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
The BOS should make its per diem increase retroactive to January 1, 2023. There is recent precedent in other pay adjustments for unprecedented situations within the County. Falling interest in the CGJ could be considered as such.

RESPONSE
Disagree. Consideration for per diem increase may be evaluated prospectively. Please defer to response for Recommendation No. 1.1.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
The BOS should provide CGJ jurors a mileage reimbursement equal to the IRS standard rate of 65.5¢.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The mileage rate is determined by Penal Code Section 890 which states that the Grand Jurors are paid the mileage rate application to county employees for each mile traveled in attending court.

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
CIVIL GRAND JURY COMPENSATION

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
The BOS should increase the CGJ per diem to $100.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation requires further analysis and evaluation of resource needs. Recommendations for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
The BOS should make its per diem increase retroactive to January 1, 2023. There is recent precedent in other pay adjustments for unprecedented situations within the County. Falling interest in the CGJ could be considered as such.

RESPONSE
Disagree. Consideration for per diem increase may be evaluated prospectively. Please refer to response for Recommendation No. 1.1.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
The BOS should provide CGJ jurors a mileage reimbursement equal to the IRS standard rate of 65.5¢.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The mileage rate is determined by Penal Code Section 890 which states that the Grand Jurors are paid the mileage rate application to county employees for each mile traveled in attending court.

ELECTION OPERATIONS



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
ELECTION OPERATIONS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
Reduce staffing early on in the election cycle. We believe this recommendation is already in progress and should continue to be implemented.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is in the process of being implemented. Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (RRCC) has implemented a staffing system where Vote Center staffing levels are ramped up the last few days of the voting period and for Election Day when the highest levels of turnout have been observed. Staffing levels are reassessed by RRCC after every election to make future elections more efficient.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
Consolidate some poll worker positions to reduce staffing early in the election cycle.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. Election Worker positions are cross-trained on a variety of tasks performed at a Vote Center and are given opportunities to learn various tasks during the early voting period in preparation for the last few days of voting and Election Day. RRCC's Safe Election Plan has been updated as COVID-19 has become endemic and Election Worker responsibilities will be updated accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
Schedule in-person training closer in time to elections.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. RRCC trains over 12,000 Election Workers for a countywide election. Given the scale required for a countywide election, RRCC must begin training election workers up to two months before an election. Nearly 1,000 training sessions take place over approximately ten weeks.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Allow poll workers to repeat in-person training or provide a recorded session to Vote Center workers.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation has been implemented. RRCC conducts virtual and online training as a supplement to in-person training and there is no restriction on the number of times an Election Worker can attend online or virtual training. RRCC trains more than 12,000 Election Workers for a countywide election and allowing Election Workers to attend more than once would require a capacity larger than the Department has. This recommendation would require a longer election worker training schedule and could increase costs to provide more trainers and classes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
Split the eight-hour, in-person training for LA County poll workers into two four-hour sessions.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. RRCC trains over 12,000 Election Workers for a countywide election. This recommendation would double the number of days required to train an Election Worker. There is also a logistical impact on the scheduling of Election Workers and tracking of completion. Additionally, the frequency of no-shows and the amount of training that needs to be rescheduled could also increase.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
Continue marketing efforts with other jurisdictions for VSAP software to offset development costs.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. RRCC's intent is not to market its voting system to other jurisdictions and function as an elections system vendor. The intent of the Voting Solutions for All People (VSAP) is to share the technology and allow other jurisdictions to leverage the technology and information we have developed. The VSAP Open Source Workgroup was established to aid in the creation of an open source plan and the establishment of a governance model. The workgroup created a high-level plan to define the required steps to establish a governance team, determine licensing models, define infrastructure and policies, and determine the ongoing lifecycle and management of VSAP Open Source. This plan is a recommended approach based on research and input from industry experts. All final recommendations and approaches should be governed and authorized by the Secretary of State or relevant regulatory authority before moving forward with implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
Produce a published report of the 2022 Gubernatorial Election and previous elections using the Vote Center paradigm focusing on possible improvements in staffing; staff training; Vote Center locations; Vote Center equipment; and election processes and procedures for the BOS.

RESPONSE

Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. RRCC is committed to a continuous improvement process. Following each election, a debrief/critique is conducted to identify areas for improvement. Surveys are also used to measure different performance metrics such as voter experience and election worker experience. RRCC is committed to continuing to gather data to improve voting experience and make processes more effective and efficient.



DEAN C. LOGAN
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

July 31, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Dean C. Logan
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY RESPONSE – ELECTION OPERATIONS

Please find attached the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk responses to the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report on Election Operations.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (562) 462-2716 or email dlogan@rrcc.lacounty.gov.

DCL:AA

Attachment

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
REGISTRAR-RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
ELECTION OPERATIONS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
Reduce staffing early on in the election cycle. We believe this recommendation is already in progress and should continue to be implemented.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. The number of staff is one of the foundational elements we take into account when determining staffing levels at Vote Centers. The number of staff assigned to a Vote Center is primarily determined by the size of the location and the number of devices. In addition, there are other important considerations for ensuring our staffing plan complies with legally required service levels. Specifically, around maintaining multilingual support in communities where those services are needed. The Department provides assistance in 19 languages. In addition, our staffing levels ensure our ability to provide curbside voting services to voters with disabilities who are physically unable to vote inside the Vote Center.

Our office has implemented a staffing system where we ramp up our Vote Center staffing levels as we get into the last few days of the voting period and for Election Day when we observe the highest levels of turnout. Staffing levels are reassessed after every election to make our future elections more efficient.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
No recommendation.

RESPONSE
No response

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
Consolidate some poll worker positions to reduce staffing early in the election cycle.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. There are currently three Election Worker positions used in the County, they are Vote Center Lead, Assistant Lead, and Clerk. These positions are cross-trained on a variety of tasks performed at a Vote Center which includes but is not limited to checking in voters, assisting voters, answering questions, receiving ballots, and providing replacement envelopes. Election Workers are given opportunities to learn the various tasks during the early voting period in preparation for the last few days

of voting and Election Day. Our Safe Election Plan has been updated as COVID-19 has become endemic and our Election Worker responsibilities will be updated accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
Schedule in-person training closer in time to elections.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable. The Department trains over 12,000 Election Workers for a countywide election. Given the scale required for a countywide election, we have to begin training election workers up to two months before an election. This training takes place over approximately ten weeks and nearly 1,000 training sessions. In addition, we have to accommodate the logistics of scheduling Election Workers for training and tracking the completion. Our schedule is designed to provide Election Workers with options to increase their participation in the training. It also allows us to reschedule Election Workers if we have no-shows or other reason that prevents them from attending training.

The Department also conducts virtual and online training as a supplement to the in-person training. These additional trainings serve as a refresher course for Election Workers and also are a more focused session on a specific topic such as Conditional Voter Registration. We measure the effectiveness of our training through a variety of performance metrics and a survey provided to our Election Workers.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Allow poll workers to repeat in-person training or provide a recorded session to Vote Center workers.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation has been implemented. The Department conducts virtual and online training as a supplement to the in-person training. These additional trainings serve as a refresher course for Election Workers and also are a more focused session on a specific topic such as Conditional Voter Registration. There is no restriction on the number of times an Election Worker can attend online or virtual training. We measure the effectiveness of our training through a variety of performance metrics and a survey provided to our Election Workers.

The Department trains over 12,000 Election Workers for a countywide election. This training takes place over approximately ten weeks and nearly 1,000 training sessions. The priority is to get all Election Workers trained in time for the election. Allowing Election Workers to attend more than once would require a capacity larger than what we currently have. This recommendation would require a longer election worker training schedule and could increase costs to provide more trainers and classes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
Split the eight-hour, in-person training for LA County poll workers into two four-hour sessions.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable. The Department trains over 12,000 Election Workers for a countywide election. This recommendation would double the number of days required to train an Election Worker. There is a logistical impact on the scheduling of Election Workers and tracking of completion. In addition, it could increase the frequency of no-shows and increase the amount of training that needs to be rescheduled. We measure the effectiveness of our training through a variety of performance metrics and a survey provided to our Election Workers.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
Continue marketing efforts with other jurisdictions for VSAP software to offset development costs.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. The Department's intent is not to market our voting system to other jurisdictions and function as an election system vendor. This would require human resources that are not currently within our operation and may expose us to liability. The intent of VSAP is to share the technology and allow other jurisdictions to leverage the technology and information we have developed. The VSAP Open Source Workgroup was established to aid in the creation of an open source plan and the establishment of a governance model. The workgroup is composed of a diverse group of technology experts in the field of elections, technology, and open source. The workgroup created a high-level plan to define the required steps to establish a governance team, determine licensing models, define infrastructure and policies, and determine the ongoing lifecycle and management of VSAP Open Source. This plan is a recommended approach based on research and input from industry experts. All final recommendations and approaches should be governed and authorized by the Secretary of State or relevant regulatory authority before moving forward with implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
Produce a published report of the 2022 Gubernatorial Election and previous elections using the Vote Center paradigm focusing on possible improvements in staffing; staff training; Vote Center locations; Vote Center equipment; and election processes and procedures for the BOS.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The Department is committed to a continuous improvement process through various strategies such as our Lean Six Sigma program and other strategies. Following each election, a debrief/critique is conducted to identify areas

for improvement. As part of this process, we conduct surveys to measure different performance metrics such as voter experience and election worker experience. The California Voters Choice Act was adopted by the County in 2020 and the Department is still in the first full cycle after implementing Vote Centers. The Department is committed to continuing to gather data to improve our voting experience and make our processes more effective and efficient.

HAVE WE M.E.T.?

Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HAVE WE M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
DPH/Department of Health Services (DHS)/DMH/BOS should prioritize recruitment of additional mental health clinicians. Among other possibilities additional benefits, financial incentives, tuition reimbursements or student loan buyouts, and flexible schedules should all be explored.

RESPONSE:
Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. The departments continue to prioritize recruitment of clinicians and explore various recruitment incentives.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2a
DMH/BOS should permit Mental Health Evaluation teams to use outside clinicians procured under contract from private companies, if DMH cannot provide sufficient personnel. Agencies should be reimbursed in whole or in part for such hires.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Recommendations for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2b
DMH/BOS should allow agencies to hire specially trained employees (non-certified, but equally qualified), in place of DMH employed mental health professionals, if DMH cannot provide sufficient personnel. Agencies should be reimbursed in whole or in part for such hires.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Recommendations for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
BOS/Los Angeles Sheriff Department (LASD)/Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD)/Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and the Los Angeles City Council (LACC) should authorize an update or replacement of the current Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system to integrate it with systems in use by other agencies.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation requires further analysis. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for details of the analysis and evaluation of resource needs. Recommendation for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4a
BOS/DMH/DPH/DHS should improve patient navigation services for recipients of emergency mental health services or allow agencies to provide their own patient navigation personnel to enable them to provide expanded services.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. The departments have undertaken a variety of initiatives to facilitate patient navigation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4b
LACoFD should be authorized to provide their own patient navigation personnel. The agency should be reimbursed by the County in whole or in part for such hires.

RESPONSE
Partially Disagree. This recommendation requires further analysis. The BOS defers to LACoFD's response for details on the analysis and evaluation of resource needs. Recommendation for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
BOS/DMH/DHS/DPH should authorize the development and staffing of additional Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers and Sobering Centers in key locations to help provide sufficient placements of mental health patients.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Recommendations for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
DMH/DPH/DHS and the BOS should substantially increase the number of rescue transport vehicles in service to promote additional opportunities for persons in need.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Recommendations for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8a
Given the need for the construction of additional mental health campuses and permanent supportive care for mentally ill patients, the BOS and LACC should endeavor to fully support and participate in the Governor's efforts to provide construction funding and programs.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Recommendations for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8b
In order to provide additional long-term mental health campuses, residential settings, and permanent supportive housing the BOS and LACC should prioritize acquiring, renovating, and opening mental health facilities.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Recommendations for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
In order to provide the Mental Health Evaluation "H (Henry) 918" Division more autonomy and greater scope of service, the LASD should authorize creation of an independent Mental Health Evaluation Bureau. This will give the MET team the ability to expand its operations and to explore various pilot programs.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation requires further analysis. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for details of the analysis and evaluation of resource needs. Recommendation for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
hope. recovery. wellbeing.

LISA H. WONG, Psy.D.
Director

Curley L. Bonds, M.D.
Chief Medical Officer

Connie D. Draxler, M.P.A.
Acting Chief Deputy Director

July 20, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Lisa H. Wong, Psy.D.
Director

SUBJECT: **RESPONSES TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT**

Attached please find the responses to the Civil Grand Jury's final report from the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health. The responses pertain to audit sections: *"AGING OUT – Transitional Aged Youth"* and *"HAVE WE M.E.T.? – Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work."*

Please let me know if you need additional information.

LHW:tld

Attachments (2)

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HAVE WE M.E.T.? MENTAL HEALTH EVALUATION TEAMS AND HOW THEY WORK

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
DPH/DHS/DMH/BOS should prioritize recruitment of additional mental health clinicians. Among other possibilities additional benefits, financial incentives, tuition reimbursements or student loan buy-outs, and flexible schedules should all be explored.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. As directed by our BOS in the April 4, 2023, motion, "Incentivizing Hiring for Los Angeles County's Alternative Crisis Response," Los Angeles County DMH is providing additional incentives to promote hiring licensed mental health clinicians for Field Intervention Teams, including co-response teams. These incentives include implementing and supplementing: sign-on bonuses, retention bonuses, field work bonuses, and increasing the pay for shift differentials.

DMH has implemented a loan repayment program and is adding Licensed Psychiatric Technicians to our stipend program to incentivize hiring.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2a
DMH/BOS should permit Mental Health Evaluation teams to use outside clinicians procured under contract from private companies, if DMH cannot provide sufficient personnel. Agencies should be reimbursed in whole or in part for such hires.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. DMH posted a solicitation to increase the number of crisis teams in the County to decrease the use of police. To date, providers have experienced difficulties hiring clinicians due to a national mental health clinician shortage.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2b

DMH/BOS should allow agencies to hire specially trained employees (non-certified, but equally qualified), in place of DMH employed mental health professionals, if DMH cannot provide sufficient personnel. Agencies should be reimbursed in whole or in part for such hires.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. DMH hires non-licensed clinicians and provides them with the necessary training to fulfill the requirements of the Board of Behavioral Sciences.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4 a

BOS/DMH/DPH/DHS should improve patient navigation services for recipients of emergency mental health services or allow agencies to provide their own patient navigation personnel to enable them to provide expanded services.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. In 2022, DMH implemented a pilot project known as Therapeutic Transportation, a collaborative with LACoFD to ensure that individuals who were experiencing a mental health crisis would get the services they needed in a more timely manner. The Therapeutic Transportation Teams included navigation and linkage of clients to requisite resources and mental health urgent care clinics as appropriate. Additionally, DMH has acquired vehicles that will allow mobile crisis teams to provide transportation rather than rely on ambulance, police, or fire. Mobile Crisis provides linkage not only to mental health but also to other social services to ensure clients' needs are met. Finally, DMH has implemented hospital navigation programs which serve to assist clients in their transition from emergency department and acute inpatient hospitalization. This program, which was piloted in Service Area 3, has decreased rehospitalization and improved access and linkage to outpatient follow-up care.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
BOS/DMH/DHS/DPH should authorize the development and staffing of additional Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers and Sobering Centers in key locations to help provide sufficient placements of mental health patients.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. DMH has authorized the addition of two additional youth Urgent Care Centers (UCC) to provide services to clients ages 3-12 years old (which has been a service gap) and is planning on adding an additional adult UCC in Service Area 7 (which has also been a service gap).

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7

DMH/DPH/DHS and the BOS should substantially increase the number of rescue transport vehicles in service to promote additional opportunities for persons in need.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. DMH has acquired vehicles that will allow mobile crisis to provide transportation rather than rely on ambulance, police, or fire. Mobile Crisis provides crisis services, linkage to mental health services, housing, and other social services.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8a

Given the need for the construction of additional mental health campuses and permanent supportive care for mentally ill patients, the BOS and LACC should endeavor to fully support and participate in the Governor's efforts to provide construction funding and programs.

RESPONSE

Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. DMH applied for all eligible rounds of Behavioral Health Continuum Infrastructure Program (BHCIP) grant funds offered by the State and DMH supported community-based organizations applications for BHCIP. BHCIP funds were specifically available for expanding or building new bed capacity.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8b

In order to provide additional long-term mental health campuses, residential settings, and permanent supportive housing the BOS and LACC should prioritize acquiring, renovating, and opening mental health facilities.

RESPONSE

Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. DMH is exploring contracts with additional mental health facilities/providers to add residential treatment beds to the network. DMH recently received conditional funding to add a Crisis Stabilization Unit for children in the High Desert. DMH has received $259M in Behavioral Health Bridge Housing (BHBH) funding to expand housing opportunities for individuals experiencing Serious Mental Illness (SMI) including prioritizing housing for CARE Court participants. DMH in collaboration with LACDA is distributing Community Care Expansion (CCE) funding that will allow for the rehabilitation of Adult Residential Facilities (ARF) and Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly (RCFE) and allow for additional operational subsidies to augment the limited funding provided by the state. DMH is also working with CEO to add a large subacute facility at the Los Angeles General Medical Center.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Public Health

BARBARA FERRER, Ph.D., M.P.H., M.Ed.
Director

MUNTU DAVIS, M.D., M.P.H
County Health Officer

MEGAN McCLAIRE, M.S.P.H.
Chief Deputy Director

313 North Figueroa Street, Suite 806
Los Angeles, CA 90012
TEL (213) 288-8117 • FAX (213) 975-1273

www.publichealth.lacounty.gov

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis
First District

Holly J. Mitchell
Second District

Lindsey P. Horvath
Third District

Janice Hahn
Fourth District

Kathryn Barger
Fifth District

July 31, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Office
713 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attention: Cheri Thomas

FROM: Barbara Ferrer, Ph.D., M.P.H., M.Ed.
Director

SUBJECT: **2022-23 Civil Grand Jury Recommendations Response For: Aging Out of Transitional Aged Youth, Zero Emissions and Air Quality Monitoring, Have We M.E.T Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work**

Attached for your consideration is the Department of Public Health's response to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury report, as required by California Penal Code sections 933(c). Please note that Public Health's Toxicology and Environmental Assessment Branch has been folded into the new Office of Environmental Justice and Climate Health. Please contact Joshua Bobrowsky at jbobrowsky@ph.lacounty.gov if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Attachment
BF:nq:tf

cc: Chief Executive Officer
Acting County Counsel
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Internal Services Department

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HAVE WE M.E.T. MENTAL HEALTH EVALUATION TEAMS AND HOW THEY WORK

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
DPH should prioritize recruitment of additional mental health clinicians. Among other possibilities additional benefits, financial incentives, tuition reimbursements or student loan buy-outs, and flexible schedules should all be explored.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Please note that the mental health clinicians at the Department of Public Health's Division of Substance Abuse Prevention and Control (DPH-SAPC) do not perform direct service work. This is because DPH-SAPC contracts out all of its services, so the recruitment of mental health clinicians is primarily to support community-based substance use disorder (SUD) services through the administrative clinical staff at DPH-SAPC. DPH-SAPC has been hiring mental health clinicians and prioritizing those hires.

Additionally, DPH operates Student Wellbeing Centers at school sites across LA County (39 at the moment). These centers create a safe space on school campuses where students can receive health affirming services and support the need to lead healthy lives. At many centers, staff see a high number of students seeking mental health support. The staff will connect students to existing mental health supports in the school system and the local community. However, many LA schools are understaffed in counseling support which can lead to long delays for students seeking mental health services. School districts should also be encouraged to prioritize hiring mental health clinicians.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
DPH should improve patient navigation services for recipients of emergency mental health services or allow agencies to provide their own patient navigation personnel to enable them to provide expanded services.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation has been partially implemented as only a small component of the jurisdiction for emergency mental health services falls to the Department of Public Health. DPH-SAPC has been coordinating with DMH and continues to strengthen our partnership to ensure that people with a SUD served by their emergency mental health services are able to be transitioned and navigated to community-based SUD treatment. Additionally, DPH-SAPC has also been expanding its Client Engagement and Navigation Services (CENS) to support client transition and navigation to SUD services.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
DPH should authorize the development and staffing of additional Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers and Sobering Centers in key locations to help provide sufficient placements of mental health patients.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is being implemented. While DPH does not have jurisdiction over Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers, DPH-SAPC does contract for sobering center services at the MLK Behavioral Health Center (MLK BHC). Despite expanded outreach and engagement with the MLK Community Hospital and local partners, these services are under-utilized. DPH-SAPC is seeking an alternate destination site designation so that first responders can drop off clients at the sobering center at MLK BHC to increase the volume of people served. DPH-SAPC is also ensuring that services offered at sobering centers appeal to individuals that may be looking for harm reduction opportunities. DPH-SAPC also already has contracted agencies that are expanding sobering center services and these sobering center services will be contracted between the community-based organization and managed care plans offering funding for sobering centers under the Community Services option of CalAIM. This will result in additional sobering center services that will not require capital investments and will be managed outside DPH-SAPC.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
DPH and the BOS should substantially increase the number of rescue transport vehicles in service to promote additional opportunities for persons in need.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for the implementation of this recommendation falls outside DPH as it is not responsible for rescue transport vehicles.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8a
Given the need for the construction of additional mental health campuses and permanent supportive care for mentally ill patients, the BOS and LACC should endeavor to fully support and participate in the Governor's efforts to provide construction funding and programs.

RESPONSE
Partially Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside of DPH. We would suggest that the County's support for funding for construction and programs from the State also highlight the importance of the County participating in allocation decisions over those funding awards. While opportunities such as the Behavioral Health Continuum Infrastructure Program (BHCIP) have been helpful, decision-making for BHCIP awards was entirely held by the State, while the County is in an ideal position to know what local capital investments are needed to address local needs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8b
In order to provide additional long-term mental health campuses, residential settings, and permanent supportive housing the BOS and LACC should prioritize acquiring, renovating, and opening mental health facilities.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for the falls outside DPH. Rather than just focusing on expanding mental health capacity, we would suggest broadening the focus of this recommendation to behavioral health capacity or "mental health and substance use" capacity so that SUD capacity is not excluded. Further, it is important to recognize that expanding SUD capacity may not always require investments in capital, since DPH-SAPC's services are entirely contracted out, but may instead require more funding and investments to support the expansion of contracted community-based SUD services.

Health Services
LOS ANGELES COUNTY

July 26, 2023

Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors

Hilda L. Solis
First District

Holly J. Mitchell
Second District

Lindsey P. Horvath
Third District

Janice Hahn
Fourth District

Kathryn Barger
Fifth District

Christina R. Ghaly, M.D.
Director

Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D., Ph.D.
Chief Deputy Director, Clinical Affairs

Nina J. Park, M.D.
Chief Deputy Director, Population Health

Elizabeth M. Jacobi, J.D.
Administrative Deputy

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

Tel: (213) 288-8050
Fax: (213) 481-0503

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

"To advance the health of our patients and our communities by providing extraordinary care"

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Christina R. Ghaly, M.D.
Director

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT**

Attached are the Department of Health Services' (DHS') responses to the 2022-2023 Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) Reports Sections:

- *"Have We M.E.T.?" – Recommendation Numbers 1.1, 1.4a, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8a, and 1.8b.*

These recommendations will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls with the Department of Mental Health (DMH). DHS defers to DMH for the responses to Recommendations 1.1, 1.4a, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8a, and 1.8b.

- *"MEDI-CAL Reimbursement, The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue" – Recommendation Numbers 1.1 and 1.2*

We concur and will continue to work with the Auditor-Controller in addressing Recommendation Number 1.1.

We concur with and have initiated actions to address Recommendation Number 1.2.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please let me know or your staff may contact Maria Lorena Andrade-Guzman at (213) 288-7901 or Angelo Cariaga at (213) 288-8437.

CRG:nm

Attachments

c: Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D. Chief Deputy Director, Clinical Affairs
Allan Wecker, Chief Financial Officer
Kevin Lynch, Chief Information Officer

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HAVE WE M.E.T? MENTAL HEALTH EVALUATION TEAMS AND HOW THEY WORK?

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
DPH/DHS/DMH/BOS should prioritize recruitment of additional mental health clinicians. Among other possibilities additional benefits, financial incentives, tuition reimbursements or student loan buy-outs, and flexible schedules should all be explored.

RESPONSE
The DHS disagrees with the finding.

This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the DMH. DHS defers to DMH for response to Recommendation No. 1.1.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4a
BOS/DMH/DPH/DHS should improve patient navigation services for recipients of emergency mental health services or allow agencies to provide their own patient navigation personnel to enable them to provide expanded services.

RESPONSE
DHS disagrees with the finding.

This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with DMH. DHS defers to DMH for response to Recommendation No. 1.4a.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
BOS/DMH/DHS/DPH should authorize the development and staffing of additional Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers and Sobering Centers in key locations to help provide sufficient placements of mental health patients.

RESPONSE
DHS disagrees with the finding.

This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with DMH. DHS defers to DMH for response to Recommendation No. 1.6.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
DMH/DPH/DHS and the BOS should substantially increase the number of rescue transport vehicles in service to promote additional opportunities for persons in need.

RESPONSE
DHS disagrees with the finding.

This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with DMH. DHS defers to DMH for response to Recommendation No. 1.7.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8a
Given the need for the construction of additional mental health campuses and permanent supportive care for mentally ill patients, the BOS and LACC should endeavor to fully support and participate in the Governor's efforts to provide construction funding and programs.

RESPONSE
DHS disagrees with the finding.

This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with DMH. DHS defers to DMH for response to Recommendation No. 1.8a.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8b
In order to provide additional long-term mental health campuses, residential settings, and permanent supportive housing the BOS and LACC should prioritize acquiring, renovating, and opening mental health facilities.

RESPONSE
DHS disagrees with the finding.

This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with DMH. DHS defers to DMH for response to Recommendation No. 1.8b.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

HALL OF JUSTICE

ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF

August 7, 2023

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

Dear Supervisors:

RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORTS OF THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

Attached is the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Department) response to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Report (CGJ) recommendations. The CGJ's areas of interest specific to the Department included:

- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track (Attachment C)
- Have we M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Team and How They Work (Attachment D)
- Sheriff's Operations: An Erosion of Trust. Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Attachment E)
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, and the Justice System (Attachment F)

Should you have questions regarding our response, please contact Division Director Conrad Meredith, Administrative Services Division, at (213) 229-3310.

Sincerely,

R. Luna

ROBERT G. LUNA
SHERIFF

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HAVE WE M.E.T.? MENTAL HEALTH EVALUATION TEAMS AND HOW THEY WORK

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2b
DMH/BOS should allow agencies to hire specially trained employees (non-certified, but equally qualified), in place of DMH employed mental health professionals, if DMH cannot provide sufficient personnel. Agencies should be reimbursed in whole or in part for such hires.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside of the LASD.

Since 1991, the DMH has been the Mental Evaluation Team's (MET) civilian partner in the co-response model. As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, additional responsibilities were increased for clinicians, thereby, resulting in a nationwide shortage of clinician personnel. The increased demand for mental health professionals has made it difficult for DMH to hire qualified personnel. The scarcity of personnel in both departments and the current mental health challenges, has required both agencies to develop innovative strategies to address clinician shortages.

In the past, LASD has inquired with several private psychiatric facilities and urgent care centers to ascertain if their clinicians would be interested in joining LASD's MET Unit as clinician partners. There appeared to be interest from the private sector in collaborating with LASD and should be explored further to address the current shortages. Currently, the LASD's Veteran's Mental Evaluation Team (VMET) partners with federally licensed clinicians from the Veteran's Administration (VA) and Veteran's Peer Access Network (VPAN).

Presently, leadership from LASD and DMH have discussed the option of partnering with other DMH programs such as the Assisted Outpatient Treatment (AOT) and Risk Assessment Management Program (RAMP). Most of the clients on AOT's case load are safety risks, due to their propensity for violence and non-compliance with medication and/or treatment, making this potential partnership viable.

It should be noted the San Diego Police Department's Psychiatric Emergency Response Team (PERT) partners with Star View Behavioral Health (SVBH). The SVBH is privately owned and not county operated.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
BOS/LASD/LACoFD/LAPD and the Los Angeles City Council (LACC) should authorize an update or replacement of the current CAD system to integrate it with systems in use by other agencies.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation requires further analysis.

The LASD's Technology and Support Division is currently engaged in exploring replacement of our current CAD system to a newer version. A Request for Proposal (RFP) for a replacement system has been issued and is in the evaluation phase. The evaluation approach is extremely extensive and subject to being prolonged, (e.g., vendor protest, contract negotiations). Recommendation for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and requests.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4a
BOS/DMH/DPH/DHS should improve patient navigation services for recipients of emergency mental health services or allow agencies to provide their own patient navigation personnel to enable them to provide expanded services.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside of the LASD.

LASD does not independently provide patient navigation services, however, with the recent national implementation of the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline, mental health agencies would be able to provide their own patient navigation personnel. The 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline is a nationwide mental health hotline for non-emergent mental health services. This navigation system would provide the necessary services for individuals experiencing a mental health crisis and afford them the opportunity to collaborate with partners in their communities.

Currently, DMH provides the Access Line for service referrals, crisis assessments, and field deployments 24-hours a day, seven days a week. This service provides assistance to those in crises, along with family members and loved ones who are affected.

In addition, DMH provides additional resources via 211 LA County. This service is available to the public and available in multiple languages. This service allows those in need to access information and obtain referrals to physical and mental health resources (i.e., housing, utilities, food, suicide, and crisis interventions).

Unfortunately, LASD does not possess the resources or experience to provide patient navigation services for recipients of emergency mental health services. These navigation services are provided by MET, RAMP, and VMET, in partnership with its DMH and federal clinicians.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
BOS/DMH/DHS/DPH should authorize the development and staffing of additional Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers and Sobering Centers in key locations to help provide sufficient placements of mental health patients.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside of the LASD.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
DMH/DPH/DHS and the BOS should substantially increase the number of rescue transport vehicles in service to promote additional opportunities for persons in need.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside of the LASD.

The MET currently collaborates with DMH for ambulance services, but ambulance services are requested by LASD field personnel. LASD requesting an ambulance to transport for medical emergencies has been found to be quicker and more time efficient. Ambulance services are normally delayed and force field deputies to transport patients to prevent waiting extended periods of time. LASD supports increased access to ambulance services for swift responses.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8b
In order to provide additional long-term mental health campuses, residential settings, and permanent supportive housing the BOS and LACC should prioritize acquiring, renovating, and opening mental health facilities.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside of the LASD.

This recommendation is beyond the LASD's scope to approve or acquire such facilities. The prioritization in acquiring, renovating, and opening mental health facilities by the BOS and LACC, would assist the MET, VMET, and RAMP with additional locations for placement of individuals experiencing a mental health crisis.

RECOMMENDATION NO 1.9
In order to provide the Mental Health Evaluation "H (Henry) 918" Division more autonomy and greater scope of service, the LASD should authorize creation of an independent Mental Health Evaluation Bureau. This will give the MET team the ability to expand its operations and to explore various pilot programs.

RESPONSE
Agree. LASD agrees with this recommendation, but a further exploration would have to be conducted in six months.

With over 10 million residents, the community's need for mental health services has reached a critical need. As LASD recovers from the COVID-19 pandemic, investing in programs to promote public safety and health has remained a priority.

Since 2018, the LASD has requested the reorganization and expansion of MET. However, due to staffing shortages and the need for collaborative growth with DMH partners, neither LASD nor DMH can expand at this time.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT

1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294
(323) 881-2401
www.fire.lacounty.gov

ANTHONY C. MARRONE
FIRE CHIEF
FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

"Proud Protectors of Life, the Environment, and Property"

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
JANICE HAHN, CHAIR
FOURTH DISTRICT

HILDA L. SOLIS — FIRST DISTRICT
HOLLY J. MITCHELL — SECOND DISTRICT
LINDSEY P. HORVATH — THIRD DISTRICT
KATHRYN BARGER — FIFTH DISTRICT

July 21, 2023

TO: FESIA DAVENPORT, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

FROM: ANTHONY C. MARRONE, FIRE CHIEF

RESPONSES TO THE 2022-23 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

As requested in your memo dated July 3, 2023, attached are the Los Angeles County Fire Department's responses to the following recommendations from the 2022-23 Civil Grand Jury Final Report:

- Have we M.E.T? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work, Recommendation Numbers 1.2b, 1.3, 1.4a, 1.4b, 1.6, 1.7.
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation, Recommendation Numbers 1.1b, 1.2a, 1.2b, 1.2c, 1.2d, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6a, 1.6b, 1.7a, 1.7b, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10.

Should you have any questions, please contact me directly at (323) 881-6180.

ACM:al

Attachments (2)

SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF:

AGOURA HILLS, ARTESIA, AZUSA, BALDWIN PARK, BELL, BELL GARDENS, BELL FLOWER, BRADBURY, CALABASAS, CARSON, CERRITOS, CLAREMONT, COMMERCE, COVINA, CUDAHY, DIAMOND BAR, DUARTE, EL MONTE, GARDENA, GLENDORA, HAWAIIAN GARDENS, HAWTHORNE, HERMOSA BEACH, HIDDEN HILLS, HUNTINGTON PARK, INDUSTRY, INGLEWOOD, IRWINDALE, LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE, LA HABRA, LA MIRADA, LA PUENTE, LAKEWOOD, LANCASTER, LAWNDALE, LOMITA, LYNWOOD, MALIBU, MAYWOOD, NORWALK, PALMDALE, PALOS VERDES ESTATES, PARAMOUNT, PICO RIVERA, POMONA, RANCHO PALOS VERDES, ROLLING HILLS, ROLLING HILLS ESTATES, ROSEMEAD, SAN DIMAS, SANTA CLARITA, SIGNAL HILL, SOUTH EL MONTE, SOUTH GATE, TEMPLE CITY, VERNON, WALNUT, WEST HOLLYWOOD, WESTLAKE VILLAGE, WHITTIER

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HAVE WE M.E.T? MENTAL HEALTH EVALUATION TEAMS AND HOW THEY WORK?

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2b
DMH/BOS should allow agencies to hire specially trained employees (non-certified, but equally qualified) in place of DMH employed mental health professionals, if DMH cannot provide sufficient personnel. Agencies should be reimbursed in whole or in part for such hires.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by LACoFD as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls outside of the LACoFD.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
BOS/LASD/LACoFD/LAPD and the LACC should authorize an update or replacement of the current CAD system to integrate it with systems in use by other agencies.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. Funding, through the County's IT Legacy Fund, has been approved to upgrade LACoFD's CAD which should allow better integration and distribution of LACoFD specialty resources within the jurisdictions served by the LACoFD. It is anticipated that the CAD upgrade will be completed by Quarter 4, 2025.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4a
BOS/DMH/DPH/DHS should improve patient navigation services for recipients of emergency medical health services or allow agencies to provide their own patient navigation personnel to enable them to provide expanded services.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by LACoFD as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls outside the LACoFD.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4b
LACoFD should be authorized to provide their own patient navigation personnel. Agency should be reimbursed by the County in whole or in part for such hires.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree. This recommendation will require further analysis. Recommendations for additional resources will be made within the context of the overall budget, numerous funding priorities, and competing requests. Additionally,

any such positions would ideally be DMH/DPSS/DPH positions to assigned to support LACoFD's mission, as LACoFD does not have the expertise nor the internal resources to provide the training and support that they would require.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
BOS/DMH/DHS/DPH should authorize the development and staffing of additional Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers and Sobering Centers in key locations to help provide sufficient placement of mental health patients.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by LACoFD because jurisdiction for this recommendation falls outside the LACoFD.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
DMH/DPH/DHS and the BOS should substantially increase the number rescue transport vehicles in service to promote additional opportunities for persons in need.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by LACoFD as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls outside the LACoFD.

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

MICHEL R. MOORE
Chief of Police

KAREN BASS
Mayor

P. O. Box 30158
Los Angeles, Calif. 90030
Telephone: (213) 486-6630
TDD: (877) 275-5273
Ref #: 8.2

November 9, 2023

Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury
222 South Hill Street
Sixth Floor, Suite 670
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Sir/Madam:

In response to the County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury request, dated June 21, 2023, the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD or Department), Detective Support and Vice Division (DSVD) has reviewed and addressed the report titled, "HAVE WE MET? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work." Below are several clarifications to the information listed in the Los Angeles Police Department section of this report, and responses to Recommendations 1.3, 1.6, and 1.7.

The LAPD clarifications to the following paragraphs within the report:

The LAPD Mental Evaluation Unit (MEU) was one of the original six law enforcement entities recognized as a national learning site and model for "Specialized Policing Responses: Law Enforcement/Mental Health." Currently, there are 15 law enforcement learning sites in operation throughout the country.

In 2005, the LAPD developed the Case Assessment and Management Program (CAMP) to identify, monitor, and engage those subjects and to construct a case management approach that linked them to appropriate services. The CAMP pairs police detectives with psychologists, nurses, and/or resources based on individual clients' needs. The CAMP typically averages approximately 30 to 40 new cases per week. After the initial contact, cases are not closed; rather, they are monitored and evaluated for the need for additional services to ensure an effective long-term assistance plan.

> **Note:** Footnote 34 on Page 9 of the report lists information received from an interview conducted on January 26, 2023, with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) personnel.

Currently, MEU-Systemwide Mental Assessment Response Team (SMART) units are assigned to the four geographic bureaus in the City of Los Angeles, operating in four shifts, 24 hours per day, seven days per week, with 10 to 14 units deployed daily. Teams include one specially

trained police officer and one licensed mental health clinician working in a co-response model responding to critical mental health incidents.

When a mental health professional is unavailable, two specially trained police officers are assigned to respond to these critical incidents.

Approximately 80 trained sergeants, detectives, and officers along with 37 licensed clinicians are on staff at MEU SMART and CAMP. The MEU SMART is often deployed in conjunction with the Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team in crisis situations, such as barricaded suspects and potential suicidal jumpers.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1.3: *Board of Supervisors (BOS)/LASD/Los Angeles County Fire Department/LAPD and the Los Angeles City Council (LACC) should authorize an update or replacement of the current Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system to integrate it with systems in use by other agencies.*

The Department acknowledges the importance of CAD system integration to streamline our processes and improve interagency communication and cooperation. The recommendation aligns with our commitment to enhancing the safety and well-being of our community members and is consistent with our goal of optimizing resource allocation and information sharing among various law enforcement agencies.

A Computer-Aided Dispatch system that can seamlessly communicate with other agencies is essential to ensure prompt and efficient response during critical incidents and emergencies. It will not only facilitate real-time information sharing but also reduce response times, enhance situational awareness, and improve the overall effectiveness of our operations.

Considering this, the Department will explore this recommendation with the Emergency Command Control Communication Systems Division (ECCCSD) and the Los Angeles City Information Technology Agency (ITA).

Recommendation 1.6: *BOS/DMH/DHS/DPH should authorize the development and staffing of additional Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers and Sobering Centers in key locations to help provide sufficient placements of mental health patients.*

This recommendation, which suggests the development and staffing of additional psychiatric urgent care centers and sobering centers in key locations, is a crucial initiative to ensure that mental health patients receive timely and appropriate care and that individuals facing substance use-related issues are provided with the necessary support.

The Department wholeheartedly supports this recommendation and recognizes the importance of enhancing the availability of these centers in key locations. The need for such facilities has become increasingly evident, as it directly addresses the challenges associated with the placement and treatment of mental health patients. Creating additional psychiatric urgent care centers and sobering centers aligns with our shared commitment to improving the quality of care and support for individuals in crisis while relieving the burden on law enforcement agencies.

The Department recognizes the importance of a careful needs assessment to identify the key locations for establishing these centers. This assessment should consider factors such as population density, proximity to existing mental health facilities, and the prevalence of substance use-related incidents.

Additionally, we encourage the involvement of mental health professionals and experts in the planning and execution of this expansion. Their expertise will be instrumental in creating an environment that is safe, therapeutic, and conducive to the recovery of individuals seeking help.

Recommendation 1.7: *Department of Mental Health (DMH)/Department of Public Health (DPH)/Department of Health Services (DHS) AND THE BOS should substantially increase the number of rescue transport vehicles in service to promote additional opportunities for persons in need.*

The Department understands that expanding the fleet of rescue transport vehicles can significantly improve the capacity to assist persons in need. This enhancement aligns with our commitment to public safety and the well-being of our community members. Therefore, the Department fully supports increasing the number of these vehicles in service.

To implement this recommendation, a collaborative approach involving multiple stakeholders, including the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD), DMH, and community partners, is warranted. This collaborative effort should involve an analysis of the current demand for rescue transport services, population growth, and geographical distribution to determine the optimal locations and number of vehicles required. In addition, a review of calls where MEU resources were deployed in conjunction with rescue transport vehicles would aid the process.

Moreover, a public awareness campaign can be initiated to educate community members about the availability and proper utilization of rescue transport services. This ensures community members are aware of how and when to access these services, which can lead to more efficient and effective responses to emergencies.

The Department remains committed to its partnership with the
Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health professionals to ensure the successful implementation of this initiative.

If you have any questions, please contact Captain Cliff Humphris.
Detective Support and Vice Division, at (213) 486-0910.

Respectfully,

MICHEL R. MOORE
Chief of Police

BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS

GENETHIA HUDLEY-HAYES
PRESIDENT

SHARON DELUGACH
VICE PRESIDENT

CORINNE TAPIA BABCOCK
JIMMY H. HARA, M.D.
JIMMIE WOODS-GRAY

LETICIA GOMEZ
COMMISSION EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT II

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

KAREN BASS
MAYOR

FIRE DEPARTMENT

KRISTIN M. CROWLEY
FIRE CHIEF

200 NORTH MAIN STREET
ROOM 1800
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

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

HTTP://WWW.LAFD.ORG

July 25, 2023

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Presiding Judge:

We are in receipt of the Civil Grand Jury report "HAVE WE M.E.T.? MENTAL HEALTH EVALUATION TEAM AND HOW THEY WORK." Pursuant to your June 21, 2023, request for response, the Los Angeles City Fire Department responds to the Civil Grand Jury's recommendations as follows:

Recommendation 1.2a: DMH/BOS should permit Mental Health Evaluation teams to use outside clinicians procured under contract from private companies, if DMH cannot provide sufficient personnel. Agencies should be reimbursed in whole or in part for such hires.

Response
The Los Angeles City Fire Department (LAFD) supports this recommendation. Based on the challenges that the Department of Mental Health (DMH) has had onboarding additional staff to meet the service demands of the County, sourcing needed staff through contracting agencies is prudent. Any increase in the availability of mental health evaluation teams will be a positive step in addressing the increased calls for service related to a mental health crisis. However, private contractors should be required to meet the same standards as the DMH staff and should be overseen by DMH.

Addressing the shortage of mental health clinicians requires a multi-faceted approach. This may involve increasing funding for mental health services, expanding educational programs and training opportunities, implementing policies to reduce stigma, and improving work conditions to prevent burnout among clinicians. These efforts aim to attract more individuals to the mental health field and retain them, ultimately expanding the availability of mental health services.

Recommendation 1.2b: DMH/BOS should allow agencies to hire specially trained employees (non-certified, but equally qualified), in place of DMH employed mental health professionals, if DMH cannot provide sufficient personnel. Agencies should be reimbursed in whole or in part for such hires.

Response
The LAFD supports this recommendation. An example of a relevant specially trained LAFD employee is an Advanced Provider (Nurse Practitioner or Physician's Assistant). The LAFD deploys a limited number of Advanced Practitioners partnered with Firefighter/Paramedics in Advanced Provider Response Units (APRUs). APRUs respond to 911 calls for service, including behavioral and psychiatric emergencies. Currently, the LAFD can transport patients experiencing an isolated psychiatric emergency who are cleared by an Advanced Practitioner to some Exodus Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers (PUCCs).

The APRU staff can provide advanced medical assessments and treatments; clear patients for transport to a Sober Center or PUCC; provide treatment and release resolutions for low acuity medical problems and make referrals to allied agencies for patients with elevated social risk factors such as homelessness.

Recommendation 1.3: BOS/LASD/LACOFD/LAPD and the Los Angeles City Council (LACC) should authorize an update or replacement of the current CAD system to integrate it with systems in use by other agencies.

Response
Computer-aided dispatch (CAD) integration or interoperability refers to the ability of different CAD systems to exchange information and communicate effectively. It plays a crucial role in public safety and emergency response operations. It enables seamless collaboration, efficient resource allocation, improved incident management, cross-jurisdictional operations, data integration and analysis, and interagency training.

- It is recommended that all public safety and partner agencies embrace CAD interoperability. Interoperable CADs can enhance capabilities, optimize response efforts, and save more lives.

Recommendation 1.4a: BOS/DMH/DPH/DHS should improve patient navigation services for recipients of emergency mental health services or allow agencies to provide their own patient navigation personnel to enable them to provide expanded services.

Response
The LAFD supports this recommendation. Improving patient navigation services for recipients of emergency mental health services is an important tactic for improving mental health services in Los Angeles County for several reasons:

1. Continuity of care: Emergency mental health services often provide immediate crisis intervention, stabilization, and short-term support. However, to effectively address the underlying mental health issues, it is essential for individuals to receive ongoing care and follow-up treatment. Patient navigation services help bridge the gap between emergency services and long-term care, ensuring a smooth transition and continuity of care for recipients.

2. Access to appropriate resources: Navigating the mental health system can be challenging, especially for individuals in crisis. Patient navigation services can help recipients connect with the appropriate resources and services they need, such as outpatient therapy, medication management, or support groups. Navigators can assist with scheduling appointments, coordinating referrals, and providing information about available community resources, making it easier for individuals to access the support they require.

3. Reducing relapse and readmission rates: Without proper follow-up and ongoing care, individuals who receive emergency mental health services may be at a higher risk of relapse or readmission to the emergency department. Patient navigation services can help prevent these relapses by ensuring that individuals receive the necessary support, monitoring, and treatment after their initial crisis. By addressing their ongoing mental health needs, patient navigation can reduce the likelihood of repeated emergencies and promote long-term recovery.

4. Support and advocacy: Navigating the mental health system can be overwhelming, especially for individuals in crisis or those who may be unfamiliar with available services. Patient navigators provide valuable support, guidance, and advocacy throughout the process. They can help individuals understand their rights, assist with paperwork and documentation, and act as a liaison between the individual and healthcare providers. This support can empower recipients, increase their engagement in their own care, and improve their overall mental health outcomes.

5. Preventive care and early intervention: Patient navigation services can also play a crucial role in preventive care and early intervention. By connecting individuals with appropriate mental health resources and support early on, potential crises can be identified and addressed before they escalate. Timely interventions and ongoing support can help individuals manage their mental health effectively, reducing the likelihood of future emergencies.

Overall, improving patient navigation services for recipients of emergency mental health services enhances their access to care, promotes continuity of care, reduces relapse rates, provides support and advocacy, and enables preventive and early intervention measures. By addressing these needs, patient navigation services can significantly improve the overall mental health outcomes and well-being of individuals in crisis.

Recommendation 1.6: BOS/DMH/DHS/DPH should authorize the development and staffing of additional Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers and Sobering Centers in key locations to help provide sufficient placements of mental health patients.

Response
The LAFD supports this recommendation. As Psychiatric Urgent Care Centers (PUCCs) and Sobering Centers are becoming increasingly occupied, it is recommended that they be geographically expanded to service a greater number of patients throughout the area. Expanding psychiatric urgent care centers, sobering centers, and additional medical detoxification centers in Los Angeles is of paramount importance to address the growing mental health and substance abuse crisis across the County.

PUCCs and Sobering Centers provide vital support and services to individuals facing acute psychiatric emergencies, alcohol or drug-related issues, and the dire need for medical detoxification. By investing in such facilities, we can ensure timely and appropriate care for those struggling with mental health challenges while also offering a safe and supportive environment for individuals seeking sobriety. With the expansion of these centers, Los Angeles can alleviate the strain on hospitals and emergency rooms, offering specialized care tailored to the unique needs of patients in crisis. Moreover, these centers can serve as a bridge to long-term treatment and recovery programs, fostering a more holistic and effective approach to healing our community. By prioritizing the establishment of additional facilities, we can create a healthier and more compassionate city that prioritizes the well-being of all its residents.

Recommendation 1.7: DMH/DPH/DHS and the BOS should substantially increase the number of rescue transport vehicles in service to promote additional opportunities for persons in need.

Response

Demand for Emergency Medical Services (EMS) has not only increased in the City and County of Los Angeles, but it has also evolved. The City of Los Angeles has not only experienced an increase in traditional calls for life-threatening emergencies, but it has also experienced an increase in calls for services related to:

- Mental health crisis incidents,
- low-acuity/non-life-threatening medical incidents, and
- Medical incidents related to homelessness.

Additional ambulances and new forms of alternative response and transport units are required to address the growing and evolving needs of the public.

The LAFD appreciates the opportunity to provide written responses to the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report "HAVE WE M.E.T.? MENTAL HEALTH EVALUATION TEAM AND HOW THEY WORK."

Sincerely,

KRISTIN M. CROWLEY
Fire Chief

HHH

Too Few, Too Much, Too Slow



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

Ann Sewill, General Manager
Tricia Keane, Executive Officer

Daniel Huynh, Assistant General Manager
Anna E. Ortega, Assistant General Manager
Luz C. Santiago, Assistant General Manager

City of Los Angeles

Karen Bass, Mayor

LOS ANGELES HOUSING DEPARTMENT
1200 West 7th Street, 9th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: 213.808.8808

housing.lacity.org

September 19, 2023

Honorable Judge Samantha P. Jessner, Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: HHH
Too Few, Too Much, Too Slow
Pre-Release of a report by the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

Dear Judge Jessner:

The Los Angeles Housing Department acknowledges receipt of the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Pre-Release of a Report regarding HHH, its findings and recommendations. The Los Angeles Housing Department appreciates the Civil Grand Jury's interest in our program. In accordance with California Penal Code §933 (c) and §933.05, we respectfully submit Attachment A as our formal response to Recommendations 1.1 through 1.11

For additional questions or comments, your staff may contact Daniel Huynh, Assistant General Manager, at: (213) 808-8901, or via email at: daniel.huynh@lacity.org.

ANN SEWILL
General Manager

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Department: Los Angeles Housing Department

Subject: 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Recommendations For:
HHH: Too Few, Too Much, Too Slow

Proposition HHH, a $1.2 billion initiative endorsed by voters in 2016, aimed to significantly boost the City's annual production of supportive housing units from 300 to 1000. The original goal of Proposition HHH was to facilitate the creation of 7,000 new homes for individuals dealing with homelessness within a span of ten years. However, the current status as of August 2023 reveals a more promising outlook, with 8,596 HHH units actively progressing. Among these, 2,877 are already in operation, while an additional 3,512 are actively under construction. Concurrently, the City continues to commit funding for another 300 non-HHH supportive housing units each year.

Recommendation No. 1.1 - Whatever remains of HHH funds, if any, should go to projects that provide more immediate "interim" housing for individuals experiencing homelessness.

Response: In the past two fiscal years the City has invested $860,516,405 from other sources in producing and operating 10,000 interim housing beds, ranging from congregate shelters to Project RoomKey motels to Tiny Home Villages and others. Every year to keep these open the City would need to allocate funds for operations ranging from $50 to $267 per unit per night, with an average of $65 per unit per night, or $237 million annually for all 10,000. Permanent housing requires the initial capital investment, but operating costs are much lower and are covered by rental income from residents and federal or county rental vouchers.

Permanent housing is not only a better financial investment; it is what moves people from homelessness into being housed. These HHH units are needed to move people from interim beds into homes. HHH is one of the few sources the City has to provide capital funding for permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness.

Recommendation No. 1.2 - The City Council, LAHD, and the Mayor's office should prioritize controlling PSH costs and mitigating delays.

Response: Despite a global pandemic and related challenges in virtual processing, the pace of development is anything but sluggish. The HHH program has committed financing to 131 projects. Fifty-three projects totaling 3,243 units have been constructed and 52 projects totaling 3,378 units are under construction. The remaining projects are in pre-development and by the end of 2024 we expect HHH to have contributed to the construction of 8,596 units of Permanent Supportive Housing. The Mayor's Office Executive Directive 30 streamlining initiative has reduced the number of days for ready-to-issue permits for HHH projects by 154 days. Every month LAHD publishes the attached HHH Summary showing how projects are progressing from early entitlement planning, to construction loan closing, to completion.

Recommendation No. 1.3 - Tiny home villages are de facto permanent housing that should be reclassified as such, protected and supported by the City, until more substantial permanent housing is available.

Response:

This recommendation falls outside the purview of LAHD. Tiny Home Villages are constructed and installed with the expectation of operating as interim housing. They do not contain individual kitchens or bathrooms, which are key components of permanent supportive housing. The city is utilizing an approach incorporating both interim and permanent supportive housing, and new PSH units are coming on line. Interim housing units serve a specific purpose of providing unhoused residents with strategies to address critical needs while being placed in permanent housing, however units constructed to the standard of permanent supportive housing are needed to address this problem in the long term. Residents of interim housing, including tiny home villages, receive access to services and support, including but not limited to on-site caseworkers, housing navigation services, and mental and physical health services.

Recommendation No. 1.4 - The City should remove any City-imposed impediment to building any type of safe, affordable PSH project, including container housing and manufactured home projects.

Response: This recommendation is not under the purview of LAHD, however the city has already implemented this recommendation to the best of its ability. The Mayor issued Executive Directive 1 (ED1), which expedites the entitlement and permitting process for 100% affordable housing developments that are consistent with the underlying zoning for a site, which includes permanent supportive housing projects. In its first 6 months 1,649 affordable units across 22 projects have secured approvals in an average of 37 days, a savings of at least 6 months. There are over 400 projects and 8,500 units in the ED1 pipeline. In June 2023, the City Council directed the Department of City Planning to develop an ordinance that would make ED1

permanent. ED 1 does not preclude based on building type, provided the project is zoning compliant and meets both building and safety requirements and building codes. However in some instances it is prudent for a project, even a permanent supportive housing project, to be subject to the required discretionary review and public hearing process. Streamlining must be applied with care.

Recommendation No. 1.5 - The City should remove any lender hesitation by guaranteeing construction loans on container PSH projects.

Response: The City's HHH pipeline of deals includes eight modular projects (modular or prefabricated construction includes "container" housing) with financing structures similar to traditionally constructed buildings. Generally, LAHD makes no distinction in the development process between modular and conventional construction. The Housing Challenge, an $120 million competition to test a range of housing innovation supported the advancement of modular projects. Thus far, LAHD has not seen a marked decrease in costs of modular construction compared to traditional construction but as the innovation develops and projects become more common, perhaps the speed of construction will increase and the costs will decrease. LAHD continues to support developers who elect to build modular projects.

Recommendation No. 1.6 - The City should immediately put vacant land under its control that is suitable to be used for housing purposes toward safely housing individuals living on the streets, in tents or in vehicles. These sites should be secured and appropriate services provided until such time as permanent housing can be produced.

Response: In November of 2012, after the dissolution of the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles (CRA/LA), the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD) created the Land Development Unit (LDU) to implement the development of affordable housing on land purchased by the CRA/LA for affordable housing.

In February of 2016, the City of Los Angeles adopted a Comprehensive Homeless Strategy that included strategy 7D, "Using Public Land for Affordable and Homeless Housing." Shortly after the homeless plan was released, the City Administrative Officer (CAO) launched the Affordable Housing Opportunity Sites (AHOS) Initiative to identify City-owned sites identified for affordable housing.

Since 2016, the LAHD and the CAO have collaborated on the Land Development and AHOS Initiative by developing common processes and regulations. In general, the CAO is responsible for identifying and evaluating City-owned sites for development, and the LAHD is responsible for selecting developers and negotiating disposition development agreements.

In December of 2019, the Los Angeles City Council restricted development of housing on public land by adopting a motion (CF 19-1362) which limits projects on public land to 100% affordable housing, unless it is determined by Council that an increased number of affordable units can be achieved through a different business model.

Additionally, LAHD must adhere to the Surplus Land Act (SLA). The SLA is a statute that local agencies must follow when disposing of surplus land. It was amended by Assembly Bill 1486 (Ting 2019) as well as other subsequent bills. These amendments modified the SLA to require local agencies across California to submit notices of availability of surplus land to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for listing on the HCD website, and to notify interested developers and certain local public entities. Land declared exempt surplus may be exempted from some or all provisions of the SLA by meeting certain criteria. The city has an ongoing effort through Executive Directive 3 to see if publicly owned sites within the City of Los Angeles can be developed with minimal public subsidies, and instructed departments to identify undeveloped or underutilized city-owned land, with the purpose of potential development into interim or permanent housing.

Recommendation No. 1.7 - The City must find a new method of developing PSH which allows for both cost and quality controls.

Response:

Costs for HHH or any affordable housing development need to be put in the context of costs for equivalent market rate developments. Even a quick google search of "multifamily construction costs in California" produces reports from the Terner Center at UC Berkeley, the UC Riverside School of Business, and others showing that market rate construction in all of California, and particularly in Los Angeles and the Bay Area, has reached staggering heights. A feasible plan to produce the housing we need must be understood in the context of the broader real estate market.

It is possible to compare the costs of affordable housing and comparable market rate developments and identify the elements that increase costs in affordable units - prevailing wages, higher energy efficiency standards, operating and replacement reserves, furniture and developer fees - that aren't included in development budgets for market rate projects because they are paid upon sale when the project is completed, or covered by escalating rents over time. Affordable housing project budgets also include holding costs and legal fees involved in assembling "soft" financing from multiple sources. The reliance on layered financing adds time and money, but stretches HHH funding to meet production goals. Without leveraging, HHH would have produced only 3,900 permanent units.

The LAHD staff is committed to finding ways to reduce costs, while retaining the commitment to funding projects that are physically and financially healthy for the decades covenanted. Realizing that some of the highest cost projects were those that had high public agency involvement, the HHH portfolio is divided into "basic" projects that include prevailing wages, higher energy efficiency standards, accessibility standards, and reserves and fees, and a "Housing Plus" category. The Housing Plus projects have been developed on Metro-owned or publicly-owned land and included requirements for community amenities such as neighborhood-serving commercial, child care centers or clinics, more parking spaces than required, or more open space. Others were funded with the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program using the State's cap and trade program, and included additional greenhouse gas reduction features, support of infrastructure such as bus shelters, and water conservation features.

In addition to better understanding cost drivers, LAHD has been working with applicants to reduce costs by creating financing tools to support the use of modular development, using all entitlement benefits available such as parking reductions, and using standardized units that reduce costs while still complying with accessibility requirements. Also, in 2011, the Department transitioned to requiring Guaranteed Maximum Contracts (G-Max Contracts) for all general contractor contracts related to the construction of LAHD-funded multifamily projects. These G-Max Contracts only allow for general contractors to receive a maximum of 14% overhead & profit on projects and eliminate the opportunity for contractors to pocket cost savings that they may be entitled to with stipulated sum construction contracts.

Recommendation No. 1.8 - Programs focused on remodeling and rehabbing structures like Project Homekey should be given funding priority over larger, publicly funded, new PSH projects.

Response:

The City of LA submitted 6 of the 13 applicant projects in Homekey Program Round 2 and an additional group of three new projects for the Homekey Program Round 3. Fortunately, the varying sources of funding available have different priorities and different timelines. For example, programs like Project Homekey focus on acquisition and rehabilitation, while other sources, like HHH, focus on the creation of new units of housing. And as one of the largest cities in America, Los Angeles has the capacity to process all these projects to start construction quickly. The diversity of sources creates an environment to test what works best, including: construction cost control, efficient use of public resources, speed of development, opportunity to provide services, appeal in the marketplace, long term viability of the project, etc. All these factors and more create a healthy environment to provide a big diverse response to a complex problem. As well, it provides the City, and

the nation, with knowledge about what responses and which typologies work best for a given population of people. *Of note, remodeled or rehabilitated projects are not necessarily smaller or less expensive than newly* constructed projects.

Recommendation No. 1.9 - The PLA was not approved by the voters for HHH and should not be applied to PSH projects.

Response: On April 13, 2018 the Los Angeles Council voted unanimously to adopt an ordinance requiring that Proposition HHH funded projects include a Project Labor Agreements, as a means to seek to address unemployment and underemployment in concentrated poverty within City neighborhoods, including the further promotion and advancement of the skills of the local labor pool. including provisions for local hire and employing transitional/disadvantaged workers who are residents of the City ofLos Angeles as one tool to address these larger issues of systemic poverty and unemployment.

As noted above, the vast majority of HHH dollars are committed to projects with this requirement in place. It should be noted that many projects obtained entitlements through Measure JJJ which also requires a Project Labor Agreement. Even if the ordinance was revoked with regard to HHH, the requirement would still be in place as a result of project entitlements.

Recommendation No. 1.10 - A new, private market solution for PSH development must be considered.

Response:

In an effort to incentivize the development of PSH projects from market rate developers, the Department of City Planning created the Qualified Permanent Supportive Housing (QPSH) program through Ordinance 185,492. The program was modeled after the Density Bonus Ordinance, but also includes several features that were unique at the time. For example, the QPSH program allowed for unlimited density for projects that were located in an R3 or less restrictive zone, up to five incentives to modify various development standards, and significant parking reductions. In addition, the program allows developers to restrict all the affordable units with rent schedule 1 instead of the more restrictive rent schedule 6. Although many affordable housing developers have utilized the program, very few market rate developers have explored the program and even less have actually proposed a project.

One of the reasons for this lack of interest may be due to the complexity of financial instruments that are necessary to construct supportive housing and the compliance requirements tied to these sources of funds

(both public and private). Another potential deterrent is the support services requirement that the program requires. Most developers do not have the experience or knowledge required to provide supportive services to the formerly homeless population. Another reason may be that the state Density Bonus program was significantly modified by AB 1763 (2019), AB 2345 (2020), and most recently by AB 2334 (2022) so that it would provide even more development incentives than the QPSH program. Therefore, developers have more profitable alternatives to the QPSH program.

LAHD would welcome any private market solution. To the best of our knowledge there have been no private solutions that combine code compliance with long term operating feasibility. What has been demonstrated in the market are projects with privately financed construction, permanent loans dependent upon extremely low operating costs and property tax abatements coupled with tenants holding Section 8 vouchers. It will be interesting to see how these projects operate long term. Lessons learned from these private market solutions may provide important lessons the City might emulate going forward.

Recommendation No. 1.11 - DWP should have one designated electrical and water contact person for each PSH project.

Response: This recommendation is not under the purview of LAHD. LADWP has been coordinating with other city departments and the Mayor's office to implement ED1, which includes expediting all 100 percent affordable projects, including permanent supportive housing projects. DWP provides project contacts that project developers or their utility consultants can reach directly, and the city has multiple teams aimed at providing project troubleshooting. The City Administrative Officer has launched a new Affordable Housing Liaison Unit, which provides concierge service to support expediting efforts of 100 percent affordable projects, and serves as a direct point of contact between project development teams and the departments. The Mayor's office also has multiple staff members to support project expediting efforts. Between these teams and designated DWP contacts, PSH developers have several designated resources and points of contact aimed at expediting development efforts, for matters related to DWP as well as other departments.

KAREN BASS
MAYOR

October 6, 2023

Samantha P. Jessner
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: HHH: Too Few, Too Much, Too Slow
Report by the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

Dear Honorable Judge Samantha P. Jessner:

The City of Los Angeles acknowledges receipt of the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report regarding Housing Vouchers for Low-Income and Homeless Angelenos, its findings and recommendations. The City respectfully submits Attachment A as the City's formal response. The City's response was prepared by knowledgeable staff working in the Los Angeles Department of Housing.

For additional questions or comments, your staff may contact Jenna Hornstock, Deputy Mayor of Housing, at jenna.hornstock@lacity.org.

Karen Bass
KAREN BASS
Mayor

Paul Krekorian
PAUL KREKORIAN
City Council President

CITY OF LOS ANGELES RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Subject: 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Recommendations:
HHH: Too Few, Too Much, Too Slow

The below responses were prepared by the Los Angeles Housing Department and the Department of Water and Power.

Recommendation No. 1.1 - Whatever remains of HHH funds, if any, should go to projects that provide more immediate "interim" housing for individuals experiencing homelessness.

Response: In the past two fiscal years the City has invested $860,516,405 from other sources in producing and operating 10,000 interim housing beds, ranging from congregate shelters to Project RoomKey motels to Tiny Home Villages and others. Every year to keep these open the City would need to allocate funds for operations ranging from $50 to $267 per unit per night, with an average of $65 per unit per night, or $237 million annually for all 10,000. Permanent housing requires the initial capital investment, but operating costs are much lower and are covered by rental income from residents and federal or county rental vouchers. Permanent housing is not only a better financial investment; it is what moves people from homelessness into being housed. These HHH units are needed to move people from interim beds into homes. HHH is one of the few sources the City has to provide capital funding for permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness.

Recommendation No. 1.2 - The City Council, LAHD, and the Mayor's office should prioritize controlling PSH costs and mitigating delays.

Response: Despite a global pandemic and related challenges in virtual processing, the pace of development is anything but sluggish. The HHH program has committed financing to 131 projects. Fifty-three projects totaling 3,243 units have been constructed and 52 projects totaling 3,378 units are under construction. The remaining projects are in pre-development and by the end of 2024 we expect HHH to have contributed to the construction of 8,596 units of Permanent Supportive Housing. Executive Directive 30 streamlining initiative has reduced the number of days for ready-to-issue permits for HHH projects by 154 days. Every month LAHD publishes the attached HHH Summary showing how projects are progressing from early entitlement planning, to construction loan closing, to completion.

Recommendation No. 1.3 - Tiny home villages are de facto permanent housing that should be reclassified as such, protected and supported by the City, until more substantial permanent housing is available.

Response: This recommendation falls outside the purview of LAHD. Tiny Home Villages are constructed and installed with the expectation of operating as interim housing. They

do not contain individual kitchens or bathrooms, which are key components of permanent supportive housing. The city is utilizing an approach incorporating both interim and permanent supportive housing, and new PSH units are coming on line. Interim housing units serve a specific purpose of providing unhoused residents with strategies to address critical needs while being placed in permanent housing, however units constructed to the standard of permanent supportive housing are needed to address this problem in the long term. Residents of interim housing, including tiny home villages, receive access to services and support, including but not limited to on-site caseworkers, housing navigation services, and mental and physical health services.

Recommendation No. 1.4 - The City should remove any City-imposed impediment to building any type of safe, affordable PSH project, including container housing and manufactured home projects.

Response: This recommendation is not under the purview of LAHD, however the city has already implemented this recommendation to the best of its ability. The Mayor issued Executive Directive 1 (ED1), which expedites the entitlement and permitting process for 100% affordable housing developments that are consistent with the underlying zoning for a site, which includes permanent supportive housing projects. In its first 6 months 1,649 affordable units across 22 projects have secured approvals in an average of 37 days, a savings of at least 6 months. There are over 400 projects and 8,500 units in the ED1 pipeline. In June 2023, the City Council directed the Department of City Planning to develop an ordinance that would make ED1 permanent. ED 1 does not preclude based on building type, provided the project is zoning compliant and meets both building and safety requirements and building codes. However in some instances it is prudent for a project, even a permanent supportive housing project, to be subject to the required discretionary review and public hearing process. Streamlining must be applied with care.

Recommendation No. 1.5 - The City should remove any lender hesitation by guaranteeing construction loans on container PSH projects.

Response: The City's HHH pipeline of deals includes eight modular projects (modular or prefabricated construction includes "container" housing) with financing structures similar to traditionally constructed buildings. Generally, LAHD makes no distinction in the development process between modular and conventional construction. The Housing Challenge, an $120 million competition to test a range of housing innovation supported the advancement of modular projects. Thus far, LAHD has not seen a marked decrease in costs of modular construction compared to traditional construction but as the innovation develops and projects become more common, perhaps the speed of construction will increase and the costs will decrease. LAHD continues to support developers who elect to build modular projects.

Recommendation No. 1.6 - The City should immediately put vacant land under its control that is suitable to be used for housing purposes toward safely housing individuals living on the streets, in tents or in vehicles. These sites should be secured and appropriate services provided until such time as permanent housing can be produced.

Response: In November of 2012, after the dissolution of the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles (CRA/LA), the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD) created the Land Development Unit (LDU) to implement the development of affordable housing on land purchased by the CRA/LA for affordable housing.

In February of 2016, the City of Los Angeles adopted a Comprehensive Homeless Strategy that included strategy 7D, "Using Public Land for Affordable and Homeless Housing." Shortly after the homeless plan was released, the City Administrative Officer (CAO) launched the Affordable Housing Opportunity Sites (AHOS) Initiative to identify City-owned sites identified for affordable housing.

Since 2016, the LAHD and the CAO have collaborated on the Land Development and AHOS Initiative by developing common processes and regulations. In general, the CAO is responsible for identifying and evaluating City-owned sites for development, and the LAHD is responsible for selecting developers and negotiating disposition development agreements.

In December of 2019, the Los Angeles City Council restricted development of housing on public land by adopting a motion (CF 19-1362) which limits projects on public land to 100% affordable housing, unless it is determined by Council that an increased number of affordable units can be achieved through a different business model.

Additionally, LAHD must adhere to the Surplus Land Act (SLA). The SLA is a statute that local agencies must follow when disposing of surplus land. It was amended by Assembly Bill 1486 (Ting 2019) as well as other subsequent bills. These amendments modified the SLA to require local agencies across California to submit notices of availability of surplus land to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for listing on the HCD website, and to notify interested developers and certain local public entities. Land declared exempt surplus may be exempted from some or all provisions of the SLA by meeting certain criteria. The city has an ongoing effort through Executive Directive 3 to see if publicly owned sites within the City of Los Angeles can be developed with minimal public subsidies, and instructed departments to identify undeveloped or underutilized city-owned land, with the purpose of potential development into interim or permanent housing.

Recommendation No. 1.7 - The City must find a new method of developing PSH which allows for both cost and quality controls.

Response: Costs for HHH or any affordable housing development need to be put in the context of costs for equivalent market rate developments. Even a quick google search of "multifamily construction costs in California" produces reports from the Terner Center at UC Berkeley, the UC Riverside School of Business, and others showing that market rate construction in all of California, and particularly in Los Angeles and the Bay Area, has

reached staggering heights. A feasible plan to produce the housing we need must be understood in the context of the broader real estate market.

It is possible to compare the costs of affordable housing and comparable market rate developments and identify the elements that increase costs in affordable units - prevailing wages, higher energy efficiency standards, operating and replacement reserves, furniture and developer fees - that aren't included in development budgets for market rate projects because they are paid upon sale when the project is completed, or covered by escalating rents over time. Affordable housing project budgets also include holding costs and legal fees involved in assembling "soft" financing from multiple sources. The reliance on layered financing adds time and money, but stretches HHH funding to meet production goals. Without leveraging, HHH would have produced only 3,900 permanent units.

The LAHD staff is committed to finding ways to reduce costs, while retaining the commitment to funding projects that are physically and financially healthy for the decades covenanted. Realizing that some of the highest cost projects were those that had high public agency involvement, the HHH portfolio is divided into "basic" projects that include prevailing wages, higher energy efficiency standards, accessibility standards, and reserves and fees, and a "Housing Plus" category. The Housing Plus projects have been developed on Metro-owned or publicly-owned land and included requirements for community amenities such as neighborhood-serving commercial, child care centers or clinics, more parking spaces than required, or more open space. Others were funded with the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program using the State's cap and trade program, and included additional greenhouse gas reduction features, support of infrastructure such as bus shelters, and water conservation features.

In addition to better understanding cost drivers, LAHD has been working with applicants to reduce costs by creating financing tools to support the use of modular development, using all entitlement benefits available such as parking reductions, and using standardized units that reduce costs while still complying with accessibility requirements. Also, in 2011, the Department transitioned to requiring Guaranteed Maximum Contracts (G-Max Contracts) for all general contractor contracts related to the construction of LAHD-funded multifamily projects. These G-Max Contracts only allow for general contractors to receive a maximum of 14% overhead & profit on projects and eliminate the opportunity for contractors to pocket cost savings that they may be entitled to with stipulated sum construction contracts.

Recommendation No. 1.8 - Programs focused on remodeling and rehabbing structures like Project Homekey should be given funding priority over larger, publicly funded, new PSH projects.

Response: The City of LA submitted 6 of the 13 applicant projects in Homekey Program Round 2 and an additional group of three new projects for the Homekey Program Round 3. Fortunately, the varying sources of funding available have different priorities and different timelines. For example, programs like Project Homekey focus on acquisition and rehabilitation, while other sources, like HHH, focus on the creation of new units of

housing. And as one of the largest cities in America, Los Angeles has the capacity to process all these projects to start construction quickly. The diversity of sources creates an environment to test what works best, including: construction cost control, efficient use of public resources, speed of development, opportunity to provide services, appeal in the marketplace, long term viability of the project, etc. All these factors and more create a healthy environment to provide a big diverse response to a complex problem. As well, it provides the City, and the nation, with knowledge about what responses and which typologies work best for a given population of people. Of note, remodeled or rehabilitated projects are not necessarily smaller or less expensive than newly constructed projects.

Recommendation No. 1.9 - The PLA was not approved by the voters for HHH and should not be applied to PSH projects.

Response: On April 13, 2018 the Los Angeles Council voted unanimously to adopt an ordinance requiring that Proposition HHH funded projects include a Project Labor Agreements, as a means to seek to address unemployment and underemployment in concentrated poverty within City neighborhoods, including the further promotion and advancement of the skills of the local labor pool. including provisions for local hire and employing transitional/disadvantaged workers who are residents of the City of Los Angeles as one tool to address these larger issues of systemic poverty and unemployment.

As noted above, the vast majority of HHH dollars are committed to projects with this requirement in place. It should be noted that many projects obtained entitlements through Measure JJJ which also requires a Project Labor Agreement. Even if the ordinance was revoked with regard to HHH, the requirement would still be in place as a result of project entitlements.

Recommendation No. 1.10 - A new, private market solution for PSH development must be considered.

Response: In an effort to incentivize the development of PSH projects from market rate developers, the Department of City Planning created the Qualified Permanent Supportive Housing (QPSH) program through Ordinance 185,492. The program was modeled after the Density Bonus Ordinance, but also includes several features that were unique at the time. For example, the QPSH program allowed for unlimited density for projects that were located in an R3 or less restrictive zone, up to five incentives to modify various development standards, and significant parking reductions. In addition, the program allows developers to restrict all the affordable units with rent schedule 1 instead of the more restrictive rent schedule 6. Although many affordable housing developers have utilized the program, very few market rate developers have explored the program and even less have actually proposed a project.

One of the reasons for this lack of interest may be due to the complexity of financial instruments that are necessary to construct supportive housing and the compliance

requirements tied to these sources of funds (both public and private). Another potential deterrent is the support services requirement that the program requires. Most developers do not have the experience or knowledge required to provide supportive services to the formerly homeless population. Another reason may be that the state Density Bonus program was significantly modified by AB 1763 (2019), AB 2345 (2020), and most recently by AB 2334 (2022) so that it would provide even more development incentives than the QPSH program. Therefore, developers have more profitable alternatives to the QPSH program.

LAHD would welcome any private market solution. To the best of our knowledge there have been no private solutions that combine code compliance with long term operating feasibility. What has been demonstrated in the market are projects with privately financed construction, permanent loans dependent upon extremely low operating costs and property tax abatements coupled with tenants holding Section 8 vouchers. It will be interesting to see how these projects operate long term. Lessons learned from these private market solutions may provide important lessons the City might emulate going forward.

Recommendation No. 1.11 - DWP should have one designated electrical and water contact person for each PSH project.

Response: DWP indicates that it has implemented this recommendation.

HOUSING VOUCHERS FOR LOW INCOME AND HOMELESS ANGELENOS



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HOUSING VOUCHERS FOR LOW-INCOME AND HOMELESS ANGELENOS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.20
The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles' (HACLA's) and Los Angeles County Development Authority's (LACDA's) Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) and Emergency Housing Voucher (EHV) programs should be administered by one agency by agreement among the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles City Council and Mayor, HACLA and LACDA. This will eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort and expense, enable Los Angeles residents to use an agency with a demonstrated excellent track record and promote efficiency. This recommendation relates to Findings 20, 21 and 22, and each of them.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented.

LACDA enjoys a close working relationship with the City of Los Angeles as well as the 17 other public housing agencies operating within the County. The LACDA has taken a regional approach to align its policies and in the implementation of its programs. To that end, the LACDA works very closely with these agencies; especially with HACLA to address utilization, interagency Memorandum of Understanding agreements to streamline lease-up and reduce barriers to access, and the creation of a universal housing application. In fact, both the LACDA and HACLA often attend landlord recruitment and education events together to demonstrate their collaborative relationship.

HACLA

Build HOPE: Investing in People and Place

August 30, 2023

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, 13th Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Your Honor:

HACLA'S RESPONSE TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORTS:

- ***HOUSING VOUCHERS FOR LOW INCOME AND HOMELESS ANGELENOS*, and**
- ***LACK OF HOUSING: THE SOCIAL INJUSTICE OF THE 21ST CENTURY***

On June 21, 2023, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles ("HACLA"), received Pre-Release Reports from the 2022-2023 County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury (the "Civil Grand Jury"). On or about July 3, 2023, the Civil Grand Jury published its Final Report. HACLA's governing body and agency head are required to provide responses to the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under their control cited in both reports. *See* Pen. Code § 933(c). This letter constitutes the response of HACLA's Board of Commissioners and Chief Executive Officer to the reports entitled *Housing Vouchers for Low Income and Homeless Angelenos* and *Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century.*

Agency Background

HACLA was established in 1938 by the City of Los Angeles Resolution No. 1241. HACLA has grown to become the second largest and leading public housing authority in the nation, providing the largest supply of quality affordable housing to residents of the City. HACLA's annual budget is close to $2 billion and through various resources, including federally-funded public housing and vouchers, houses over 105,000 Angelenos.

HACLA administers nearly 60,000 rental assistance vouchers across multiple federal programs including the Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV), Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Vouchers (VASH), and more recently Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV). For the last 15 years HACLA's HCV program has been rated as a "High Performer" by the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) in its annual performance assessment. Additionally, HACLA's public housing program, with 6,393 public housing units, has been rated as a "High Performer" by HUD for 13 years. Through these programs along with its acquisition and development of affordable housing, HACLA is a principal player in providing much needed affordable housing in Los Angeles.

From January through June 2023, HACLA's Section 8 Department housed 2,733 new families and is on track to house 6,000 by the end the year. This is the largest number of new families HACLA has housed in a single year. Additionally, HACLA is utilizing 98% of the federal funds it receives for the HCV program. In July 2021, HACLA received 3,365 EHVs, the second largest allocation in the nation. As of the date of this response, 2,601 families have secured housing with an EHV. It has taken an immense effort and significant

resources to reach this milestone, and no other housing authority, except for the New York City Housing Authority, has reached this number. HACLA is on track to reach 100 percent utilization of these vouchers by year-end. In furtherance of Los Angeles' housing goals, HUD recently awarded HACLA 250 new VASH vouchers on June 1, 2023, and 377 new Stability Vouchers are expected on August 1, 2023. These recent awards demonstrate HUD's confidence in HACLA.

The Section 8 Department is handling a very large volume of applicants and participants. Recognizing its continuing growth and operational complexities, in June 2022 HACLA initiated, with the assistance of Guidehouse, Inc., a consulting firm, an organizational assessment of the Section 8 Department to identify opportunities for operational improvements and streamlining. Since then, HACLA has implemented some quick-wins, and is continuing to identify areas for future, systemic, long-term modernization.

HACLA responds below to the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of HACLA and defers to other agencies to respond to those findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under their control.

HOUSING VOUCHERS FOR LOW INCOME AND HOMELESS ANGELENOS

FINDINGS REGARDING HACLA

1. *HACLA's caseworkers handle many parts of servicing HCV and EHV applicants and holders; whereas LACDA's work flow for handling HCVs and EHVs uses specialized teams or departments.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding because, as set forth in HACLA's response to Recommendation 1.1 of this report below, HACLA uses a specialized team model.

2. *HACLA has difficulty recruiting and retaining employees for working on HCVs and especially the EHV temporary program.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding. During the COVID-19 pandemic HACLA experienced challenges in filling vacancies, especially for temporary work. Further details are provided in HACLA's response to Recommendation 1.2 of this report below.

3. *HACLA caseworkers sometimes do not give meaningful and prompt replies to inquiries from applicants, tenants and landlords.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding and is working to improve overall customer service across the agency. HACLA's Director of the Section 8 Department has met with staff in that department and reminded them of the importance of providing meaningful customer service. HACLA recently updated the staff performance evaluation tool, which includes a performance indicator related to customer service.

4. *HCV applicants and EHV homeless referrals must complete a "byzantine housing application process" and provide extensive documentation, not only of their income, but also identification and verification of citizenship, typically a birth certificate.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding. The voucher programs are federally funded and have federal requirements which HACLA must adhere to. For years, HACLA has advocated for changes to the programs that will reduce barriers to access. Recently, in March 2023, HACLA submitted a waiver request

to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to waive many of the burdensome application requirements for people experiencing homelessness. On July 18, 2023 and August 14, 2023, HACLA received a response from HUD providing limited approval of four of the eight waiver requests for a one year period. HACLA will continue its advocacy for streamlining program requirements. HACLA is working with Guidehouse to streamline the application process and paperwork required as well.

5. *When HACLA clients reach the point of getting selected to apply for and receive Section 8 vouchers, they are given a very limited period of time in which to complete the complex application and assemble the required documentation.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding. HACLA is required to comply with the federal requirement to issue vouchers within a specified time period.

6. *Holders of HCVs and EHVs navigate a difficult rental market and are given 180 days to find landlords who will accept their vouchers.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. The City of Los Angeles has a difficult rental market with a vacancy rate of less than 3%. Although all voucher holders are usually provided with 180 days to find housing, HACLA modified its policy allowing up to 365 days for EHV participants. HACLA is currently evaluating this policy and will soon make appropriate adjustments to ensure that voucher holders have adequate time but not defer the housing search. HACLA is now providing services to voucher holders from a professional housing location/relocation company in order to assist participants in locating housing as soon as possible.

7. *Many HCVs/EHVs go unused because initial inspections and necessary re-inspections are not done in a timely manner.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. This finding is vague and the Civil Grand Jury did not identify any evidence supporting this finding. Additional information is provided within HACLA's response to Recommendation 1.9 of this report below.

8. *Despite HACLA's landlord outreach and incentive programs, many landlords remain reluctant to accept tenants using HCVs and EHVs.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding. HACLA is working with Mayor Bass to roll out a communication campaign that will encourage more landlords to accept tenants using vouchers.

9. *The Cecil Hotel in downtown Los Angeles and other SROs have large numbers of vacancies despite readiness and availability to accept HCV and EHV applicants.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA agrees that the Cecil Hotel may have available rental units. However, voucher holders, not HACLA, choose the property and community they live in. HACLA is prohibited by HUD from steering voucher holders to a specific property.

10. *HACLA's low Unit Utilization Rate can be attributed in part to HACLA's conservative strategy of issuing no more EHVs than allocated it by HUD.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. The Civil Grand Jury did not provide evidence that additional issuance of vouchers could increase or expedite utilization. Additional information is provided

in HACLA's response to Recommendation 1.10 of this report below.

11. *Many landlords and tenants, and even quite a few HACLA employees are unaware that FEHA prevents landlords from discriminating against tenants who plan to pay rent using government provided vouchers.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. Many landlords and tenants may be unaware that FEHA prevents landlords from discriminating against tenants who plan to pay rent using government provided vouchers. However, HACLA disagrees with the vague finding that "quite a few HACLA employees" are unaware of this. It appears the Civil Grand Jury interviewed approximately *four* voucher department employees in preparing its report. HACLA provides annual trainings for its staff, conducts bi-monthly landlord orientations, and issues regular reminders via newsletters and forms to both voucher holders and landlords regarding this subject. HACLA will continue to issue information and guidance to all stakeholders.

12. *Although FEHA prevents landlords from discriminating against applicants and tenants who plan to pay rent using government provided vouchers, HACLA, and the Los Angeles City Attorney do little to enforce this law, and referrals for enforcement are seldom made.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA agrees that some landlords discriminate against voucher holders in violation of the FEHA, but HACLA is not responsible for enforcing the FEHA, nor does it have the authority to do so. When HACLA becomes aware of alleged FEHA violations, it refers those matters to the Housing Rights Center. Additionally, HACLA welcomes enforcement by the City Attorney or other agencies, and we plan to meet with the City Attorney's Office to discuss whether they may be able to assist in this regard.

FINDINGS RELATED TO MULTIPLE AGENCIES

20. *Having HACLA and LACDA performing the same tasks is an unnecessary duplication of effort and results in confusion and numerous inefficiencies.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. Each public housing authority is responsible for administering its own program and complying with federal regulations. Each public housing authority operates within the limits of specific jurisdictions authorized by HUD.

21. *LACDA has had considerably better results than HACLA in issuing vouchers and moving applicants into homes.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. This oversimplified comparison ignores the reality that LACDA and HACLA operate in different jurisdictions, serve different populations, encounter different challenges, and have different histories. For instance, while this finding is vague as to which voucher program it is referring to, if the reference is to the EHV program, the LACDA began issuing vouchers before HACLA because it already had an established team that transitioned from an expiring program to the new EHV program. HACLA had to hire and train new staff during the COVID-19 pandemic.

22. *HACLA's and LACDA's Section 8 HCV and EHV programs could be combined into one agency by agreement among the Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles City Council and Mayor, HACLA, and LACDA. Already, numerous cities contract with LACDA to manage Section 8 programs.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. Each public housing authority is responsible for administering its own program and complying with federal regulations. Each public housing authority operates within the limits of specific jurisdictions authorized by HUD.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HACLA

1.1 HACLA should consider adopting LACDA's workflows for handling HCVs and EHVs, using specialized teams.

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA already operates in a specialized team model. Staff are responsible for handling specialized tasks such as reviewing applications, conducting housing quality standards inspections, reviewing leases, preparing housing assistance contracts, etc.

1.2 HACLA *should consider using temporary workers to perform routine tasks and process paperwork that involve little or not client interface. When hiring, it should also explore recruiting non-traditional employees, such as retired people.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA is already using temporary employees. With the support of its bargaining units, HACLA has been utilizing temporary workers to assist with various tasks related to issuing vouchers and preparing housing assistance contracts for the past year. Permanent employees are selected through a certified list of candidates who apply through an open and competitive recruitment. HACLA retirees receiving a public employees retirement benefit must comply with the employment restrictions set forth in their retirement plan. Nevertheless, all members of the public who believe they meet the minimum requirements are welcomed to apply.

In an effort to further expedite housing, as of February 2023, HACLA is also utilizing a third-party industry administrator, Nan McKay & Associates, to assist with preparing housing contracts for EHV and project-based voucher holders.

1.3 HACLA should develop methods to assure that inquiries and complaints regarding Section 8 vouchers get meaningful responses within two business days.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. This is already HACLA's internal response time requirement, whether a question or inquiry comes into the customer contact center or directly by phone or email to a staff person in any unit, including EHV and HCV. Supervisors continuously reinforce this requirement with their staffs and monitor its adherence, taking corrective actions as appropriate. Efforts to ensure full staffing in all units contributes to improvement in this crucial metric.

1.4 HACLA's Section 8 application forms and instructions should be shortened and simplified.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. As noted, HACLA is working with consultant Guidehouse and has already identified this as an area of improvement. The collaboration is in the process of shortening and simplifying Section 8 application forms and instructions while still meeting HUD regulations.

1.5 HACLA should give applicants forms and instructions, along with appropriate assistance, in time so that the applications can be ready for filing and review at the earliest possible times well before their names come up for vouchers.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HUD requires that all application income verifications forms and documents be current within 60 days of voucher issuance. To meet this requirement, applicants are provided application packets with adequate advance notice to complete them timely with assistance available from Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) supported case managers for special program applicants and HACLA staff for Section 8 waitlist applicants.

1.6 HACLA should partner or leverage outside housing specialists to assist clients in navigating the complex process of applying for Section 8 vouchers.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. Applicants are already connected with case workers assigned by LAHSA. They are responsible for providing wraparound services which include assistance with completing voucher applications, obtaining required identity and income documents, housing navigation and search, and facilitating move-ins. To further supplement this effort, HACLA now has an internal housing support specialist team and in June contracted with OPC/TranSystems, a relocation expert, to provide housing search assistance.

1.7 HACLA should schedule inspections at the earliest possible time when it appears that they will be necessary, even if applications and other details have not been completed.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HUD requires that the proposed rental unit be inspected within 60 calendar days of the contract date. For this reason, potential rental units cannot be pre-inspected if the owner has not completed a Request for Tenancy Approval for a unit that the tenant has selected. However, HACLA has adjusted its internal process to negotiate the rent immediately upon receipt of the Request for Tenancy Approval, prior to the inspection rather than after, to reduce delays and more efficiently process the work. Prior to this change made in April, rent discussion with the owner took place after the unit was inspected by the inspections team. Many times, the inspection was fruitless because the owner was not in agreement with the rent offer. Or, an additional inspection was warranted to validate additional information provided by the owner, such as additional amenities. Delays in scheduling inspections are generally due to the owner or property manager indicating that unit has not been made ready for a new tenant, the units is not vacant or utilities have not been turned on. Approximately 50% of units fail their first-time inspection because deficiencies are identified in the unit.

1.8 HACLA should creatively use HUD service fees as landlord incentives, including housing search assistance, application fees, utility hook-ups charges, security deposit assistance and a landlord mitigation fund.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA already provides several landlord incentives to help facilitate the utilization of vouchers for people experiencing homelessness; these incentives are virtually the same as those offered by the LACDA. For EHV applicants, HACLA pays landlords a $2,500 signing on bonus, provides security deposit assistance and up to $5,000 in unit repairs. Funds for paying these incentives are covered with service fees received from HUD. Landlords

willing to house an HCV client experiencing homelessness, are also eligible to receive similar incentives which are paid with Los Angeles County Measure H funds. Additional information is available on HACLA's website at hacla.org and attached to this response. See Attachments 1 and 2. These incentives have been offered since inception of the EHV program in 2021, and with passing of the County of Los Angeles Measure H in 2017.

To further supplement this effort in the EHV program, in June HACLA contracted with TranSystems Corp., formerly known as Overland, Pacific, and Cutler, a professional housing relocation firm, to provide housing search assistance. HACLA has hired designated housing support specialists to also facilitate housing search assistance. These efforts supplement the work of a real estate broker that HACLA has contracted with since the beginning of the EHV program that does outreach to landlords to secure property listings for applicants.

1.9 HACLA should arrange to have many units in a SRO building inspected at one time, so that several units can be leased without inspectors duplicating efforts and making numerous separate trips to the site.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. As noted in 1.7 above, HUD requires that the proposed rental unit be inspected within 60 calendar days of the contract date. For this reason, potential rental units cannot be pre-inspected if the voucher holder and owner have not completed a Request for Tenancy Approval for a unit that the tenant has selected. HACLA attempts to group inspections in the same building wherever possible, but inspecting units that applicants have not selected or may never select is not an efficient use of inspection resources.

1.10 HACLA should consider implementing LACDA's more aggressive method of over-issuing EHV vouchers.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. Although HACLA received 3,365 EHVs, it has issued 4,516 in anticipation that not all voucher holders will be successful. HACLA is closely monitoring the success rate of voucher holders and will issue more vouchers as needed. It is a balancing act to issue the appropriate number of vouchers so that the full allocation is utilized while avoiding:

- over-saturation and competition among all voucher holders (as well as renters without vouchers) for the same affordable units; and
- the problem of overissuing vouchers that later need to be rescinded due to full utilization of the allocation or insufficient funding, as has happened with other housing authorities.

HACLA's responsible approach is in line with HUD's expectations.

1.11 HACLA should provide easy to read and understand written information about FEHA's antidiscrimination provisions to landlords and tenants, and should schedule seminars and/or webinars to educate the public on this topic.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA already provides every voucher holder and landlord with easy to read and understand information about FEHA anti-discrimination provisions, including local Source of Income ordinances. Information is also provided in landlord and tenant newsletters and on HACLA's website. HACLA provides this information to landlords during HACLA landlord orientation sessions and in partnership with LAHD in their landlord information

sessions as well.

1.12 HACLA supervisors and caseworkers should be taught about FEHA and related local ordinances and should be trained on how and when to make referrals to the City Attorney or the HRC.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA staff are already trained on FEHA and related local ordinances at least annually with additional training offered on a bi-monthly basis and assist clients with completing the federal forms. Staff have also been instructed on how to make referrals to HRC regarding local Source of Income discrimination, as HRC is the agency contracted by the City of Los Angeles for Source of Income discrimination enforcement. As noted previously, HACLA welcomes additional enforcement by the City Attorney or other enforcement agencies, and HACLA plans to discuss whether any such assistance may be available later this calendar year.

RECOMMENDATION FOR MORE THAN ONE AGENCY

1.20 HACLA's and LACDA's HCV and EHV programs should be administered by one agency by agreement among the Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles City Council and Mayor, HACLA, and LACDA. This will eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort and expense, enable Los Angeles residents to use an agency with a demonstrated excellent track record and promote efficiency.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted and is not reasonable. As detailed in the Background section of this response, HACLA has a demonstrated excellent track record as noted by its high performer rating by HUD, near full utilization of budgeted resources; extraordinary leasing efforts this year and continued award of new resources by HUD. As with all PHAS, HACLA administers its program and complies with all federal regulations within its significant jurisdiction as authorized by HUD in an effective manner. HACLA and LACDA collaborate, share best practices, and, more importantly, share one common goal – to end homelessness in Los Angeles.

LACK OF HOUSING THE SOCIAL INJUSTICE OF THE 21ST CENTURY

FINDINGS REGARDING HACLA

1. *EHV voucher funding will end in the fall of 2023.*

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. Funding for EHV is not ending in 2023 and leasing of EHV will continue beyond 2023 for any public housing authority who has available vouchers as clarified in HUD's PIH Notice 2023-14 issued on June 29, 2023.

2. *Units are often left empty, waiting for a tenant, because a potential tenant is not document ready to occupy the unit.*

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA agrees with this finding to the extent that it refers to units tied to a Permanent Supportive Housing Project-Based Voucher. HACLA is working closely with the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority and the Los Angeles Housing Department to improve the method and timeline for matching individuals and families to HACLA's units.

7. *HACLA does not inspect potential voucher funded units in a timely manner.*

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. HACLA inspects a unit only after a voucher holder

has submitted a request for tenancy approval to HACLA and the owner has agreed to consider tenancy. Because HUD requires HACLA to inspect a unit within 60 days of the contact date, inspections cannot be conducted too far in advance. Furthermore, it is not the best use of staff resources to inspect a unit that may never get selected by a voucher holder.

20. The total allotment for HUD vouchers for the City is 58,000 per year. These vouchers are all allocated.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA's total allocation of vouchers is 57,985. At this time HACLA is expending the 98% of the annual funds made available by HUD to make rental payments.

21. Many landlords violate the antidiscrimination law regarding renting to potential voucher holders.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA believes that some, not necessarily many, landlords may violate antidiscrimination law, but does not have evidence on this point.

24. There are 10,000 people with vouchers in the City who have been unable to find housing.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. There are approximately 3,100 voucher holders looking for housing at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1.7 HACLA must implement procedures to inspect potential voucher funded units in a timely manner.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report and will continue to implement procedures to inspect properties in a timely manner. The average time period from receiving an inspection request to scheduling the inspection is three days, with shortest being one day and longest being 12 days. The primary reason for a delay is the inability to reach the owner or property manager to schedule the inspection. The average time from scheduling an inspection to conducting the inspection is four days, with the shortest being two days and the longest being 14 days. The primary reason is for any delay is that the property has not been made ready for a new tenant (the unit is not vacant, housekeeping and maintenance is required, utilities are not turned on, etc.). Almost 50% of units must be re-inspected to correct deficiencies cited in the initial inspection.

HACLA conducts over 60,000 inspections every calendar year – a huge undertaking for any organization. As stated above, HACLA is pursuing technological improvements for scheduling and communicating with property owners and managers.

Closing Statement

HACLA recognizes that all public entities, including HACLA, can and should improve their delivery of services. People experiencing homelessness face many housing barriers, including discrimination, in a challenging Los Angeles rental market of low vacancies and high rents. HACLA leadership wishes to express its sincere appreciation to HACLA staff for their tireless dedication and to property owners for supporting the agency's mission to preserve, enhance, and expand deeply affordable housing opportunities that improve the quality of life for all Angelenos.

Sincerely,

Cielo Castro
Chairperson, Board of Commissioners

Doug Guthrie
President and CEO

Attachments 1 and 2

KAREN BASS
MAYOR

October 6, 2023

Samantha P. Jessner
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Housing Vouchers For Low Income and Homeless Angelenos
Report by the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

Dear Honorable Judge Samantha P. Jessner:

The City of Los Angeles acknowledges receipt of the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report regarding Housing Vouchers for Low-Income and Homeless Angelenos, its findings and recommendations. The City respectfully submits Attachment A as the City's formal response.

For additional questions or comments, your staff may contact Jenna Hornstock, Deputy Mayor of Housing, at jenna.hornstock@lacity.org.

KAREN BASS
Mayor

PAUL KREKORIAN
City Council President

CITY OF LOS ANGELES RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Subject: 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Recommendations For:
Housing Vouchers For Low Income and Homeless Angelenos

Recommendation 1.20 HACLA's and LACDA's HCV and EHV programs should be administered by one agency by agreement among the Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles City Council and Mayor, HACLA, and LACDA. This will eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort and expense, enable Los Angeles residents to use an agency with a demonstrated excellent track record and promote efficiency. This recommendation relates to Findings 20, 21, and 22, and each of them.

The City shares the interest of the Grand Jury in seeing that all Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) and Emergency Housing Voucher (EHV) programs be administered as effectively and efficiently as possible. The City finds that, while good intentioned, the Grand Jury's recommendation that these programs be administered by one agency, specifically, the Los Angeles County Development Authority, appears to be based on an incomplete analysis that did not consider a number of factors. The analysis does not take into account recent steps that HACLA has taken to better ensure that EHVs are processed more quickly and fully utilized prior to September 2023. This response is in two parts: (1) A summary of the actions not included in the Civil Grand Jury's analysis and (2) A brief review of the Grand Jury's analysis and findings, which led to their recommendation. Note that HACLA's response provides more detail on the report.

Actions that HACLA has taken to expedite issuance and placement of EHVs
Ensuring that HACLA's EHVs are allocated and that recipients are placed in housing is a priority for the City. In response to discussions with the City, HACLA has:

- In February 2023, contracted with Nan McKay and Associates, an experienced voucher program administrator, to assist with processing the lease up PBV (and EHV) units. They will complete the entire leasing process for clients from referral receipt to contract execution, supplementing existing staff to reduce processing timelines. HACLA has brought on 17 contract staff positions through this process;
- Created a team of Housing Support Specialists. This team will support voucher holders by connecting them to available rental units before the voucher expires. HACLA has hired 4 team members and is seeking two more. Specifically, the HSS team will:
    - Provide rental search assistance.
    - Conduct telephonic banking (and email).
    - Provide information related to and process requests for voucher extensions, when appropriate.
    - Supplement the efforts of HACLA's brokerage firm Gray Rose by conducting landlord outreach and provide cash incentive information and other benefits associated with leasing to a voucher holder.
- Contracted with OPC -Overland, Pacific & Cutler, LLC for professional housing locator services. This is an experienced housing relocation and locator vendor

already doing business in our community. The contract will assist approximately 1,900 voucher holders. OPC's work will include:

- Rental search assistance.
- Locate and expand available rental listings in the Housing Authority's jurisdiction.
- Provide individual and/or group coaching sessions on presentation and interview techniques to prepare for landlord screening.
- Provide assistance with completing rental applications.
- Provide transportation services for referred voucher/certificate holders, individually or in groups.
- Expedite the leasing process by assisting landlords with the completion and submittal of Requests for Tenancy Approval Forms (RFTA) to HACLA
- Support partner agencies holding housing fairs

Beyond the EHV process, HACLA has been working with an outside consulting firm, Guidehouse Inc, to do a systems analysis of its operations to identify ways to improve The processes. They have done similar work with the New York City Housing Authority.

The Civil Grand Jury Analysis

- The analysis is based on a limited number of interviews and conversations and appears not to address all of the input HACLA provided to the Grand Jury, in particular recent developments in their work to more efficiently place vouchers.
- The analysis is focused on the Emergency Housing Voucher program which is a one-time program, and the analysis does not address the Housing Choice Voucher Program. The recommendation appears to conflate these programs and recommend one entity take over these programs.
- The analysis does not directly address, nor do the findings and recommendations take into account, the difference in the number of vouchers and people served by the County versus the City of Los Angeles. This is alluded to in the report showing that the City has 3,365 EHVs and the County only 1,964 but it is not discussed. Nor does the analysis discuss the relative number of HCVs each entity processes.
- The analysis finds nearly identical challenges for both HACLA and LACDA. The two main differences in the Grand Jury's findings are that (1) LACDA's work flow is team based and HACLA's is more individualized and (2) LACDA overcommitted its EHV which caused better utilization rates. However there are issues with the depth of exploration in these findings:
  - HACLA has clarified that the analysis of the Grand Jury is incorrect and HACLA does in fact have specialized teams assigned to manage the voucher process
  - HACLA's utilization rate for vouchers was inaccurate as of the date of the report, and HACLA has instituted other measures to increase utilization which are discussed in another section of this response. As of July 21, HACLA has placed 2,325 families with EHVs, out of 3,365 total, a utilization rate of 69%.
  - HACLA did overissue its EHVs and expects to use 100% of the EHVs by the end of calendar year 2023

- The Grand Jury cites that HACLA returned funding; however, it was not HCV nor EHV funding returned but Continuum of Care (COC) funding, a wholly different program that has its own set of implementation challenges for a host of housing authorities. This fact should not have any bearing on the final recommendation and it should be noted that LACDA also returned COC funding.
- The findings note that LACDA, like HACLA, has challenges finding and retaining staff. Yet there is no discussion of how merging the two programs would impact staffing at LACDA nor how LACDA could absorb the excess work with the staffing challenges it faces; the recommendation is to move a program that requires significantly more capacity to a program with less staffing and the same challenge hiring staffing.

LACDA
Los Angeles County Development Authority

July 20, 2023

TO: Each Supervisor

FROM: Emilio Salas, Executive Director

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO THE 2022-2023 LA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached please find the response prepared by the Los Angeles County Development Authority to the findings of the 2022-2023 LA County Civil Grand Jury Final Report. Specifically, the agency's response addresses the findings found in the Housing Vouchers for Low-Income and Homeless Angelenos section of the Final Report.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (626) 586-1505.

Attachment

c: Cheri Thomas, Senior Manager, Chief Executive Office

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (LACDA)

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
HOUSING VOUCHERS FOR LOW-INCOME AND HOMELESS ANGELENOS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.13
LACDA should explore recruiting temporary workers to perform routine tasks and process paperwork that involve little or no client interface. It should also explore hiring non-traditional employees such as retired people.

RESPONSE
LACDA disagrees with this finding. This recommendation has been implemented and has been part of the agency's current practice.

If the recommendation intended to state that LACDA should hire individuals working for temporary agencies to fill some of its regular positions, this is already current practice. Individuals hired through temporary agencies often acquire experience and program knowledge making them strong candidates to fill regular positions within the agency. However, if the recommendation intended to state that LACDA should hire temporary workers only for lower level jobs that involve little or no client interface, LACDA disagrees with this recommendation and will not implement it. The agency uses temporary workers to fill a temporary need not based on the complexity of the assignment.

With respect to the hiring of non-traditional employees such as retired people, the agency's current practice is to explore the hiring of non-traditional employees including retired people and public housing residents.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.14
LACDA's Section 8 application forms and instructions should be shortened and simplified.

RESPONSE
LACDA agrees partially with this finding. This recommendation has been implemented to the extent possible under Federal regulations.

The agency aims to simplify the application process for applicants wherever possible. For example, LACDA has streamlined its annual recertifications, income, and asset forms, such that participants with a fixed income only need to provide these documents every three (3) years. Additionally, the creation of the agency's online Rent Café Portal has made it easier for participants to complete their annual certification or to submit income changes.

However, the Section 8 program is a Federally-funded program with requirements set forth by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to which the agency must adhere. As a result, there are limits to the number of documents and processes that LACDA is able to shorten or simplify, and therefore, LACDA cannot fully implement this recommendation. It should be noted that LACDA has fiercely advocated for changes to the Section 8 program that will reduce barriers to access as evidenced by the agency's recent waiver requests and Federal advocacy efforts that specifically asked legislators to make changes to simplify the application and eligibility determination process, as well as to the HUD Secretary to waive burdensome processes that are within their jurisdiction to approve.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.15
LACDA should give applicants forms and instructions, along with appropriate assistance, in time so that the applications can be ready for filing and review at the earliest possible time, well before their names come up for vouchers.

RESPONSE
LACDA disagrees with this finding. This recommendation will not be implemented.

This recommendation reflects the lack of understanding of the CGJ in regard to Federal program requirements. Federal regulations require that applicants have current documentation such as income verification forms, not older than 60 days, at the time of voucher issuance. Providing applicants with forms months in advance would nullify the process. Moreover, oftentimes an applicant's circumstance may change from the time their name is placed on the waiting list to the time their name comes up for a voucher, requiring a modification in the application. In addition, reissuing paper applications would be costly for the agency. As such, LACDA cannot implement this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.16
LACDA should partner or leverage outside housing specialists to assist clients in navigating the complex process of applying for Section 8 vouchers.

RESPONSE
LACDA disagrees with this finding. This recommendation has been implemented and has been part of the agency's current practice.

The agency's current practice is to work with outside case managers from a number of community-based organizations with whom it partners, as well as with internal Housing Navigators, who provide wrap-around services including assistance with completing voucher applications, obtaining required identity and income documents, housing navigation and search, and facilitating move-ins.

It is unfortunate that the CGJ did not confirm the agency's current practice prior to making this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.17
LACDA should creatively use HUD service fees as landlord incentives, including housing search assistance, application fees, utility hook-up charges, security deposit assistance, and landlord mitigation fund.

RESPONSE
LACDA disagrees with this finding. This recommendation has been implemented and has been part of the agency's current practice.

If the recommendation intended to reference the Emergency Housing Voucher (EHV) program, current practice is for LACDA to utilize HUD service fees for landlord incentives including housing search assistance, application fees, utility hookup charges, security deposit assistance, and a landlord mitigation fund. If the recommendation intended to reference the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program, the CGJ should have been aware that HUD does not provide special service fees for the Section 8 program for this use. However, the agency utilizes local County funding to fill this gap and provide these landlord incentives and has done so for the past eight years. In either instance, the agency is using funding creatively to provide this type of assistance and as such, current practice incorporates this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.18
LACDA should provide easy to read and understand written information about FEHA's anti-discrimination provisions to landlords and tenants and should schedule seminars and/or webinars to educate the public on this topic.

RESPONSE
LACDA disagrees with this finding. This recommendation has been implemented and has been part of the agency's current practice.

The agency's current practice is to provide easy to read and understand written information about the Fair Employment and Housing Act's (FEHA) anti-discrimination provisions to landlords and tenants; the agency also schedules seminars and webinars to educate the public on this topic. For example, LACDA contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) to provide tenant/owner workshops and includes notices in its monthly newsletters to tenants. The agency also provides HUD's fair housing form in all voucher packets; these forms are also available in the agency's lobbies. Additionally, LACDA refers applicants to the Housing Resource Center and Legal Aid, as needed. Finally, during the height of the pandemic, in partnership with the County's Chief Executive Office, Homeless Initiative (CEO-HI) staff, the agency convened monthly "COVID Tenant Protections" and "COVID Rental Property Owner" roundtable meetings in alternate months, with the County's Department of Consumer and Business Affairs staff present at all meetings to inform participants about COVID-19 Tenant Protections and the Stay Housed LA resource. As such, current practice incorporates this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.19
LACDA caseworkers and supervisors should be taught about FEHA and related local ordinances and should be trained on how and when to make referrals to the Los Angeles County Counsel or to HRC.

RESPONSE
LACDA agrees partially with this finding. This recommendation has been partially implemented as part of the agency's current practice and will be fully implemented in the future.

The agency's current practice is to provide annual training to both caseworkers and supervisors on Fair Housing, which is ongoing as the agency is notified of updates. As such, current practice incorporates this recommendation.

With respect to training for caseworkers and supervisors on how and when to make referrals to the Los Angeles County Counsel or to HRC, LACDA has provided training for caseworkers to make referrals to the HRC. In fact, LACDA provides funding to the HRC specifically to provide source of income discrimination information to both landlords and tenants and to follow up accordingly with landlords that are found to be in violation of this statute. To the extent that the Civil Grand Jury spoke to individuals who stated they were unaware of these protocols, then it is imperative upon LACDA to ensure training efforts are bolstered. As such, LACDA will increase its efforts to provide this ongoing training.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.20
HACLA's and LACDA's HCV and EHV programs should be administered by one agency by agreement among the BOS, the Los Angeles City Council and Mayor, HACLA and LACDA. This will eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort and expense, enable Los Angeles residents to use an agency with a demonstrated excellent track record and promote efficiency. This recommendation relates to Findings 20, 21 and 22, and each of them.

RESPONSE
LACDA disagrees with this finding. This recommendation will not be implemented.

LACDA enjoys a close working relationship with the City of Los Angeles as well as the 17 other public housing agencies operating within the County. LACDA has taken a regional approach to align its policies and in the implementation of its programs. To that end, LACDA works very closely with these agencies; especially with the HACLA to address utilization, interagency Memorandum of Understanding agreements to streamline lease-up and reduce barriers to access, and the creation of a universal housing application. In fact, both LACDA and HACLA often attend landlord recruitment and education events together to demonstrate their collaborative relationship.

It is disheartening that the CGJ came to this conclusion without recognizing the level of coordination and collaboration that exists today between the two agencies. In fact, many of the landlord incentive programs that LACDA was credited for in this

report are also operational within HACLA and have been for many years. LACDA remains steadfast in its partnership and in its mutual aspirational goal to end homelessness within our City and County.

THE INMATE RECEPTION CENTER

An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, and the Justice System



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE-CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICE

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
THE INMATE RECEPTION CENTER (IRC)

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.1
The entire AJIS system must be replaced with a modern information system that utilizes data integration techniques. This will provide secure, fast, accurate, and complete information for the staff and managers, and provide fair and timely treatment for the inmates. Until the information system is modernized, the IRC will not be able to improve its performance significantly. All other improvements are dependent on putting in place a system that can interact with the similar systems of other relevant agencies, especially the Court.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. LASD is currently engaged with the AJIS vendor, Syscon Justice Systems, in a gap analysis exercise to validate that the latest version of their solution platform will be able to meet all business requirements. Pending completion in September 2023, LASD will notify the BOS of its intention to enter into sole source negotiations for a new agreement with the vendor for implementation of the modern replacement system.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.2
The County should develop an information system capable of receiving data and communications from the Court. It is imperative that these two systems communicate because a real time, interactive system will significantly decrease the time that inmates are held at the IRC.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. The intended modern AJIS platform will be capable of receiving data from the Court's new Tyler Technologies Odyssey system. Because Odyssey is currently projected to go-live this year (November), LASD should also work with the Courts on developing an application programming interface to allow information transfers from Odyssey to the current iteration of AJIS.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.3
Whether a new system is built in-house or contracted out, staff must be included in every step of the design, development, testing, and implementation. If staff needs are shortchanged, the project will suffer ongoing deficiencies, and the IRC will not see maximum improvement.

RESPONSE

Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. The project should be recognized as and prioritized by the LASD executives for the critical and significant undertaking that it is. A steering committee for AJIS modernization will be convened comprising all the relevant and impacted stakeholders in November when the Sheriff initiates the AJIS replacement project. Participation by both business and technical staff in all facets of this endeavor is key to achieving the desired outcomes.

County of Los Angeles
INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
1100 North Eastern Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90063

SELWYN HOLLINS
Director

Telephone: (323) 267-2101
FAX: (323) 264-7135

"Trusted Partner and Provider of Choice"

July 20, 2023

To: Cheri Thomas
Chief Executive Office

From: Selwyn Hollins
Director

2022 – 2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY RESPONSE

Attached is the response to the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report for the Inmate Reception Center recommendations 6.1, 6.2, 6.3. Internal Services Department collaborated with Sheriff's Department and the CEO-Chief Information Officer on the response.

If there are additional questions, please contact Mirian Avalos, General Manager of Information Technology Services at (323) 443-6305, via email: MSAvalos@isd.lacounty.gov.

SH:MO:MA:rk

Attachment

c: Sheriff's Department
CEO-Chief Information Officer

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
THE INMATE RECEPTION CENTER

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.1
The entire AJIS system must be replaced with a modern information system that utilizes data integration techniques. This will provide SECURE, fast, accurate, and complete information for the staff and managers, and provide fair and timely treatment for the inmates. Until the information system is modernized, the IRC will not be able to improve its performance significantly. All other improvements are dependent on putting in place a system that can interact with the similar systems of other relevant agencies, especially the Court.

RESPONSE
The Internal Services Department (ISD) agrees with this recommendation. This recommendation will not be implemented by ISD as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the LASD. ISD defers to the LASD response.

LASD is actively involved with a vendor to initiate the replacement of the legacy AJIS system. The objective is to implement a contemporary system that aligns with current needs and requirements. A response to the BOS is pending the completion of a gap analysis. That analysis is expected to conclude in September 2023.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.2

The County should develop an information system capable of receiving data and communications from the Court. It is imperative that these two systems communicate because a real time, interactive system will significantly decrease the time that inmates are held at the IRC.

RESPONSE
ISD agrees with this recommendation. This recommendation will not be implemented by ISD as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the LASD. ISD defers to the LASD's response. It is imperative for LASD to incorporate communication interfaces as part of the system requirements. Collaboratively working with the Court to establish essential communication interfaces for their upcoming Tyler Odyssey system, scheduled to go live in November 2023, is critical.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.3

Whether a new system is built in-house or contracted out, staff must be included in every step of the design, development, testing, and implementation. If staff needs are shortchanged, the project will suffer ongoing deficiencies, and the IRC will not see maximum improvement.

RESPONSE

ISD agrees with this recommendation. This recommendation will not be implemented by ISD as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the LASD. ISD defers to the LASD's response.

We recommend the formation of a project steering committee comprising key stakeholders from all business and technical sectors within the organization. Ensuring the participation of well-suited representatives at all organizational levels throughout each project phase will be instrumental in achieving success by effectively addressing business and technical requirements.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICFER FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
THE INMATE RECEPTION CENTER (IRC)

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.1
The entire Automated Justice Information System (AJIS) system must be replaced with a modern information system that utilizes data integration techniques. This will provide SECURE, fast, accurate, and complete information for the staff and managers, and provide fair and timely treatment for the inmates. Until the information system is modernized, the IRC will not be able to improve its performance significantly. All other improvements are dependent on putting in place a system that can interact with the similar systems of other relevant agencies, especially the Court.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented per the Chief Information Office's (CIO) response. The BOS defers to the CIO's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.2
The County should develop an information system capable of receiving data and communications from the Court. It is imperative that these two systems communicate because a real time, interactive system will significantly decrease the time that inmates are held at the Inmate Reception Center (IRC).

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented per the CIO's response. The BOS defers to the CIO's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.3
Whether a new system is built in-house or contracted out, staff must be included in every step of the design, development, testing, and implementation. If staff needs are shortchanged, the project will suffer ongoing deficiencies, and the IRC will not see maximum improvement.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented per the CIO's response. The BOS defers to the CIO's response for implementation details.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

HALL OF JUSTICE

ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF

August 7, 2023

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

Dear Supervisors:

RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORTS OF THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

Attached is the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Department) response to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Report (CGJ) recommendations. The CGJ's areas of interest specific to the Department included:

- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track (Attachment C)
- Have we M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Team and How They Work (Attachment D)
- Sheriff's Operations: An Erosion of Trust. Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Attachment E)
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, and the Justice System (Attachment F)

Should you have questions regarding our response, please contact Division Director Conrad Meredith, Administrative Services Division, at (213) 229-3310.

Sincerely,

R. Luna

ROBERT G. LUNA
SHERIFF

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
THE INMATE RECEPTION CENTER (IRC)

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.1
The entire AJIS system must be replaced with a modern information system that utilizes data integration techniques. This will provide SECURE, fast, accurate, and complete information for the staff and managers, and provide fair and timely treatment for the inmates. Until the information system is modernized, the IRC will not be able to improve its performance significantly. All other improvements are dependent on putting in place a system that can interact with the similar systems of other relevant agencies, especially the Court.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. On July 19, 2023, Data Systems Bureau (DSB) began working with "Syscon" in identifying the requirements of a new jail management platform.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.2
The County should develop an information system capable of receiving data and communications from the Court. It is imperative that these two systems communicate because a real time, interactive system will significantly decrease the time that inmates are held at the IRC.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. The courts will be implementing their new system (Odyssey) in early November 2023. It has been the plan of the Sheriff's DSB to be able to "link" the court's Odyssey system with the current AJIS system used by LASD. The plan is also for the new program being built by Syscon to communicate with the courts system. The anticipated implementation of the Syscon program is currently 24 months.

Rutherford provisions allow LASD to release newly remanded inmates on fractional time credits. If IRC had knowledge of the arrivals sentence and credits these fractional credits could be applied with a nexus to the inmate's arrival. If the inmate did not have any medical or mental health concerns, they could be expedited to the Release Area. The current paper driven system does not allow for quick identification of these inmates.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.3

Whether a new system is built in-house or contracted out, staff must be included in every step of the design, development, testing, and implementation. If staff needs are shortchanged, the project will suffer ongoing deficiencies, and the IRC will not see maximum improvement.

RESPONSE

Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented. DSB's Director Scott Goodwin has identified subject matter experts within IRC and facilitated meetings with "Syscon." The meetings allowed "Syscon" to learn the current IRC process from the end user and inquire what shortcomings exist.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

HALL OF JUSTICE

ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF

July 21, 2023

The Honorable Samantha P. Jessner
Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, 13th Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Presiding Judge Jessner:

LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT ON THE INMATE RECEPTION CENTER

Thank you for providing a copy of the Civil Grand Jury report entitled: "The Inmate Reception Center an Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice Center." I thank the Civil Grand Jury for its work and dedication to public service, and their efforts in creating a meaningful report.

The Civil Grand Jury identified a significant issue in highlighting the overdue need to update the archaic technological system that currently exists in the Inmate Reception Center ("IRC"). The current system fails to address the needs of the Department, the inmates, and the justice system. Work proceeds so slowly that the system is referred to as the "Pony Express." The system inhibits the processing of newly arrived inmates and was, in part, responsible for recent litigation on delays in processing individuals at the IRC.

The Civil Grand Jury also correctly identified our reliance on the Automated Justice Information System ("AJIS') as outdated. While a project to upgrade our technology to modern standards will be costly, its cost is minimal compared to the expense involved with keeping the system in place. Thus, I concur that a modern robust information system is needed and is decades overdue. A modern jail management system would resolve many processing

issues and the associated delays identified by the Civil Grand Jury. I understand the challenges the Department faces in the IRC and am committed to technological advancements to assist in solving these systemic problems.

Should you have any questions, please contact Division Director Eileen Decker, Office of Constitutional Policing, at (213) 229-3096.

Sincerely,

R. Luna

ROBERT G. LUNA
SHERIFF

JUVENILE JUSTICE CYA



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
JUVENILE JUSTICE CYA

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
The Probation Department, in conjunction with the Department of Juvenile Justice and the BOS, shall develop a system for managing juvenile offenders which recognizes and facilitates the care and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2(a)
The leaking steam-vent issue at Central Juvenile Hall must be addressed immediately, as it constitutes a serious hazard to the incarcerated juveniles.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented during FY 2023-24. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2 (b)
The County must immediately begin substantial physical renovation of both the Central and Nidorf juvenile facilities to make those facilities acceptably habitable for youthful offenders.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2 (c)
The County must find some alternative facility in which to house juvenile offenders until such renovations can be achieved.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
Allotment of funds must be a top priority. An immediate large-scale financial investment in the juvenile justice system is required to provide adequate facilities and services for the juveniles detained.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented with existing resources. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
The Probation Department must institute or upgrade programs that encourage incarcerated juveniles to become aware, and to understand, that there are consequences for inappropriate behavior, whether in or out of detention facilities.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Probation officers and custody officers assigned to juvenile facilities must be provided with safety or protective gear to ensure their personal safety. The gear must be inventoried and restocked as appropriate.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation requires further analysis to determine appropriate personal safety gear options best suited for detention personnel. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
A new set of rules must be developed by the Probation Department that will provide consequences and accountability for juvenile offenders when they misbehave or act out, and that can be enforced without violating the rights of the juveniles.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7 (a)
The County must provide opportunities for juvenile offenders to be rehabilitated and educated while detained. These programs must include mandatory educational programs (up to high school graduation or GED level) and career training options.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7 (b)
Advanced educational programs, career training, enrichment programs (such as art and music), and physical activities should be provided and encouraged.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
Twenty-four-hour on-site counseling and mental health care, and on-going family reunification services, must be made available to juveniles detained at all juvenile halls and camps.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. The recommendation will not be implemented as mental health care is not provided 24/7 onsite.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9 (a)
Probation officers and staff members must be educated to treat even violence-prone juvenile offenders with respect and tolerance without putting anyone at risk of harm.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9 (b)
Violence-prone juvenile offenders must be educated/counseled to understand that accountability will be imposed and that there will be consequences for bad actions while detained.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10 (a)
Probation and custody officer staffing problems at juvenile facilities must be addressed and appropriate hiring implemented, along with increased training programs for new hires. This is a major issue.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10 (b)
Probation and custody officers must be trained to recognize emerging problems and to take appropriate actions to defuse potentially violent situations.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10 (c)
Counseling, mental health services, and wellness programs should be instituted for probation officers and staff members who are not coming in to work because of injuries, stress, and other management issues.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.11
Probation and custody officers must be given additional and ongoing training to enable them to handle juveniles who act up or act out with physical violence.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is being implemented. The BOS defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
JUVENILE JUSTICE CYA

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
The Probation Department, in conjunction with the Department of Juvenile Justice and the BOS shall develop a system for managing juvenile offenders which recognizes and facilitates the care and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2(a)
The leaking steam-vent issue at Central Juvenile Hall must be addressed immediately, as it constitutes a serious hazard to the incarcerated juveniles.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented during FY 2023-24. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2 (b)
The County must immediately begin substantial physical renovation of both the Central and Nidorf juvenile facilities to make those facilities acceptably habitable for youthful offenders.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2 (c)
The County must find some alternative facility in which to house juvenile offenders until such renovations can be achieved.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
Allotment of funds must be a top priority. An immediate large-scale financial investment in the juvenile justice system is required to provide adequate facilities and services for the juveniles detained.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented with existing resources. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
The Probation department must institute or upgrade programs that encourage incarcerated juveniles to become aware, and to understand that there are consequences for inappropriate behavior, whether in or out of detention facilities.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Probation officers and custody officers assigned to juvenile facilities must be provided with safety or protective gear to ensure their personal safety. The gear must be inventoried and restocked as appropriate.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation requires further analysis to determine appropriate personal safety gear options best suited for detention personnel. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
A new set of rules must be developed by the Probation Department that will provide consequences and accountability for juvenile offenders when they misbehave or act out, and that can be enforced without violating the rights of the juveniles.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7 (a)
The County must provide opportunities for juvenile offenders to be rehabilitated and educated while detained. These programs must include mandatory educational programs (up to high school graduation or GED level) and career training options.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7 (b)
Advanced educational programs, career training, enrichment programs (such as art and music), and physical activities should be provided and encouraged.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
Twenty-four-hour on-site counseling and mental health care, and on-going family reunification services, must be made available to juveniles detained at all juvenile halls and camps.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. The recommendation will not be implemented as mental health care is not provided 24/7 onsite.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9 (a)
Probation officers and staff members must be educated to treat even violence-prone juvenile offenders with respect and tolerance without putting anyone at risk of harm.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9 (b)
Violence-prone juvenile offenders must be educated/counseled to understand that accountability will be imposed and that there will be consequences for bad actions while detained.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10 (a)
Probation and custody officer staffing problems at juvenile facilities must be addressed and appropriate hiring implemented, along with increased training programs for new hires. This is a major issue.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10 (b)
Probation and custody officers must be trained to recognize emerging problems and to take appropriate actions to defuse potentially violent situations.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10 (c)
Counseling, mental health services, and wellness programs should be instituted for probation officers and staff members who are not coming in to work because of injuries, stress, and other management issues.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.11
Probation and custody officers must be given additional and ongoing training to enable them to handle juveniles who act up or act out with physical violence.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is being implemented. The CEO defers to the Probation Department's response for further information on the implementation.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

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

Guillermo Viera Rosa
Interim Chief Probation Officer

July 24, 2023

TO: Fesia Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Guillermo Viera Rosa
Interim Chief Probation Officer

SUBJECT: PROBATION RESPONSES TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORTS: AGING OUT TRANSITIONAL AGED YOUTH AND JUVENILE JUSTICE CYA

The 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) convened committees to address two issues affecting system-involved youth. The first committee report addressed systemic factors contributing to homelessness of youth who age out of the foster care and Probation systems. Based upon their findings, the CGJ Aging Out Committee report identified specific recommendations for each department and entity that funds, supports, or provides direct services to system involved transitional aged youth in Los Angeles County. The Probation responses to those recommendations are in Attachment A. The second committee report addressed Juvenile Justice issues affecting youth after the closure of the California Youth Authority (CYA), the creation of the Department of Juvenile Justice and its subsequent closure because of SB823. The Probation Department responses to the recommendations on juvenile justice are in Attachment B.

California Penal Code Sections 933(c) and 933.05 require a written response to all recommendations contained in this report. Responses by elected county officials and agency heads shall be made no later than sixty (60) days after the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury publishes its report and files with the Clerk of the Court. Responses by the governing body of public agencies shall be ninety (90) days after the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury publishes its reports and files with the Clerk of the Court. Responses shall be made in accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05 (a) and (b).

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
JUVENILE JUSTICE CYA

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
The Probation Department, in conjunction with the Department of Juvenile Justice and the BOS, shall develop a system for managing juvenile offenders which recognizes and facilitates the care and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Probation currently has a Behavioral Management Program (BMP). However, Probation is in the process of enhancing the BMP to align with industry standards and research best practices. The BMP manual is completed, and training materials are being finalized. Probation plans on implementing the newly enhanced BMP in September 2023.

The BMP is an integrated approach to behavior modification designed to effect positive behavioral change in a relatively short period of time. The BMP allows youth to earn points and privileges as they demonstrate skillful behavior in their daily activities and applies proportional consequences to decrease the likelihood of negative behavior. The focus and activities in the halls are geared towards personal growth and youth development. Each aspect of the facility operation (mealtimes, school, recreation, programming, etc.), provides opportunities for staff to structure the environment, describe behaviors that they expect to see, and create opportunities for youth to demonstrate these behaviors and be recognized for them. The BMP includes progressive levels that allow staff and youth to see and measure growth. Youth earn access to greater independence, opportunities, and privileges as they demonstrate positive behavior throughout their stay in juvenile hall. Every interaction that occurs in the program is viewed as an opportunity to work with youth and to support staff to create an environment that encourages positive behavior, discourages inappropriate behavior, and where new skills are taught and modeled for youth.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2 (a)
The leaking steam-vent issue at Central Juvenile Hall must be addressed immediately, as it constitutes a serious hazard to the incarcerated juveniles.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented during FY 2023-24. Probation continues a collaborative partnership with the DPW, the DHS, and USC University Hospital to address the steam leaks and the challenges those leaks produce. This collaboration has involved site walk-throughs and discussions of various options for routing and replacement of the aged pipe system and various mechanical

components. A collaborative decision was made to pursue the best solution; the solution designs and associated cost estimates will solidify during FY 2023-24. These estimates include timeframes for an anticipated competitive solicitation, approvals needed from the BOS, permitting, and construction.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2 (b)
The County must immediately begin substantial physical renovation of both the Central and Nidorf juvenile facilities to make those facilities acceptably habitable for youthful offenders.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been partially implemented as the renovation is currently ongoing. The County has allocated funds to make substantial physical renovations to both Central and Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Halls. The County contracted an architectural firm to conduct a study and make recommendations on improving the structures. The recommended renovations are underway to make the necessary upgrades to the dilapidated buildings, as well as, to transform the living units into a homelike environment, create outdoor spaces, and transform the facility to be consistent with the goals of Youth Justice Reimagined.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2 (c)
The County must find some alternative facility in which to house juvenile offenders until such renovations can be achieved.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The County invested the necessary resources to ensure an alternate facility was renovated and approved by the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) to ensure it met the Title 15 minimum standards for local detention facilities. Prejudicated juvenile offenders are being relocated to the newly reopened Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall which had been closed since 2017. This was accomplished through a collaborative effort among Probation, the DPW, ISD, consultants, and contractors working around the clock to prepare Los Padrinos to house all pre-adjudicated youth by July 23, 2023.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
Allotment of funds must be a top priority. An immediate large-scale financial investment in the juvenile justice system is required to provide adequate facilities and services for the juveniles detained.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented with existing resources. The County has invested in the juvenile justice system by allotting targeted funds to update, renovate and redesign probation facilities. The goal is to create a "home like" environment with healing and rehabilitative spaces, as prescribed in Youth Justice Reimagined. In addition, Probation has committed funding for programs and services which will be administered through Probation, the Department of Youth Development, other county departments, and contracted community-based

organizations. Probation is currently developing a comprehensive program and recreation plan for the pre-adjudicated youth, and the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council – Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant (JJCC-JJRBG) Subcommittee will develop the program and services plan for the Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF) population.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
The Probation department must institute or upgrade programs that encourage incarcerated juveniles to become aware, and to understand, that there are consequences for inappropriate behavior, whether in or out of detention facilities.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Probation is committed to implementing programs that are evidenced-based, in which research supports the identified intervention and has positive outcomes for youth. There are programs and services currently offered in the juvenile halls by Probation, other county departments, and contracted community-based organizations; however, Probation is developing a comprehensive program and recreation plan for the juvenile institutions which will encourage youth to be aware and understand there are consequences for inappropriate behavior. These programs will support and be integrated into the established BMP. In addition, Credible Messengers that are embedded in the halls, will support staff and reinforce the view that there are consequences for inappropriate behavior.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
Probation officers and custody officers assigned to juvenile facilities must be provided with safety or protective gear to ensure their personal safety. The gear must be inventoried and restocked as appropriate.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented upon further research on protective gear options for detention personnel. Probation is eliminating the use of Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) Spray (pepper spray) which was a tool used to control, restrain, or subdue imminent or actual violent behavior by the youth if such behavior presented a clear danger. It was not used for punishment, retaliation or for disciplinary purposes. Given the elimination of OC Spray, Probation is researching alternatives and other tools that can be used when a detention staff is confronted with violent youth offenders. Because safety and security are paramount and OC Spray is not an option, Probation is exploring the use of "stab vests" for Detention Services Officers and other Probation staff who work directly with the youth. Probation expects to complete its research and procure safety or protective gear during FY 2023–24.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
A new set of rules must be developed by the Probation Department that will provide consequences and accountability for juvenile offenders when they misbehave or act out, and that can be enforced without violating the rights of the juveniles.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. As previously noted, Probation has a BMP that is being enhanced to ensure consequences and accountability are clearly articulated. The California Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement (Cal DOJ MOU) requires the Monitoring Team to approve the BMP to ensure it contained the components consistent with evidence-based practices and did not violate youths' rights. The enhanced BMP was approved by the Monitoring Team as required by the Cal DOJ MOU. In addition, youth are provided information on their rights during their orientation and there are Youth Rights posters throughout the facility.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7 (a)
The County must provide opportunities for juvenile offenders to be rehabilitated and educated while detained. These programs must include mandatory educational programs (up to high school graduation or GED level) and career training options.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) provides a comprehensive education program that builds students' academic skills through courses where they can earn the credits required for a high school diploma. Students are provided with school counseling and transition supports. Qualifying students may also prepare for and earn a high school equivalency certificate through the HiSet examination.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7 (b)
Advanced educational programs, career training, enrichment programs (such as art and music), and physical activities should be provided and encouraged.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Probation youth who have earned a high school diploma or GED are provided with advanced educational and career training opportunities, including taking college courses, earning a Cal-OSHA certificate, or participating in Probation's youth employment program. Regarding physical activities, youth receive at least one hour daily of recreation time and are encouraged to engage in physical activities.

Probation operates the nation's largest college program in a juvenile justice setting. This year-round program provides students in juvenile halls and camps with an opportunity to earn transferable college credits while in Probation's care. Students are provided with the necessary tools to succeed in the program including textbooks, access to technology and academic support. Our largest post-secondary partner is the Los Angeles Mission College. We also offer college courses in collaboration with East Los Angeles College, Trade Tech, and University of California

Los Angeles (UCLA). The Cal-OSHA certification involves completing a 10-hour OSHA course in a variety of career fields. These courses are designed to improve workplace safety, compliance, and risk management. With the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO), Probation youth who have earned a high school diploma or GED have an opportunity to gain valuable work experience and earn a paycheck through Probation's Youth Employment Program. Students in the program participate in paid Personal Enrichment Training where they learn valuable employment and financial literacy skills.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
Twenty-four-hour on-site counseling and mental health care, and on-going family reunification services, must be made available to juveniles detained at all juvenile halls and camps.

RESPONSE
Partially agree as not all services are provided 24/7 onsite. This recommendation has been partially implemented. Probation staff are available 24 hours a day onsite to counsel youth and provide ongoing family reunification services such as facilitating telephone calls, family visits and supporting family reunification efforts identified in the youth's individualized treatment plans. DMH provides on-site clinicians at each facility from 6:00 am to 10:00 pm, during the youth's waking hours. After hours, a licensed mental health care provider is available by telephone for staff to consult with and/or assess for a psychiatric hold.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9 (a)
Probation officers and staff members must be educated to treat even violence-prone juvenile offenders with respect and tolerance without putting anyone at risk of harm.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Probation staff receive training covering a variety of topics addressing how to work with violent prone juvenile offenders and to treat them with respect and tolerance without putting anyone at risk of harm. Probation employees receive training on, including but not limited to de-escalation, physical intervention, trauma informed care, and motivational interviewing techniques.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9 (b)
Violence-prone juvenile offenders must be educated/counseled to understand that accountability will be imposed and that there will be consequences for bad actions while detained.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. As previously noted, Probation is developing a BMP that encompasses educating detained youth on accountability and consequences for violent and inappropriate behavior. In addition, Probation is utilizing Credible Messengers to educate and counsel youth. Credible Messengers are defined as natural leaders who have successfully navigated their own prior involvement in the justice system, share similar life experiences with the current justice involved youth, and are poised to have a transformative impact. Their objectives include to promote youth development and healing, support and strengthen all facility staff through co-training and collaboration to ensure safety and security within a facility and increase the efficacy of overall practices and programming. Credible Messengers will receive the BMP training to further reinforce the recommendation of educating and counseling youth that accountability will be imposed and there will be consequences for bad actions while detained.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10 (a)
Probation and custody officer staffing problems at juvenile facilities must be addressed and appropriate hiring implemented, along with increased training programs for new hires. This is a major issue.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. The staffing problems are being addressed through a myriad of approaches which include aggressive recruitment efforts, providing monetary incentives for sworn staff not currently assigned to the juvenile halls to work overtime in the halls, conducting in person door knocks to encourage staff to return to work, and mandatory deployments. Training is essential for the proper care and custody of our youth and for everyone's overall safety. As such, Probation's Training Center adjusted its training of new hires to better prepare them for the job and to improve retention. New hires are now being integrated into the halls during their academy training; Academy cadets are trained not only at the Probation Training Center, but they receive training at the halls themselves, spending time on a unit and shadowing existing staff, while being exposed to real life situations they can present to the trainers for additional learning opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10 (b)
Probation and custody officers must be trained to recognize emerging problems and to take appropriate actions to defuse potentially violent situations.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Probation provides training to detention staff on active supervision, de-escalation, and physical intervention techniques. These trainings provide the skills to observe and identify problematic behaviors, how to prevent the escalation of the negative behavior, and how to physically intervene to stop the behavior. Probation recognizes the need for more

robust self-defense training since the elimination of OC Spray; more self-defense techniques will be incorporated into the physical intervention trainings in the next training year.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10 (c)
Counseling, mental health services, and wellness programs should be instituted for probation officers and staff members who are not coming in to work because of injuries, stress, and other management issues.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. Probation provides referrals to support services to staff members who are not coming to work because of injuries, stress, and other management or personal issues. These wellness programs include a Peer Support program developed and managed by Probation, the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) administered by the County's Department of Human Resources, and Probation Support Services (PSS), and Probation's own contract for therapeutic support services. These wellness programs are not only available to employees not coming to work, but any employee needing counseling, mental health, or a wellness program have access to these options.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.11
Probation and custody officers must be given additional and ongoing training to enable them to handle juveniles who act up or act out with physical violence.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is being implemented. Probation recognizes the changing population of youth being detained; they are entering with higher risk factors and having higher needs. In addition, the Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF) youth need a higher level of care. During FY 2023 -2024 Probation is enhancing its training on de-escalation strategies and physical intervention techniques and will be expanding training on self-defense techniques to address this population.

LACK OF HOUSING

The Social Injustice of the 21st Century



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

KAREN BASS
MAYOR

October 6, 2023

Samantha P. Jessner
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
Report by the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

Dear Honorable Judge Samantha P. Jessner:

The City of Los Angeles acknowledges receipt of the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report regarding Lack of Housing, its findings and recommendation. The City respectfully submits Attachment A as the City's formal response.

For additional questions or comments, your staff may contact Jenna Hornstock, Deputy Mayor of Housing, at jenna.hornstock@lacity.org.

Karen Bass

KAREN BASS
Mayor

Paul Krekorian

PAUL KREKORIAN
City Council President

CITY OF LOS ANGELES RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Subject: 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Recommendations For:
Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century

Recommendation 1.1 Going forward, the city and county should ensure subsidy funding for EHV vouchers.
The city agrees in principle, but this finding requires further study. The city aims to ensure that ongoing demand for housing vouchers is met, however it does not have the funds available to directly finance all required operating subsidies. The city continues to lobby state and federal entities to continue or create ongoing funding for housing vouchers, and to ensure that the number of allocated vouchers matches demand. The United to House LA Measure passed in 2022 allocates funding for both rental assistance and operating assistance, and once fully implemented can provide assistance directly to renters meeting certain criteria, and to projects to subsidize operations and services for affordable housing. However Measure ULA is currently facing legal challenges, and these funds cannot be fully implemented until the challenges have concluded. The city is also researching alternative financing mechanisms to housing vouchers, in order to maximize the impact of limited subsidies.

In addition, as clarified in HUD's PIH Notice 2023-14 issued on June 29, 2023, funding for EHV is not ending in 2023 and leasing of EHV will continue beyond 2023 for any public housing authority who has available vouchers.

Recommendation 1.4 The city should appoint an independent commission to review and approve new housing construction throughout the city.
The city has conducted extensive research on ways the city should review and approve new housing construction, and this research has demonstrated that establishing additional commissions as part of the review and approval process can hinder housing production, and lead to increased production timeframes and inflated costs. The city is working through various efforts to make more development available through a by-right approval, which will streamline housing construction and have a more meaningful impact on housing production.

Recommendation 1.5 The city and county should find other ways of funding PSH.
This recommendation is currently being implemented by the city. The city has been actively analyzing and advocating for alternative ways of funding permanent supportive housing. In 2022 city voters passed the United to House LA Measure, which is estimated to raise roughly $672 million annually. While the ballot measure placed restrictions on uses for the funds, some of the revenue could be available to fund the construction of PSH units. The city is also actively lobbying for more county, state, and federal funding for affordable housing, including PSH, and the city regularly explores other options with partners at the county level, such as the newly formed special district LACAHSA (Los Angeles County Affordable Housing Solutions Agency). However one challenge with PSH

units is that they typically require deep subsidies for operations in order to fund necessary wrap-around services, along with capital funds for construction. This typically requires long term, ongoing, and committed funding, and a lack of adequate committed funding can jeopardize a project's long term feasibility and ability to continue providing residents with necessary services. Project Based Vouchers, which are administered by the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) have generally filled this role of ongoing operating subsidy, but there are a limited number of PBVs available left. The City has launched an effort, working with LAHD and HACLA, to size the need for operating subsidies and identify funding sources to ensure that more PSH units can have the funding needed for operation. Projects within the city can also apply and compete for programs administered through the County, such as No Place Like Home funds, the County's Affordable Housing Program Budget Funds, as well as other time limited funding programs such as ARP funds, as well as state funds through programs such as the Homekey Program.

Recommendation 1.6 The City and County must streamline the land acquisition process by removing unnecessary restrictions.
It is our understanding that the land acquisition process is not hampered through restrictions such as existing zoning and other regulations, and is more strongly affected by increased acquisition costs. Land values within the city are historically high, and this can impact housing production through increased development costs. The city is implementing initiatives to streamline the development process and enable more by-right development approvals, which will have a more significant impact on housing production. Note that streamlining restrictions and creating by-right zoning can cause land values to *increase* because these efforts make it easier to develop and/or allow for more development. To ensure that this additional value created is captured by the City, the City is working to ensure that upzoning and streamlining requires the inclusion of affordable housing in projects that benefit from these significant value adds.

Recommendation 1.8 The city should use available parking lots to provide a safe space to shelter people living in cars or RV's, including restrooms and trash removal
The city is currently working to implement this finding, and is researching ways to expand it to more areas. The City is in the process of evaluating sites' suitability for safe parking and RV storage, and these sites include a variety of City, County, and other public entity owned sites. There are a variety of factors that influence if city owned sites are suitable for interim housing, and the number of sites suitable for safe parking and RV storage will be significantly smaller than the total number of available parking lots or city owned sites. The City is also implementing through its Inside Safe initiative a comprehensive interim housing strategy to move unhoused individuals and families into interim housing, and eventually into permanent housing.

The approved Fiscal Year 23-24 budget allocated $3 million through the Unappropriated Balance for a pilot program for RV storage. This program will develop and implement a citywide strategy to place those experiencing homelessness from recreational vehicles into interim or permanent housing, provide them compensation to give the City their RVs

for storage and dismantlement, and to place them in permanent housing. The City Administrative Officer's homelessness team is the lead on implementing this effort.

Recommendation 1.9 The City and County should appoint someone whose responsibility is to sue violating landlords, possibly contracting with private attorneys

The City agrees with this finding in part. The Los Angeles Housing Department already coordinates with outside private attorneys, and refers source-of-income complaints to the Housing Rights Center, which is better equipped to investigate and litigate source-of-income discrimination. The City partners with HRC for a citywide fair housing program, which includes a wide range of anti-discrimination legal services. Along with investigative and potential litigative actions, HRC's services include legal and administrative referrals to state and federal fair housing agencies. The state has enacted its own ban on source-of-income discrimination, and state entities are better resourced to enforce these statutes.

Recommendation 1.10 The City should build the prescribed Housing Element Allotment units.

The city agrees in principle and is already working to implement what we believe is the intent of this recommendation. The City has been researching and implementing efforts that will remove barriers to producing more housing, to ensure that there is sufficient zoning capacity to meet the goals of the Housing Element. Program 121 RHNA Re-Zoning of the Housing Element requires City Planning to identify and recommend rezoning for a minimum of 124,880 moderate and above moderate income units, and a minimum of 130,533 lower income units by October 30, 2024. This rezoning will occur through updates to the City's 16 Community Plans, as well as citywide ordinances to create additional zoning capacity through expanding affordable housing incentive programs. The Department of City Planning has already launched the Citywide Rezoning program, which has seven components and will rezone for up to 250,000 new units.

The city as an entity does not build the units that are assigned to it under the Housing Element or the Regional Housing Needs Allocation nor is that the intent or direction of these State directives. These housing units are largely developed and constructed by private developers or nonprofit entities, and the scale of housing production is influenced by a number of factors. The city is undergoing multiple processes to enable and incentivize more housing production at various income levels, however the construction of these units will be conducted by these outside entities.

Recommendation 1.12 a The City should use these new laws to encourage development and conversion of underutilized and vacant commercial buildings into housing.

The city agrees with this finding and has already begun implementing it. The city has an existing Adaptive Reuse Ordinance, and is in the process of updating the ordinance to expand it citywide and create opportunities for adaptive reuse of commercial and office buildings into housing. Program 13 Adaptive Reuse of the City's Housing Element has the stated objective to implement revisions to the Citywide Adaptive Reuse Ordinance

and/or the Density Bonus Ordinance, to include incentives and provisions for adaptive reuse. This program aims to explore additional incentives to facilitate housing production and adaptive reuse projects, through expanding by-right processes, reduced minimum unit sizes, reduced parking standards, flexible building standards, and increased flexibility on the types of uses and locations that can be converted through adaptive reuse. State legislation such as SB 6 and AB 211 allows the conversion of underutilized and vacant commercial buildings into housing, and the city does not prohibit developing underutilized or vacant commercial buildings into housing, provided that the proposals meet NOFA guidelines and are competitive compared to other proposed projects.

Recommendation 1.13 The city should charge higher linkage fees.
The city adopted the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee Ordinance in 2017, and the fee amount was determined after considerable research, financial analysis and outreach, with the full fee amount in effect in 2019. This fee amount was determined after extensive research to determine how to balance between maximizing potential revenue for affordable housing while remaining sensitive to individual submarkets. The Nexus Study examined a variety of fee scenarios, and examined a range of fee levels to inform the optimum fee amount while not discouraging housing development through an excessively high fee. The Affordable Housing Linkage Fee adjusts annually for inflation, and every 5 years market areas and geographies are adjusted when necessary to reflect the most up to date market trends.

Recommendation 1.14 The City should facilitate alternate unit construction through various means such as loan guaranties and eliminating various entitlement and permitting obstacles.
The City is already implementing this recommendation. In March 2023 the Los Angeles Housing Department launched the Fast Track Solutions Loan program, which provided additional gap financing for projects with immediate funding shortfalls, to ensure construction could commence in time for various state and federal deadlines. The Fast Track Solutions Loan program has expended all of its available funding, however the initial Measure ULA programs will provide up to $56M in additional funding for a similar program. The City is also launching an effort to study alternative financing mechanisms, including a potential guarantee program focused on encouraging lenders to underwrite to the rent levels provided by Section 8 tenant choice vouchers which can dramatically expand the ability for housing developers to access needed capital and provide more affordable units.

Executive Directive 1 (ED1) expedites the entitlement and permitting process for 100% affordable housing developments that are consistent with the underlying zoning for a site. In its first 6 months 1,649 affordable units across 22 projects have secured approvals in an average of 37 days, a savings of at least 6 months. There are over 400 projects and 8,500 units in the ED1 pipeline. In June 2023, the City Council directed the Department of City Planning to develop an ordinance that would make ED1 permanent.

Recommendation 1.15 The City should eliminate or reduce the school tax for Mayor Bass's 100% affordable PSH.
This recommendation cannot be implemented by the City. The school tax refers to the Los Angeles Unified School District Developer Fee. The City neither sets nor determines the Fee for new construction of any project type. While the City has an agreement with LAUSD to collect developer fees before issuing any building permits, the City does not have the ability to eliminate or reduce the fee for any projects. The Developer Fee is an impact fee used to fund school facilities, and offset increased demand from family units. There is also a mechanism for 100% PSH projects to be exempt from the Developer Fee, as affordable housing projects are not required to pay the fee for any units that can be reasonably expected to have no school aged children in residence, such as studio or one-bedroom units. Per recent Point In Time Homeless Counts, the homeless population in Los Angeles largely consists of single adults, and units constructed for these individuals could seek an exemption through existing means.

Recommendation 1.16 Mayor Bass should extend her ED1 directive to include all affordable and low income housing.
The City partially agrees. The Mayor issued Executive Directive 1 (ED1), which expedites the entitlement and permitting process for 100% affordable housing developments that are consistent with the underlying zoning for a site. In its first 6 months 1,649 affordable units across 22 projects have secured approvals in an average of 37 days, a savings of at least 6 months. There are over 400 projects and 8,500 units in the ED1 pipeline. In June 2023, the City Council directed the Department of City Planning to develop an ordinance that would make ED1 permanent.

The Housing Accountability Act (SB330) already has strong provisions for ensuring that the City must approve any housing projects that meet the City's zoning and objective design standards. However in some instances it is prudent for a project, even an affordable housing project, to be subject to the required discretionary review and public hearing process. Streamlining must be applied with care.

Recommendation 1.17 The City should use the private capital group model for funding and construction of its 100% PSH.
The city agrees in principle with this finding. The City has been researching through ongoing efforts alternatives financing models for 100% PSH projects. However PSH units are developed and constructed by private and nonprofit developers, and each organization determines their own financing plans for their projects. The city has an ongoing effort through ED 3 to see if publicly owned sites within the City of Los Angeles can be developed with minimal public subsidies. Outside of this effort, the City does not have a mechanism to require PSH developers to use or forgo specific financing models for their projects. It should also be noted that these projects generally require ongoing operating subsidies to maintain adequate property management and reserves for which there has yet to be identified a private funding mechanism given that these units do not generate profits.

Recommendation 1.18 The City should avoid using tax credits for funding its 100% PSH construction
The city agrees in part with this finding. The City has been researching alternatives to the tax credit model for financing 100% PSH projects. However PSH units are developed and constructed by private and nonprofit developers, and each organization determines their own financing plans for their projects. The city has an ongoing effort through ED 3 to see if publicly owned sites within the City of Los Angeles can be developed with minimal or no public subsidies such as tax credits, by exploring alternative funding models. Outside of this effort, the City does not have a mechanism to require PSH developers to forgo the tax credit financing model.

Recommendation 1.19 No Recommendation.

Recommendation 1.20 There should be more voucher subsidies available to allow new permanent housing to be accessed by low income applicants.
The city agrees with this finding but it requires funding that currently is not available. The city aims to ensure that ongoing demand for housing vouchers is met, however it does not have the funds available to directly finance all required operating subsidies nor the demand for tenant based vouchers. The city continues to lobby state and federal entities to expand funding for housing vouchers, and to ensure that the number of allocated vouchers matches demand. The United to House LA Measure (ULA) passed in 2022 and allocates funding for both rental assistance and operating assistance, and once fully implemented can provide some assistance directly to renters meeting certain criteria, and to projects to subsidize operations and services for affordable housing. However Measure ULA is currently facing legal challenges.

Recommendation 1.21 The City and County should enforce the anti-discrimination laws against landlords.
The City agrees with this finding in part. The Los Angeles Housing Department already coordinates with outside private attorneys, and refers source-of-income complaints to the Housing Rights Center, which is better equipped to investigate and litigate source-of-income discrimination. The City partners with HRC for a citywide fair housing program, which includes a wide range of anti-discrimination legal services. Along with investigative and potential litigative actions, HRC's services include legal and administrative referrals to state and federal fair housing agencies. The state has enacted its own ban on source-of-income discrimination, and state entities are better resourced to enforce these statutes. The City has also adopted a Tenant Anti-Harassment Ordinance, which protects tenants from harassment from landlords. This program took effect August 6, 2021, and will receive expanded funding through Measure to House ULA, along with additional aid to notify tenants of their rights.

Recommendation 1.22 The City must allow funds to adequately provide for upkeep, repairs, additions and other necessary maintenance of repurposed properties into the future.
The City agrees with this finding in part. When City funding is part of a project, the City requires projects' financial proformas to demonstrate adequate asset management

reserves. The City is also working with stakeholders that own and operate permanent supportive housing to identify current needs for financing that will allow for adequate maintenance and repairs, as many of these properties have faced higher operational costs than anticipated and struggle with funding the needed repairs with rental income and operating subsidies available to them. However the City does not have a mechanism that can place maintenance reserve requirements on privately financed projects. Building upkeep, regular repairs, and other necessary maintenance is a responsibility of property owners and operators, and is funded through adequate operating and asset management reserves, which is typically raised in the initial development process and maintained throughout operations. The city operates a code enforcement team through the Housing Department that responds to complaints and issues related to building health. The Systematic Code Enforcement Program (SCEP) does regular inspections of rental units to ensure basic life safety and code compliance of privately owned units as well

Recommendation 1.23 The City must streamline the permitting process to enable the necessary repairs, additions and other necessary maintenance to proceed in a timely manner for the low income, repurposed properties.
The city agrees with this finding and has already begun implementing it. For properties that are repurposed for other uses, the Citywide Adaptive Reuse Ordinance, which is circulating for public comment, will streamline the permitting process for conversion of commercial properties to residential use. Through ED 1 and the efforts to codify ED 1 permanently, affordable housing projects can utilize expedited permitting and approvals.

Recommendation 1.24 LAHSA needs to provide adequate housing navigators to assist the 10,000 people currently holding vouchers find rental units.
LAHSA is a separate entity from the city. It is the city's understanding that LAHSA is hiring recruiters to support service providers to support a staffing caseload ratio of 1 to 20. The city's understanding is that LAHSA is also launching a series of Job Fairs and hiring events to support service providers in their hiring efforts, however LAHSA would require sufficient funding to support 166 Housing Navigators.

Recommendation 1.25 The computer program Build LA should be expanded to include all affordable and low income housing construction projects.
The city agrees with this finding and has already begun implementing it. Build LA is a wholesale revamping of the permitting system within LADBS, and will include all housing construction projects within the City of Los Angeles.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
LACK OF HOUSING. THE SOCIAL INJUSTICE OF THE 21ST CENTURY.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
Going forward, the City and County should ensure subsidy funding for Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV) vouchers.

- EHV voucher funding will end in the fall of 2023.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls outside of the County. The County agrees with the need to ensure subsidy funding for EHV vouchers; however, since the EHV is a federally funded program, the County is unable to ensure subsidy funding for EHV vouchers. It should be noted that funding for the EHVs won't end in the fall of 2023, but rather new participants cannot be added beyond the fall of 2023. Additionally, as part of the County's advocacy efforts, LACDA as well as the County of Los Angeles BOS meet with members of the County's Congressional delegation on an annual basis to advocate for continued and increased funding for programs addressing housing and homelessness, such as the EHV program. It is our hope that the Federal government will fold the EHV program into the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program prior to the sunset of the EHV program.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
The City and County should find other ways of funding PSH.

- Public construction of low-income, permanent supportive housing (PSH) is usually accomplished by leveraging the funds from several different sources.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. While PSH usually requires the leveraging of funds from several different sources, the City and County have identified new ways of funding PSH. Both the City and County provide subsidies for capital, rent, and supportive services for PSH utilizing various sources of funding. For example, the City recently found another way to fund PSH by passing Measure ULA, which is estimated to generate over $600M annually to fund subsidized housing development, housing acquisition and rehabilitation, rent assistance, and other housing- and homelessness-related purposes in the City of LA. In addition, the LACDA has recently issued Notices of Funding Availability for capital subsidy using one-time ARP funds, in addition to the County's annual allocation of Affordable Housing Program Budget Funds and the State's No Place Like Home funds. Further, the County has pursued funding for permanent supportive housing

development through the State's Homekey Program, which has awarded the County funds to develop more than 900 units, with additional proposals under consideration at this time. This funding, in combination with County funds, has enabled development of PSH with just two funding sources in most cases. Additionally, the L.A. County Affordable Housing Solutions Agency was recently formed to provide an additional facet of regional focus on creating more affordable housing, including PSH, throughout all of Los Angeles County (County).

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
The City and County must streamline the land acquisition process by removing unnecessary restrictions.

- Land acquisition is hampered by restrictive zoning and other obstructive regulations.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. In recent years, the County has passed numerous housing ordinances— Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance, Density Bonus Ordinance, By Right Housing Ordinance, Housing Preservation Ordinance, Interim and Supportive Housing Ordinance—to remove barriers to housing.

The Housing Element, adopted by the BOS, includes proposed and ongoing programs that reduce regulatory barriers and provide incentives for private development. In recent years, the County has made significant progress in improving its development review process and procedures, as well as modifying development standards to facilitate residential development. There remain additional opportunities to remove barriers from the Zoning Code to accommodate the changing housing needs for unincorporated LA County. Another barrier is the entitlement process itself, which the County has helped to streamline through ordinance amendments, organizational change, technology, and increased efficiencies in case processing.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
The City and County should appoint someone whose responsibility is to sue violating landlords, possibly contracting with private attorneys.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation requires further analysis.

On June 18, 2019, the BOS amended the County Code, Title 8 – Consumer Protection, Business and Wage Regulations Amendment Ordinance for adoption by repealing Chapter 8.58 entitled, "Mobilehome Park Tenant Protections," and adding Chapter 8.58 entitled, "Source of Income Protection," which prohibits discrimination

based on an individual's source of income with respect to residential rental properties in the unincorporated territory of the County, except those properties that are defined as exempt.

The County currently funds the Housing Rights Center (HRC) to provide information and assistance to renters on matters concerning renters' rights, including source of income discrimination. HRC will also follow up directly with violating property owners, by phone or through written correspondence in an attempt to gain compliance, similar to the other jurisdictions cited in the report.

Also, County Code Sections 8.52.130.B(6) provide Anti-Harassment protections to tenants if a landlord violates any law which prohibits discrimination based on source of income. In addition, Section 8.52.170 allows tenant, or any person or entity acting on behalf of the tenant, including the County, to bring a civil action and/or proceeding for violation of Chapter 8.52, for civil penalties, injunctive, declaratory and other equitable relief, restitution and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. There are similar provisions in Chapter 8.57.

Most recently, on July 11, 2023, the BOS asked County Counsel, in collaboration with the Department of Consumer and Business Affairs (DCBA), to report back within 10 months with a Right to Counsel ordinance for adoption to provide legal representation to eligible tenants. This ordinance would guarantee eligible tenants legal representation for unlawful detainer (eviction) lawsuits. (https://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/182295.pdf)

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.11
The County should build the prescribed Housing Element Allotment units.

- The County's Housing Element Allotment is to build 5,644 new units in the unincorporated areas of the County.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) as determined by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for unincorporated Los Angeles County for the 2021-2029 Housing Element is 90,052, of which 39,339 must be for low- and very low-income households. Under State housing element law, the Housing Element and its attendant RHNA does not require or assign responsibility to any jurisdiction for the delivery or construction of units; rather, the RHNA for unincorporated County is the number of housing units that the County is required to plan for through its zoning authority. As such, the County is not responsible for the construction of any housing units.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.12 (b)
The County should use these new laws to encourage development and conversion of underutilized and vacant commercial buildings into housing.

- The State has passed SB 6 and AB 211 that allows conversion of underutilized and vacant commercial buildings to be converted into housing.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. Both bills allow for residential development in mixed use and commercial areas, which is consistent with existing General Plan and zoning regulations in commercial and mixed-use zones in unincorporated LA County. In addition, the County is working on an adaptive reuse ordinance to identify additional incentives to encourage and streamline the adaptive reuse of underutilized and vacant commercial buildings into housing.

Additionally, the LACDA's Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) does not prohibit the development of affordable housing using alternative development methodologies as long as they meet the NOFA guidelines. As such, the conversion of underutilized and vacant commercial buildings would be well-received as other methodologies such as manufactured housing and motel conversions have already been eligible for our funding. Affordable housing developers are most knowledgeable and proactive in identifying emerging opportunities in acquisition, construction, and financing that are the most effective in addressing the development of affordable housing.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.19
No recommendation

RESPONSE
No response

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.20
There should be more voucher subsidies available to allow new permanent housing to be accessed by low-income applicants.

- The total allotment for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) vouchers for the City is 58,000 per year.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls to the federal government. Voucher subsidies that support new permanent housing are federally funded, as allotted by HUD to public housing agencies. The City and County of Los Angeles each receive a separate allocation. As part of the County's advocacy efforts, the LACDA as well as the BOS meet with members of the County's Congressional delegation on an annual basis, to advocate for continued and increased funding for programs addressing housing and homelessness, such as voucher subsidies.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.21
The City and County should enforce the anti-discrimination laws against landlords.

- Many landlords violate the antidiscrimination law regarding renting to potential voucher holders

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation requires further analysis.

On June 18, 2019, the BOS amended the County Code, Title 8 - Consumer Protection, Business and Wage Regulations Amendment Ordinance for adoption amending County Code, Title 8 - Consumer Protection, Business and Wage Regulations by repealing Chapter 8.58 entitled, "Mobilehome Park Tenant Protections," and adding Chapter 8.58 entitled, "Source of Income Protection," which prohibits discrimination based on an individual's source of income with respect to residential rental properties in the unincorporated territory of the County, except those properties that are defined as exempt.

The County currently funds the Housing Rights Center (HRC) to provide information and assistance to renters on matters concerning renters' rights, including source of income discrimination. HRC will also follow up directly with violating property owners, by phone or through written correspondence in an attempt to gain compliance, similar to the other jurisdictions cited in the report.

Also, County Code Sections 8.52.130.B(6) provide Anti-Harassment protections to tenants if a landlord violates any law which prohibits discrimination based on source of income. In addition, Section 8.52.170 allows tenant, or any person or entity acting on behalf of the tenant, including the County, to bring a civil action and/or proceeding for violation of Chapter 8.52, for civil penalties, injunctive, declaratory and other equitable relief, restitution and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. There are similar provisions in Chapter 8.57.

Most recently, on July 11, 2023, the BOS asked County Counsel, in collaboration with DCBA, to report back within 10 months with a Right to Counsel ordinance for adoption to provide legal representation to eligible tenants. This ordinance would provide eligible tenants legal representation for any private civil lawsuits. (https://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/182295.pdf)

707 Wilshire Blvd., 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Ph: 213 683.3333
Fax: 213 892.0093
TTY: 213 553.8488
www.lahsa.org

MEMO

To: Fesia A. Davenport, Chief of Los Angeles County

From: Dr. Valencia Adams Kellum, CEO

Date: July 28, 2023

CC: Dr. Holly Henderson, Director Risk Management; Nathaniel VerGow Deputy, Chief of Systems Officer; Rachel Johnson, Chief of Staff; Tifara Monroe, Deputy Chief/Sr. Advisor; Kristina Dixon Chief Financial Officer and Administrative Officer; Jeffrey Samson Deputy Chief Financial & Administration Officer

Re: LAHSAs response 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Letter

Attached are the responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Reports, Aging Out Youth and Lack of Housing recommendations.

Sincerely,

Va Lecia Adams Kellum

Dr. Va Lecia Adams Kellum
Chief Executive Officer

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
LACK OF HOUSING

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
LAHSA should have more than one document ready potential tenant for each unit, so that no units are left vacant waiting for qualified tenant.

RESPONSE
LAHSA agrees with recommendation No. 1.2 and is in the process of being implemented. LAHSA has implemented a new matching strategy for Project Based Units called batch matching. Batch matching is an innovative approach aimed at optimizing the utilization of available housing units by inviting eligible households to apply for PSH resources that allow them to be quickly matched and processed by the appropriate entities responsible to confirming client eligibility for a unit, followed by quick lease up/move-in support and connection to supportive services to achieve housing stability. It involves streamlining the process of matching potential clients with housing units by considering multiple eligible clients for each unit simultaneously. This strategy allows us to identify and assess a larger pool of candidates, thereby increasing the likelihood of filling vacancies promptly and efficiently.

Under the new Project Based Lease Up Model, 45 days prior to the anticipated Certificate of Occupancy, individuals who meet the eligibility and prioritization criteria for the property will receive notification regarding their potential eligibility for a unit at the specified property. They will be advised to promptly apply for the property, using our Universal Housing Application (UHA), for a potential match and application processing. The property management will process these applications in the order of their receipt, following the unit eligibility criteria, followed by a subsequent review and approval by the participating Public Housing Authority providing rental assistance for the property. If there are more approved applicants than available units in the building, the excess applicants will be placed on the property's waitlist. They will retain their eligibility for potential vacancies at the building throughout the lease-up process until 100% lease up is achieved. Additionally, they will remain eligible for consideration at other properties in the area, provided they meet project eligibility.

LAHSA continues to work with our partners such as DMH and DHS, as well as the Public Housing Authorities for both the City (HACLA) and County (LACDA) of Los Angeles, in efforts to adopt this model as an expansion for reducing vacancies within our projects which have turnover units as well. It is important to note that while batch matching offers significant advantages in reducing unit vacancies, it is not a one-size-fits-all solution. Certain factors, such as the availability of suitable

housing units, the preferences and choices of potential clients, and the unique circumstances of each individual, can influence the effectiveness of the batch matching process. The goal of batch matching is to efficiently utilize housing resources and reduce vacancy rates, while fostering community building and prioritizing client choice. These objectives collectively contribute to the effectiveness and success of PSH programs in providing stable housing and support services to individuals experiencing chronic homelessness.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
LAHSA must revise the VI-SPDAT system to make it fairer for all applicants.

RESPONSE
LAHSA agrees with recommendation No. 1.3, and plans to implement. As a result of concerns with the VI-SPDAT, LAHSA stopped using the VI-SPDAT in interim housing and rapid rehousing programs in July 2022.

LAHSA was not able to stop using the tool for PSH matching as it is not possible to assess vulnerability using case conferencing for such a large homeless population, thus making it necessary rely on an assessment tool to identify vulnerability and potential PSH need. In Spring 2023, LAHSA piloted using VI-SPDAT scores with only a minimum threshold, as opposed to in descending order, to reduce the impact of in equities VI-SPDAT scores on PSH referrals.

In June 2023, the Coordinated Entry System (CES) Triage Tool Research and Refinement (CESTTRR) team released their final report. Please see LAHSA's responses and next steps for each of the recommendations provided in the CESTTRR report.

Recommendation 1: Implement the shorter more concise version of the Revised Triage Tool based upon data science recommendations and vetting/rewording by the Community Advisory Board.

- LAHSA plans to implement the new revised tool; to implement, LAHSA will hire a consultant to create and implement a training curriculum that will support the execution of this recommendation.

Recommendation 2: Implement the Revised Triage Tool's embedded practices that incorporate race equity and a trauma-informed approach. In addition, the Revised Triage Tool: (a) should not be used as an intake, nor conducted at intake; (b) the Revised Triage should be read word for word to clients, until case managers are comfortable enough to make minor "off script" adjustments; (c) the tool should be administered in a private place whenever possible so as to maximize client comfort in answering personal questions.

- LAHSA plans to implement the new revised tool; to implement, LAHSA will hire a consultant to create and implement a training curriculum that will support the execution of this recommendation.

Recommendation 3: Use the new scoring system that is anchored in predicting "adverse events."

- LAHSA will implement the new score system, with support from system partners and the CES Policy council.

Recommendation 4: Prioritize persons scoring above a new threshold or higher on the new scoring system for permanent supportive housing.

- LAHSA will implement the new score system, with support from system partners and the CES Policy council.

Recommendation 5: Incorporate additional information with the new scoring system to determine how housing will be allocated (i.e., matching decision)

- LAHSA will implement the new score system, with support from system partners and the CES Policy council. Other factors will be included in prioritization as well.

LAHSA looks forward to implementing these changes to create a more equitable and fair housing system.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.24
LAHSA needs to provide adequate housing navigators to assist the 10,000 people currently holding vouchers find rental units.

RESPONSE
LAHSA agrees with recommendation No. 1.24 and is in the process of being implemented. LAHSA meets with SPA wide community non -profit partners monthly basis to review client level progress and housing connections to ensure 100 percent slots utilization and staffing capacity to carry out the role. Housing Navigation (HN) is offered from one Access Center per SPA to support those participants who do not utilize Interim Housing Resources. HN is offered from Interim Housing (IH) sites throughout the County to support all participants entering interim housing programs to access HN services. LAHSA Technical advisors train interim housing providers on document collection to expedite housing match and connection to HN.

LAHSA scheduled a HN Bootcamp for the first week of August to ensure service providers and staff can support their participants fully within the program parameters.

LAHSA is hiring recruiters to support service providers hire staffing to support a 1 to 20 caseload ratio. LAHSA is launching five Job Fairs to support service providers in their hiring efforts. These Job Fairs are SPA-wide and located throughout the County of Los Angeles. To support 10,000 people currently holding vouchers, there would need to be sufficient funding for 166 Housing Navigators.

In support of this expansive need in the Homeless Services System, LAHSA is creating an Emergency Housing Navigation team, located within the Multi-Department Crisis Response Team Department, that will be nimble and mobile to respond quickly to the needs of service providers while they hire staff. LAHSA also continues to pursue all funding opportunities to add additional funds to Housing Navigation Programs throughout the program year. In addition, LAHSA will continue to work with service providers to ensure there are ample Housing Navigation staff and support in place to provide services to participants.

HACLA

Build HOPE: Investing in People and Place

August 30, 2023

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, 13th Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Your Honor:

HACLA'S RESPONSE TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORTS:

- ***HOUSING VOUCHERS FOR LOW INCOME AND HOMELESS ANGELENOS*, and**
- ***LACK OF HOUSING: THE SOCIAL INJUSTICE OF THE 21ST CENTURY***

On June 21, 2023, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles ("HACLA"), received Pre-Release Reports from the 2022-2023 County of Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury (the "Civil Grand Jury"). On or about July 3, 2023, the Civil Grand Jury published its Final Report. HACLA's governing body and agency head are required to provide responses to the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under their control cited in both reports. *See* Pen. Code § 933(c). This letter constitutes the response of HACLA's Board of Commissioners and Chief Executive Officer to the reports entitled *Housing Vouchers for Low Income and Homeless Angelenos* and *Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century*.

Agency Background

HACLA was established in 1938 by the City of Los Angeles Resolution No. 1241. HACLA has grown to become the second largest and leading public housing authority in the nation, providing the largest supply of quality affordable housing to residents of the City. HACLA's annual budget is close to $2 billion and through various resources, including federally-funded public housing and vouchers, houses over 105,000 Angelenos.

HACLA administers nearly 60,000 rental assistance vouchers across multiple federal programs including the Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV), Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Vouchers (VASH), and more recently Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV). For the last 15 years HACLA's HCV program has been rated as a "High Performer" by the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) in its annual performance assessment. Additionally, HACLA's public housing program, with 6,393 public housing units, has been rated as a "High Performer" by HUD for 13 years. Through these programs along with its acquisition and development of affordable housing, HACLA is a principal player in providing much needed affordable housing in Los Angeles.

From January through June 2023, HACLA's Section 8 Department housed 2,733 new families and is on track to house 6,000 by the end the year. This is the largest number of new families HACLA has housed in a single year. Additionally, HACLA is utilizing 98% of the federal funds it receives for the HCV program. In July 2021, HACLA received 3,365 EHVs, the second largest allocation in the nation. As of the date of this response, 2,601 families have secured housing with an EHV. It has taken an immense effort and significant

resources to reach this milestone, and no other housing authority, except for the New York City Housing Authority, has reached this number. HACLA is on track to reach 100 percent utilization of these vouchers by year-end. In furtherance of Los Angeles' housing goals, HUD recently awarded HACLA 250 new VASH vouchers on June 1, 2023, and 377 new Stability Vouchers are expected on August 1, 2023. These recent awards demonstrate HUD's confidence in HACLA.

The Section 8 Department is handling a very large volume of applicants and participants. Recognizing its continuing growth and operational complexities, in June 2022 HACLA initiated, with the assistance of Guidehouse, Inc., a consulting firm, an organizational assessment of the Section 8 Department to identify opportunities for operational improvements and streamlining. Since then, HACLA has implemented some quick-wins, and is continuing to identify areas for future, systemic, long-term modernization.

HACLA responds below to the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of HACLA and defers to other agencies to respond to those findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under their control.

HOUSING VOUCHERS FOR LOW INCOME AND HOMELESS ANGELENOS

FINDINGS REGARDING HACLA

1. *HACLA's caseworkers handle many parts of servicing HCV and EHV applicants and holders; whereas LACDA's work flow for handling HCVs and EHVs uses specialized teams or departments.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding because, as set forth in HACLA's response to Recommendation 1.1 of this report below, HACLA uses a specialized team model.

2. *HACLA has difficulty recruiting and retaining employees for working on HCVs and especially the EHV temporary program.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding. During the COVID-19 pandemic HACLA experienced challenges in filling vacancies, especially for temporary work. Further details are provided in HACLA's response to Recommendation 1.2 of this report below.

3. *HACLA caseworkers sometimes do not give meaningful and prompt replies to inquiries from applicants, tenants and landlords.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding and is working to improve overall customer service across the agency. HACLA's Director of the Section 8 Department has met with staff in that department and reminded them of the importance of providing meaningful customer service. HACLA recently updated the staff performance evaluation tool, which includes a performance indicator related to customer service.

4. *HCV applicants and EHV homeless referrals must complete a "byzantine housing application process" and provide extensive documentation, not only of their income, but also identification and verification of citizenship, typically a birth certificate.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding. The voucher programs are federally funded and have federal requirements which HACLA must adhere to. For years, HACLA has advocated for changes to the programs that will reduce barriers to access. Recently, in March 2023, HACLA submitted a waiver request

to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to waive many of the burdensome application requirements for people experiencing homelessness. On July 18, 2023 and August 14, 2023, HACLA received a response from HUD providing limited approval of four of the eight waiver requests for a one year period. HACLA will continue its advocacy for streamlining program requirements. HACLA is working with Guidehouse to streamline the application process and paperwork required as well.

5. *When HACLA clients reach the point of getting selected to apply for and receive Section 8 vouchers, they are given a very limited period of time in which to complete the complex application and assemble the required documentation.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding. HACLA is required to comply with the federal requirement to issue vouchers within a specified time period.

6. *Holders of HCVs and EHVs navigate a difficult rental market and are given 180 days to find landlords who will accept their vouchers.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. The City of Los Angeles has a difficult rental market with a vacancy rate of less than 3%. Although all voucher holders are usually provided with 180 days to find housing, HACLA modified its policy allowing up to 365 days for EHV participants. HACLA is currently evaluating this policy and will soon make appropriate adjustments to ensure that voucher holders have adequate time but not defer the housing search. HACLA is now providing services to voucher holders from a professional housing location/relocation company in order to assist participants in locating housing as soon as possible.

7. *Many HCVs/EHVs go unused because initial inspections and necessary re-inspections are not done in a timely manner.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. This finding is vague and the Civil Grand Jury did not identify any evidence supporting this finding. Additional information is provided within HACLA's response to Recommendation 1.9 of this report below.

8. *Despite HACLA's landlord outreach and incentive programs, many landlords remain reluctant to accept tenants using HCVs and EHVs.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA agrees with this finding. HACLA is working with Mayor Bass to roll out a communication campaign that will encourage more landlords to accept tenants using vouchers.

9. *The Cecil Hotel in downtown Los Angeles and other SROs have large numbers of vacancies despite readiness and availability to accept HCV and EHV applicants.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA agrees that the Cecil Hotel may have available rental units. However, voucher holders, not HACLA, choose the property and community they live in. HACLA is prohibited by HUD from steering voucher holders to a specific property.

10. *HACLA's low Unit Utilization Rate can be attributed in part to HACLA's conservative strategy of issuing no more EHVs than allocated it by HUD.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. The Civil Grand Jury did not provide evidence that additional issuance of vouchers could increase or expedite utilization. Additional information is provided

in HACLA's response to Recommendation 1.10 of this report below.

11. *Many landlords and tenants, and even quite a few HACLA employees are unaware that FEHA prevents landlords from discriminating against tenants who plan to pay rent using government provided vouchers.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. Many landlords and tenants may be unaware that FEHA prevents landlords from discriminating against tenants who plan to pay rent using government provided vouchers. However, HACLA disagrees with the vague finding that "quite a few HACLA employees" are unaware of this. It appears the Civil Grand Jury interviewed approximately *four* voucher department employees in preparing its report. HACLA provides annual trainings for its staff, conducts bi-monthly landlord orientations, and issues regular reminders via newsletters and forms to both voucher holders and landlords regarding this subject. HACLA will continue to issue information and guidance to all stakeholders.

12. *Although FEHA prevents landlords from discriminating against applicants and tenants who plan to pay rent using government provided vouchers, HACLA, and the Los Angeles City Attorney do little to enforce this law, and referrals for enforcement are seldom made.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA agrees that some landlords discriminate against voucher holders in violation of the FEHA, but HACLA is not responsible for enforcing the FEHA, nor does it have the authority to do so. When HACLA becomes aware of alleged FEHA violations, it refers those matters to the Housing Rights Center. Additionally, HACLA welcomes enforcement by the City Attorney or other agencies, and we plan to meet with the City Attorney's Office to discuss whether they may be able to assist in this regard.

FINDINGS RELATED TO MULTIPLE AGENCIES

20. *Having HACLA and LACDA performing the same tasks is an unnecessary duplication of effort and results in confusion and numerous inefficiencies.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. Each public housing authority is responsible for administering its own program and complying with federal regulations. Each public housing authority operates within the limits of specific jurisdictions authorized by HUD.

21. *LACDA has had considerably better results than HACLA in issuing vouchers and moving applicants into homes.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. This oversimplified comparison ignores the reality that LACDA and HACLA operate in different jurisdictions, serve different populations, encounter different challenges, and have different histories. For instance, while this finding is vague as to which voucher program it is referring to, if the reference is to the EHV program, the LACDA began issuing vouchers before HACLA because it already had an established team that transitioned from an expiring program to the new EHV program. HACLA had to hire and train new staff during the COVID-19 pandemic.

22. *HACLA's and LACDA's Section 8 HCV and EHV programs could be combined into one agency by agreement among the Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles City Council and Mayor, HACLA, and LACDA. Already, numerous cities contract with LACDA to manage Section 8 programs.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. Each public housing authority is responsible for administering its own program and complying with federal regulations. Each public housing authority operates within the limits of specific jurisdictions authorized by HUD.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HACLA

1.1 HACLA should consider adopting LACDA's workflows for handling HCVs and EHVs, using specialized teams.

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA already operates in a specialized team model. Staff are responsible for handling specialized tasks such as reviewing applications, conducting housing quality standards inspections, reviewing leases, preparing housing assistance contracts, etc.

1.2 HACLA *should consider using temporary workers to perform routine tasks and process paperwork that involve little or not client interface. When hiring, it should also explore recruiting non-traditional employees, such as retired people.*

HACLA RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA is already using temporary employees. With the support of its bargaining units, HACLA has been utilizing temporary workers to assist with various tasks related to issuing vouchers and preparing housing assistance contracts for the past year. Permanent employees are selected through a certified list of candidates who apply through an open and competitive recruitment. HACLA retirees receiving a public employees retirement benefit must comply with the employment restrictions set forth in their retirement plan. Nevertheless, all members of the public who believe they meet the minimum requirements are welcomed to apply.

In an effort to further expedite housing, as of February 2023, HACLA is also utilizing a third-party industry administrator, Nan McKay & Associates, to assist with preparing housing contracts for EHV and project-based voucher holders.

1.3 HACLA should develop methods to assure that inquiries and complaints regarding Section 8 vouchers get meaningful responses within two business days.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. This is already HACLA's internal response time requirement, whether a question or inquiry comes into the customer contact center or directly by phone or email to a staff person in any unit, including EHV and HCV. Supervisors continuously reinforce this requirement with their staffs and monitor its adherence, taking corrective actions as appropriate. Efforts to ensure full staffing in all units contributes to improvement in this crucial metric.

1.4 HACLA's Section 8 application forms and instructions should be shortened and simplified.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. As noted, HACLA is working with consultant Guidehouse and has already identified this as an area of improvement. The collaboration is in the process of shortening and simplifying Section 8 application forms and instructions while still meeting HUD regulations.

1.5 HACLA should give applicants forms and instructions, along with appropriate assistance, in time so that the applications can be ready for filing and review at the earliest possible times well before their names come up for vouchers.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HUD requires that all application income verifications forms and documents be current within 60 days of voucher issuance. To meet this requirement, applicants are provided application packets with adequate advance notice to complete them timely with assistance available from Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) supported case managers for special program applicants and HACLA staff for Section 8 waitlist applicants.

1.6 HACLA should partner or leverage outside housing specialists to assist clients in navigating the complex process of applying for Section 8 vouchers.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. Applicants are already connected with case workers assigned by LAHSA. They are responsible for providing wraparound services which include assistance with completing voucher applications, obtaining required identity and income documents, housing navigation and search, and facilitating move-ins. To further supplement this effort, HACLA now has an internal housing support specialist team and in June contracted with OPC/TranSystems, a relocation expert, to provide housing search assistance.

1.7 HACLA should schedule inspections at the earliest possible time when it appears that they will be necessary, even if applications and other details have not been completed.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HUD requires that the proposed rental unit be inspected within 60 calendar days of the contract date. For this reason, potential rental units cannot be pre-inspected if the owner has not completed a Request for Tenancy Approval for a unit that the tenant has selected. However, HACLA has adjusted its internal process to negotiate the rent immediately upon receipt of the Request for Tenancy Approval, prior to the inspection rather than after, to reduce delays and more efficiently process the work. Prior to this change made in April, rent discussion with the owner took place after the unit was inspected by the inspections team. Many times, the inspection was fruitless because the owner was not in agreement with the rent offer. Or, an additional inspection was warranted to validate additional information provided by the owner, such as additional amenities. Delays in scheduling inspections are generally due to the owner or property manager indicating that unit has not been made ready for a new tenant, the units is not vacant or utilities have not been turned on. Approximately 50% of units fail their first-time inspection because deficiencies are identified in the unit.

1.8 HACLA should creatively use HUD service fees as landlord incentives, including housing search assistance, application fees, utility hook-ups charges, security deposit assistance and a landlord mitigation fund.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA already provides several landlord incentives to help facilitate the utilization of vouchers for people experiencing homelessness; these incentives are virtually the same as those offered by the LACDA. For EHV applicants, HACLA pays landlords a $2,500 signing on bonus, provides security deposit assistance and up to $5,000 in unit repairs. Funds for paying these incentives are covered with service fees received from HUD. Landlords

willing to house an HCV client experiencing homelessness, are also eligible to receive similar incentives which are paid with Los Angeles County Measure H funds. Additional information is available on HACLA's website at hacla.org and attached to this response. See Attachments 1 and 2. These incentives have been offered since inception of the EHV program in 2021, and with passing of the County of Los Angeles Measure H in 2017.

To further supplement this effort in the EHV program, in June HACLA contracted with TranSystems Corp., formerly known as Overland, Pacific, and Cutler, a professional housing relocation firm, to provide housing search assistance. HACLA has hired designated housing support specialists to also facilitate housing search assistance. These efforts supplement the work of a real estate broker that HACLA has contracted with since the beginning of the EHV program that does outreach to landlords to secure property listings for applicants.

1.9 HACLA should arrange to have many units in a SRO building inspected at one time, so that several units can be leased without inspectors duplicating efforts and making numerous separate trips to the site.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. As noted in 1.7 above, HUD requires that the proposed rental unit be inspected within 60 calendar days of the contract date. For this reason, potential rental units cannot be pre-inspected if the voucher holder and owner have not completed a Request for Tenancy Approval for a unit that the tenant has selected. HACLA attempts to group inspections in the same building wherever possible, but inspecting units that applicants have not selected or may never select is not an efficient use of inspection resources.

1.10 HACLA should consider implementing LACDA's more aggressive method of over-issuing EHV vouchers.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. Although HACLA received 3,365 EHVs, it has issued 4,516 in anticipation that not all voucher holders will be successful. HACLA is closely monitoring the success rate of voucher holders and will issue more vouchers as needed. It is a balancing act to issue the appropriate number of vouchers so that the full allocation is utilized while avoiding:

- over-saturation and competition among all voucher holders (as well as renters without vouchers) for the same affordable units; and
- the problem of overissuing vouchers that later need to be rescinded due to full utilization of the allocation or insufficient funding, as has happened with other housing authorities.

HACLA's responsible approach is in line with HUD's expectations.

1.11 HACLA should provide easy to read and understand written information about FEHA's antidiscrimination provisions to landlords and tenants, and should schedule seminars and/or webinars to educate the public on this topic.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA already provides every voucher holder and landlord with easy to read and understand information about FEHA anti-discrimination provisions, including local Source of Income ordinances. Information is also provided in landlord and tenant newsletters and on HACLA's website. HACLA provides this information to landlords during HACLA landlord orientation sessions and in partnership with LAHD in their landlord information

sessions as well.

1.12 HACLA supervisors and caseworkers should be taught about FEHA and related local ordinances and should be trained on how and when to make referrals to the City Attorney or the HRC.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report. HACLA staff are already trained on FEHA and related local ordinances at least annually with additional training offered on a bi-monthly basis and assist clients with completing the federal forms. Staff have also been instructed on how to make referrals to HRC regarding local Source of Income discrimination, as HRC is the agency contracted by the City of Los Angeles for Source of Income discrimination enforcement. As noted previously, HACLA welcomes additional enforcement by the City Attorney or other enforcement agencies, and HACLA plans to discuss whether any such assistance may be available later this calendar year.

RECOMMENDATION FOR MORE THAN ONE AGENCY

1.20 HACLA's and LACDA's HCV and EHV programs should be administered by one agency by agreement among the Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles City Council and Mayor, HACLA, and LACDA. This will eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort and expense, enable Los Angeles residents to use an agency with a demonstrated excellent track record and promote efficiency.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted and is not reasonable. As detailed in the Background section of this response, HACLA has a demonstrated excellent track record as noted by its high performer rating by HUD, near full utilization of budgeted resources; extraordinary leasing efforts this year and continued award of new resources by HUD. As with all PHAS, HACLA administers its program and complies with all federal regulations within its significant jurisdiction as authorized by HUD in an effective manner. HACLA and LACDA collaborate, share best practices, and, more importantly, share one common goal – to end homelessness in Los Angeles.

LACK OF HOUSING THE SOCIAL INJUSTICE OF THE 21ST CENTURY

FINDINGS REGARDING HACLA

1. *EHV voucher funding will end in the fall of 2023.*

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. Funding for EHV is not ending in 2023 and leasing of EHV will continue beyond 2023 for any public housing authority who has available vouchers as clarified in HUD's PIH Notice 2023-14 issued on June 29, 2023.

2. *Units are often left empty, waiting for a tenant, because a potential tenant is not document ready to occupy the unit.*

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA agrees with this finding to the extent that it refers to units tied to a Permanent Supportive Housing Project-Based Voucher. HACLA is working closely with the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority and the Los Angeles Housing Department to improve the method and timeline for matching individuals and families to HACLA's units.

7. *HACLA does not inspect potential voucher funded units in a timely manner.*

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. HACLA inspects a unit only after a voucher holder

has submitted a request for tenancy approval to HACLA and the owner has agreed to consider tenancy. Because HUD requires HACLA to inspect a unit within 60 days of the contact date, inspections cannot be conducted too far in advance. Furthermore, it is not the best use of staff resources to inspect a unit that may never get selected by a voucher holder.

20. The total allotment for HUD vouchers for the City is 58,000 per year. These vouchers are all allocated.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA's total allocation of vouchers is 57,985. At this time HACLA is expending the 98% of the annual funds made available by HUD to make rental payments.

21. Many landlords violate the antidiscrimination law regarding renting to potential voucher holders.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA partially agrees with this finding. HACLA believes that some, not necessarily many, landlords may violate antidiscrimination law, but does not have evidence on this point.

24. There are 10,000 people with vouchers in the City who have been unable to find housing.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA disagrees with this finding. There are approximately 3,100 voucher holders looking for housing at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1.7 HACLA must implement procedures to inspect potential voucher funded units in a timely manner.

HACLA'S RESPONSE – HACLA implemented this recommendation prior to this report and will continue to implement procedures to inspect properties in a timely manner. The average time period from receiving an inspection request to scheduling the inspection is three days, with shortest being one day and longest being 12 days. The primary reason for a delay is the inability to reach the owner or property manager to schedule the inspection. The average time from scheduling an inspection to conducting the inspection is four days, with the shortest being two days and the longest being 14 days. The primary reason is for any delay is that the property has not been made ready for a new tenant (the unit is not vacant, housekeeping and maintenance is required, utilities are not turned on, etc.). Almost 50% of units must be re-inspected to correct deficiencies cited in the initial inspection.

HACLA conducts over 60,000 inspections every calendar year – a huge undertaking for any organization. As stated above, HACLA is pursuing technological improvements for scheduling and communicating with property owners and managers.

Closing Statement

HACLA recognizes that all public entities, including HACLA, can and should improve their delivery of services. People experiencing homelessness face many housing barriers, including discrimination, in a challenging Los Angeles rental market of low vacancies and high rents. HACLA leadership wishes to express its sincere appreciation to HACLA staff for their tireless dedication and to property owners for supporting the agency's mission to preserve, enhance, and expand deeply affordable housing opportunities that improve the quality of life for all Angelenos.

Sincerely,

Cielo Castro
Chairperson, Board of Commissioners

Doug Guthrie
President and CEO

Attachments 1 and 2

LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT WORKERS' COMPENSATION



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District



Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.



If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT WORKERS' COMPENSATION

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1.a
The CEO should carefully consider its renewal options with Sedgwick as the sole-source contracted Third Party Administrator (TPA) for workers compensation (WC) claims administration by soliciting multiple TPAs and awarding at least two independent contracts.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the Chief Executive Office's (CEO) response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1.b
LACoFD should be invited to participate in the development of the renewal of the TPA Unit C contract.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD and CEO's response for further information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.a
LACoFD, working with the CEO and Department of Human Resources (DHR), should amend the existing TPA Unit C contract with Sedgwick to include detailed Account Service Instructions (ASIs) on preferred methods of claims management for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD and CEO's responses for further information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.b
The Account Service Instructions (ASI) amendments should direct Sedgwick adjusters to provide "point of entry" authorization for all firefighter WC claims for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD and CEO's responses for further information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.c
The ASI amendments should include penalties for delays in claims caused by Sedgwick's claims handling that result in LACoFD having to use overtime staffing for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD and CEO's responses for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.d
LACoFD should consider arranging "ride-alongs" to help claims adjusters better understand the nature of firefighters work by observing their activities.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
The ASI amendments should authorize TPA adjusters to pay up to 25 percent more than the Office Medical Fee Schedule (OMFS) standard fees for doctors to treat firefighter patients in order to expedite treatment and recovery for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD and the CEO's responses for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
LACoFD should work with DHR to expand the contracted clinic network to expedite treatment for the most common firefighter injuries, particularly orthopedic injuries.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation will be implemented.

The CEO will implement this recommendation and provide clarification. The workers' compensation medical provider network (MPN) is administered by CorVel Corporation (CorVel) under contract with the County. Currently, Local 1014, Fire Management, and CEO staff are discussing the expansion of the prior authorization program. New facilities will be vetted by participating parties (including CorVel), and after consensus is reached, included in the prior authorization program. DHR is not involved with this process.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
LACoFD should authorize firefighters' WC claims immediately, and not contest such claims, except where fraud or demonstrable misconduct is suspected.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD and the CEO's responses for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6.a
LACoFD should offer financially attractive buy-outs of California Labor Code (LC) 4850 benefits for firefighters who are permanently disabled or forced by injuries into retirement. This would allow firefighters to retire and be replaced by permanent hires.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree. This recommendation requires further analysis. Settlements of LC 4850 benefits may not be supported by existing law and would unlikely be approved by the Workers' Compensation Board. The analysis of all settlements needs to be conducted on a case-by-case basis and subject to review and approval of all parties. The BOS defers to the LACoFD and the CEO's responses for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6.b
LACoFD should continue to offer frequent Academy classes in order to hire more recruits. This will reduce reliance on backfill overtime staffing.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7.a
LACoFD should make full use of CEO Risk Management's Ventiv Claims Enterprise (VCE) to manage WC claims and its Return-to-Work (RTW) program.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD and the CEO's responses for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7.b
DHR should assist LACoFD by developing a comprehensive Disability Compliance Record module as part of VCE.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD and the CEO's responses for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
LACoFD should continue to develop creative RTW strategies, such as remote work by computer, work from home, and community service work.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
LACoFD should continue to emphasize firefighter training and physical and mental fitness programs to control the frequency and severity of injuries/illnesses.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD's response for further information on the implementation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10
LACoFD should continue to reach out to firefighters on disability through frequent personal contact by peers and supervisors as part of its employee wellness programs.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. The BOS defers to the LACoFD's response for further information on the implementation.

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT WORKERS' COMPENSATION

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1.a
The CEO should carefully consider its renewal options with Sedgwick as the sole-source contracted TPA for WC claims administration by soliciting multiple TPAs and awarding at least two independent contracts.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented.

Since 1986, the County has always contracted with more than one TPA to provide workers' compensation claims administration services per workers' compensation claims services solicitation. On March 5, 2019, the CEO recommended the BOS approve contracts with York Risk Services Group (York) and Sedgwick Claims Management, Inc. (Sedgwick). The BOS approved the contracts on March 26, 2019, for the two TPAs; however, Sedgwick subsequently purchased York. The contract with Sedgwick was competitively bid and was not presented or contracted as a "sole-source" contract.

In recent years, the workers' compensation claims administration industry has experienced difficulties in recruiting competent claims staff and an escalation in salaries. Therefore, CEO will perform further analysis with respect to exercising the contract option years.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1.b



RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as specified below.

Currently, LACoFD and CEO staff meet regularly to discuss workers' compensation claims administration. These meetings address a variety of issues that may be incorporated into future workers' compensation claims administration statement of works. Furthermore, LACoFD and CEO staff regularly work with the TPA to adjust the framework of the administration of workers' compensation claims to accommodate issues as they arise.

Under County Code Section 5.31.050, and through delegation, the CEO is mandated to "establish, administer, and operate, as part of the Countywide safety program, a complete self-insured workers' compensation system to ensure the full provision of

benefits under the law to employees whose injuries arise out of and in the course of employment." CEO Risk Management staff are highly specialized personnel with expertise in all facets of Risk Management, including workers' compensation. While input from County departments is vital and encouraged, the final decisions must be made by these industry professionals in accordance with local and State statutes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.a
LACoFD, working with the CEO and Department of Human Resources (DHR), should amend the existing TPA Unit C contract with Sedgwick to include detailed ASIs on preferred methods of claims management for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented.

The ASI model is already incorporated within the contract. Currently, workers' compensation claims administration is performed under client-specific claim handling protocols. Those protocols can be found in the Statement of Work, County of Los Angeles Select Policies and Standards, County of Los Angeles Utilization Review Guidelines, County of Los Angeles Workers' Compensation Audit Manual, and Sedgwick's Claims Administration Procedure Manual.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.b
The ASI amendments should direct Sedgwick adjusters to provide "point of entry" authorization for all firefighter WC claims for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented.

It is irresponsible to provide blanket approval of all workers' compensation claims. Currently, Sedgwick claims examiners authorize medical treatment using the County-developed utilization review guidelines. These guidelines were developed with input from physicians that treat County firefighters and are intentionally liberal. Overall claims administration is expected to be advocacy-based and managed as directed under Statement of Work paragraphs 1.5.1 and 1.5.2.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.c
The ASI amendments should include penalties for delays in claims caused by Sedgwick's claims handling that result in LACoFD having to use overtime staffing for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented.

This recommendation does not take the LACoFD's return-to-work obligations into account and oversimplifies the complexity of physician, employee, and LACoFD role in overtime usage. Furthermore, CEO staff believe no workers' compensation third party administrator would agree to penalties or excess cost provisions related to an employer's overtime usage. The current Statement of Work requires repayment for the following:

- Late payment, inaccurate payments, or nonpayment of any benefit to any applicant or medical provider resulting in penalty, interest, or attorney fees.

- Overpayment of any benefit owed to any applicant, lien claimant, or other party in a case due to Contractor's failure to comply with the performance standard set forth in Appendix A, Scope of Work, Paragraph 1.0.

- Excess payment of any benefit to any applicant, lien claimant, or other party in a case due to Contractor's failure to comply with the performance standard set forth in Appendix A, Scope of Work, Paragraph 1.0.

- Fines and/or administrative penalties assessed against the County due to the Contractor's failure to comply with the performance standard set forth in Appendix A, Scope of Work, Paragraph 1.0.

Including a reimbursement provision related to non-workers' compensation benefits would have a negative impact on the competitive bidding process and could make third party administrative services cost prohibitive. In addition, enforcement of this provision would be arbitrary.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
The ASI amendments should authorize TPA adjusters to pay up to 25 percent more than the Office Medial Fee Schedule (OMFS) standard fees for doctors to treat firefighter patients in order to expedite treatment and recovery for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented.

Currently, firefighters have access to high quality "funnel" orthopedic facilities. These facilities have prior approval status and are willing to expedite evaluation and treatment for Los Angeles County firefighters.

Under California Labor Code Section 5307.1, the official medical fee schedule establishes a reasonable maximum fee for medical services. In addition, under County Code Section 5.31.050, the County of Los Angeles self-insured workers' compensation program is mandated to "control of workers' compensation costs consistent with provision of full benefits under the law." Increasing the payments to medical treatment providers above the statutory reasonable maximum is not consistent with good governance of scarce tax dollars. The impact could increase

LACoFD workers' compensation costs by $4M-$5M annually without any evidence that the increased compensation to physicians would expedite treatment or benefit the injured employee.

On July 6, 2023, CEO staff verified that the City of Long Beach does not pay treating physicians "25 percent over the standard OMFS fees" (see Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers' Compensation Report 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury, pg. 12).

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
LACoFD should work with DHR to expand the contracted clinic network to expedite treatment for the most common firefighter injuries, particularly orthopedic injuries.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation will be implemented.

The CEO will implement this recommendation and provide clarification. The workers' compensation medical provider network (MPN) is administered by CorVel Corporation (CorVel) under contract with the County. Currently, Local 1014, Fire Management, and CEO staff are discussing the expansion of the prior authorization program. New facilities will be vetted by participating parties (including CorVel), and after consensus is reached, included in the prior authorization program. DHR is not involved with this process.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
LACoFD should authorize firefighters' WC claims immediately, and not contest such claims, except where fraud or demonstrable misconduct is suspected.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented.

This recommendation is not consistent with statute. Under California Labor Code Section 3600, an employer is liable for compensation "for any injury sustained by his or her employees arising out of and in the course of the employment." Similar language is found in County Code Section 5.31.050, which requires an investigation and compensability determination. The acceptance of an industrial injury must be based on factual, legal, or medical grounds. This recommendation would be in direct violation of these statues, incentivizes abuse, and will result in increased costs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6.a
LACoFD should offer financially attractive buy-outs of LC 4850 benefits for firefighters who are permanently disabled or forced by injuries into retirement. This would allow firefighters to retire and be replaced by permanent hires.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree. This recommendation requires further analysis.

CEO will continue to work collaboratively with LACoFD and County Counsel on the analysis to ensure any settlement offer is reasonable and weighs available resources and competing priorities. This recommendation will be predicated on an injured firefighter's willingness to retire prior to using the full year of the LC 4850 benefit. While receiving LC 4850 benefits, the firefighter continues to accrue retirement service time and other employment benefits that might be paid pre-retirement and pensionable. A settlement of LC 4850 benefits may not be supported by existing law and would unlikely be approved by the Workers' Compensation Board. The analysis of all settlements needs to be conducted on a case-by-case basis and subject to review and approval of all parties.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7.a
LACoFD should make full use of CEO Risk Management's Ventiv Claims Enterprise (VCE) to manage WC claims and its RTW program.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented.

Ventiv Technology and LACoFD Disability Management and Compliance Section (DMCS) staffs are periodically meeting to review business requirements. The data conversion and full implementation will begin once Ventiv's Amendment Six is approved. CEO staff estimates this will take approximately six months.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7.B
DHR should assist LACoFD by developing a comprehensive Disability Compliance Record module as part of VCE.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. The CEO defers to DHR and the LACoFD's responses for further information on the implementation.

ANTHONY C. MARRONE
FIRE CHIEF
FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

"Proud Protectors of Life, the Environment, and Property"

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT

1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294
(323) 881-2401
www.fire.lacounty.gov

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
JANICE HAHN, CHAIR
FOURTH DISTRICT

HILDA L. SOLIS
FIRST DISTRICT

HOLLY J. MITCHELL
SECOND DISTRICT

LINDSEY P. HORVATH
THIRD DISTRICT

KATHRYN BARGER
FIFTH DISTRICT

July 21, 2023

TO: FESIA DAVENPORT, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

FROM: ANTHONY C. MARRONE, FIRE CHIEF

RESPONSES TO THE 2022-23 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

As requested in your memo dated July 3, 2023, attached are the Los Angeles County Fire Department's responses to the following recommendations from the 2022-23 Civil Grand Jury Final Report:

- Have we M.E.T? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work, Recommendation Numbers 1.2b, 1.3, 1.4a, 1.4b, 1.6, 1.7.
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation, Recommendation Numbers 1.1b, 1.2a, 1.2b, 1.2c, 1.2d, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6a, 1.6b, 1.7a, 1.7b, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10.

Should you have any questions, please contact me directly at (323) 881-6180.

ACM:al

Attachments (2)

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT WORKERS COMPENSATION

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1.b
LACoFD should be invited to participate in the development of the renewal of the TPA Unit C contract.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the CEO.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.a
LACoFD, working with the CEO and Department of Human Resources (DHR), should amend the existing TPA Unit C contract with Sedgwick to include detailed ASIs on preferred methods of claims management for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the CEO.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.b
The ASI amendments should direct Sedgwick adjusters to provide "point of entry" authorization for all firefighter WC claims for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the CEO.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.c
The ASI amendments should include penalties for delays in claims caused by Sedgwick's claims handling that result in LACoFD having to use overtime staffing for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the CEO.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2.d
LACoFD should consider arranging "ride-alongs" to help claims adjusters better understand the nature of firefighters work by observing their activities.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented. The Department has established a process of a "Show-Me" day at the Department's training facility to help claims adjusters better understand the nature of firefighters work by observing their activities. Attendees include staff from Sedgwick, the CEO, and the Department's Disability Management and Compliance Section (DMCS). The demonstration includes a live fire event with an emergency response operation that will provide more insight on the types of tools and skills used by firefighters on incidents. This event is expected to take place in the fall 2023. Based on the intent of the recommendation the Department believes this satisfies the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO .1.3
The ASI amendments should authorize TPA adjusters to pay up to 25 percent more than the Office Medical Fee Schedule (OMFS) standard fees for doctors to treat firefighter patients in order to expedite treatment and recovery for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the CEO.

RECOMMENDATION NO .1.4
LACoFD should work with DHR to expand the contracted clinic network to expedite treatment for the most common firefighter injuries, particularly orthopedic injuries.

RESPONSE
Partially Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. However, this recommendation does not fall within the responsibilities of DHR but within the jurisdiction of the CEO's responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATION NO .1.5
LACoFD should authorize firefighters' workers compensation (WC) claims immediately, and not contest such claims, except where fraud or demonstrable misconduct is suspected.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for this recommendation falls with the CEO.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6.a
LACoFD should offer financially attractive buyouts of Labor Code (LC) 4850 benefits for firefighters who are permanently disabled or forced by injuries into retirement. This would allow firefighters to retire and be replaced by permanent hires.

RESPONSE
Partially Disagree. This recommendation requires further analysis. LACoFD will continue to work collaboratively with CEO and County Counsel on the analysis to ensure any settlement offer is reasonable and weighs available resources and competing priorities. The implementation will be predicated on an injured firefighter's willingness to retire prior to using the full year of the LC 4850 benefit. While receiving LC 4850 benefits, the firefighter continues to accrue retirement service time and other employment benefits that might be paid pre-retirement and pensionable. A settlement of LC 4850 benefits may not be supported by existing law and would unlikely be approved by the Workers' Compensation Board. The analysis of all settlements needs to be conducted on a case-by-case basis and subject to review and approval of all parties.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6.b
LACoFD should continue to offer frequent Academy classes to hire more recruits. This will reduce reliance on backfill overtime staffing.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. The Department continues to maintain a minimum of 3-4 Recruit Training Academies per year. The maximum number of recruits per academy is 56 recruits. On average, 80 percent of recruits are successful in completing the training academy. Each academy costs the Department approximately $3-4 million. The Department budgets for three recruit academies per fiscal year and funding would need to be identified for any additional academies. Also, staffing at the firefighter rank is not a driving factor in the utilization of backfill overtime. From 2021 to 2022, the Department over hired fire fighters and found that it had no effect on the utilization of backfill overtime.

The Department's utilization of backfill is primarily due to vacancies at the fire fighter specialist rank and the large number of fire captains out on leave which creates staffing issues. In an effort to mitigate the issue, the Department will often over hire captains. In order to reduce the impact of backfill overtime staffing, the Department will have to focus on fire captains out on leave and continue to hold regular promotions for fire fighter specialist and fire captain ranks.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7.a
LACoFD should make full use of CEO Risk Management's Ventiv Claims Enterprise (VCE) to manage WC claims and its RTW program.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented and will work collaboratively with the CEO.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7.b
DHR should assist LACoFD by developing a comprehensive Disability Compliance Record module as part of VCE.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. DHR has developed a module for the recording and tracking disability management and compliance Countywide (formerly referred to as "return-to-work"). This new module joins other modules on the Ventiv platform, including modules for the management of workers' comp claims, and absence (protected leave) management.

The module is currently undergoing user testing; once testing has been completed satisfactorily, the module will be rolled out to all departments, along with robust training to ensure fidelity in application.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
LACoFD should continue to develop creative return-to-work strategies, such as remote work by computer, work from home, and community service work.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. LACoFD continuously evaluates return-to-work strategies. The Department has implemented changes to the patient status report emphasizing the temporary work restriction section which enables the Department to readily evaluate injured workers for limited duty assignments. Alternative limited duty schedules have been implemented to include 9/80, 4/10, and 3/36 as alternatives to the 5/40 schedule. Limited duty from home is an option that is being evaluated. The Department has engaged with Sedgwick to ensure timely delivery of temporary work restrictions.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
LACoFD should continue to emphasize firefighter training and physical and mental fitness programs to control the frequency and severity of injuries/illnesses.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented. The Department's Fitness For Life Program provides modules four times a year, on fitness/health, the last two have addressed the following topics:

- Food Safety and Handling
- Occupational Fitness Assessment Test

Additionally, the Wellness Division will establish a periodical/video quarterly to provide a Well-Talk. It will include the following programs: Peer Support, Chaplains, Fitness for Life and Health Programs Office. These periodical/videos will provide Department members with updated information regarding upcoming events, helpful hints, and navigating the Wellness Division's services.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10
LACoFD should continue to reach out to firefighters on disability through frequent personal contact by peers and supervisors as part of its employee wellness programs.

RESPONSE

Agree. This recommendation has been implemented. In March 2023, the Wellness Division began receiving a list of current employees out on injury/illness over 90 days. This list is disseminated through the peer support leads to our peer support members who reach out and provide a "check-in" and assist with any possible issues the employee maybe having with the workers' compensation claims' process. Follow-up contact is provided, as needed, to assist these employees.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

HEADQUARTERS
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 W. TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 579 • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-2406 • FAX (213) 621-0387

BRANCH OFFICE
510 S. VERMONT AVENUE, 12TH FLOOR • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90020
(213) 866-5946 • FAX (213) 637-0821

LISA M. GARRETT
DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL

July 28, 2023

To: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

From: Lisa M. Garrett
Director of Personnel

RESPONSE TO CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached is the response from the Department of Human Resources to the Civil Grand Jury Final Report regarding the Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers' Compensation.

Should you have questions, please contact me or Pamela A. Missett, Chief Deputy, at (213) 866-2359 or pmissett@hr.lacounty.gov.

LMG:PAM:jgg

Attachment

LMG to CEO - Response to CGJ Report - 07-28-2023

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT WORKERS' COMPENSATION

RECOMMENDATION 1.2a
LACoFD, working with the CEO and DHR, should amend the existing TPA Unit C contract with Sedgwick to include detailed ASIs on preferred methods of claims management for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by DHR as jurisdiction for this recommendation is with the CEO's Risk Management Division.

RECOMMENDATION 1.2b
The ASI amendments should direct Sedgwick adjusters to provide "point of entry" authorization for all firefighter WC claims for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by DHR as jurisdiction for this recommendation is with the CEO's Risk Management Division.

RECOMMENDATION 1.2c
The ASI amendments should include penalties for delays in claims caused by Sedgwick's claims handling that result in LACoFD having to use overtime staffing for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by DHR as jurisdiction for this recommendation is with the CEO's Risk Management Division.

RECOMMENDATION 1.3
The ASI amendments should authorize TPA adjusters to pay up to 25% more than the OMFS standard fees for doctors to treat firefighter patients in order to expedite treatment and recovery for the remainder of the existing contract. Future contracts with any TPA must include these ASIs.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by DHR as jurisdiction for this recommendation is with the CEO's Risk Management Division.

RECOMMENDATION 1.4
LACoFD should work with DHR to expand the contracted clinic network to expedite treatment for the most common firefighter injuries, particularly orthopedic injuries.

RESPONSE
Partially Agree. This recommendation will not be implemented by DHR as jurisdiction for this recommendation is with the CEO's Risk Management Division.

RECOMMENDATION 1.6.a
LACoFD should offer financially attractive buyouts of LC 4850 benefits for firefighters who are permanently disabled or forced by injuries into retirement. This would allow firefighters to retire and be replaced by permanent hires.

RESPONSE
Partially Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by DHR as jurisdiction for this recommendation is with the CEO's Risk Management Division.

RECOMMENDATION 1.6.b
LACoFD should continue to offer frequent Academy classes in order to hire more recruits. This will reduce reliance on backfill overtime staffing.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation will not be implemented by DHR as jurisdiction for this recommendation is with the LACoFD.

RECOMMENDATION 1.7.a
LACoFD should make full use of CEO Risk Management's VCE to manage WC claims and its RTW program.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation will not be implemented by DHR as jurisdiction for this recommendation is with the CEO's Risk Management Division.

RECOMMENDATION 1.7.b
DHR should assist LACoFD by developing a comprehensive Disability Compliance Record module as part of VCE.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented in the coming weeks.

DHR has developed a module dedicated to the tracking and management of disability compliance cases Countywide; this module was developed to integrate with and support the County's new framework for disability management and compliance across all departments. The module is currently in the final phase of user testing and will be rolled out for Countywide use in the next few weeks; the expectation will be that all departments, including the LACoFD, will use this module as the sole system of record for managing all their disability cases.

MEDI-CAL REIMBURSEMENT

The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

Health Services
LOS ANGELES COUNTY

July 26, 2023

Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors

Hilda L. Solis
First District

Holly J. Mitchell
Second District

Lindsey P. Horvath
Third District

Janice Hahn
Fourth District

Kathryn Barger
Fifth District

Christina R. Ghaly, M.D.
Director

Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D., Ph.D.
Chief Deputy Director, Clinical Affairs

Nina J. Park, M.D.
Chief Deputy Director, Population Health

Elizabeth M. Jacobi, J.D.
Administrative Deputy

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

Tel: (213) 288-8050
Fax: (213) 481-0503

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

"To advance the health of our patients and our communities by providing extraordinary care"

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Christina R. Ghaly, M.D.
Director

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT**

Attached are the Department of Health Services' (DHS') responses to the 2022-2023 Los Angeles Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) Reports Sections:

- *"Have We M.E.T.?" – Recommendation Numbers 1.1, 1.4a, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8a, and 1.8b.*

These recommendations will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls with the Department of Mental Health (DMH). DHS defers to DMH for the responses to Recommendations 1.1, 1.4a, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8a, and 1.8b.

- *"MEDI-CAL Reimbursement, The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue" – Recommendation Numbers 1.1 and 1.2*

We concur and will continue to work with the Auditor-Controller in addressing Recommendation Number 1.1.

We concur with and have initiated actions to address Recommendation Number 1.2.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please let me know or your staff may contact Maria Lorena Andrade-Guzman at (213) 288-7901 or Angelo Cariaga at (213) 288-8437.

CRG:nm

Attachments

c: Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D. Chief Deputy Director, Clinical Affairs
Allan Wecker, Chief Financial Officer
Kevin Lynch, Chief Information Officer

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
MEDI-CAL REIMBURSEMENT – THE FINAL RESOLUTION OF AN ONGOING ISSUE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
The LACA-C should continue to follow-up with DHS and report back to BOS on the resolution of the six partially implemented Priority 1 and 2 recommendations.

In the Auditor-Controller's Department of Health Services (DHS) – Online Real-time Centralized Health Information Database (ORCHID) System Review – First Follow-up Review (Report #K19FZ) dated March 17, 2023, they noted the following six partially implemented recommendations:

1. ***Medical Coding Backlog (Priority 1)** – DHS management implement a plan to resolve the medical coding backlog to ensure patient services are billed within insurance provider's billing deadlines.*
2. ***Medical Coding Process (Priority 1)** – DHS management strengthen the medical coding process to ensure coding is timely and accurate before billing by:*
    a. *Evaluating enhancing ORCHID (Online Real-time Centralized Health Information Database), and in the interim establishing manual processes, to notify coding staff when incomplete patient records are updated, and notify medical and coding supervisory personnel when incomplete records remain unresolved for extended periods (e.g., 15 or 30 days).*
    b. *Implementing a process to review coding accuracy (e.g., on a sample basis) before billing.*
    c. *Maintaining documentation to support billing error investigations.*
3. ***Recording Patient Services (Priority 1)** – DHS management review the design of the process for recording patient services in ORCHID to determine whether processes, including management self-monitoring, can be strengthened to ensure medical staff record patient services completely and accurately before they are sent for medical coding.*
4. ***Privilege User Activity Reviews (Priority 2)** – DHS management strengthen the process for reviewing their employee's user activity in ORCHID by reviewing activity from all privileged users/areas and documenting the review to support the activity is appropriate and authorized.*
5. ***Management Monitoring of Internal Controls (Priority 2)** – DHS management ensure ongoing self-monitoring processes include:*

a. *Examination of processes/control activities, such as review of an adequate number of transactions on a regular basis to ensure adherence to County rules.*

b. *Documenting the monitoring activity and retaining evidence so it can be subsequently validated.*

c. *Elevating material exceptions to management on a timely basis to ensure awareness of relative control risk, and to ensure appropriate corrective actions are implemented.*

6. ***Standards and Procedures (Priority 2)*** *– DHS management ensure written standards and procedures adequately guide supervisors and staff in the performance of their duties for all ORCHID processes.*

RESPONSE
DHS agrees with the recommendation.

DHS will work with the Auditor-Controller to ensure that all three Priority 1 recommendations and two Priority 2 recommendations (Issue 5 and Issue 6 noted above) will be fully implemented by September 30, 2023. DHS estimates that Issue 4 – Privileged User Activity Review will be implemented by December 31, 2023.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
The DHS should complete the resolution of the six partially implemented Priority 1 and 2 recommendations, no later than September 30, 2023.

RESPONSE
DHS agrees with this recommendation.

All three Priority 1 findings and two Priority 2 recommendations (Issue 5 and Issue 6 noted above) will be implemented by September 30, 2023. Issue 4 – Privileged User Activity Reviews will be implemented by December 31, 2023.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

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

OSCAR VALDEZ
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

ASSISTANT AUDITOR-CONTROLLERS

MAJIDA ADNAN
ROBERT G. CAMPBELL
CONNIE YEE

July 18, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

Attn: Cheri Thomas

FROM: Oscar Valdez
Auditor-Controller

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 2022-23 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT**

As requested, attached is the Department of Auditor-Controller's response to the Fiscal Year 2022-23 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report sections entitled "MEDI-CAL REIMBURSEMENTS – The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue." Per the Grand Jury's request, the Auditor-Controller is responding to Recommendation 1.1.

If you have any questions, please call me at (213) 974-8302.

OV:cy

Attachment

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
MEDI-CAL REIMBURSEMENT – THE FINAL RESOLUTION OF AN ONGOING ISSUE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
The Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller (LACA-C) should continue to follow up with the DHS and report back to the BOS on the resolution of the six partially implemented Priority 1 and 2 recommendations.

RESPONSE
The LACA-C agrees with the recommendation and will implement it. The LACA-C will work with DHS to conduct another follow-up review and report back to the BOS on the status of the six partially implemented Priority 1 and 2 recommendations in accordance with our protocol for audit follow-ups.

PROPOSITION 19 IMPLEMENTATION AND RELATED MATTERS



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

JEFFREY PRANG
ASSESSOR
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 320
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2770
assessor.lacounty.gov
(213) 974-3101

Assessor Los Angeles County
Valuing People and Property

July 24, 2023

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

RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORT OF THE 2022-2023
LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY

Dear Supervisors:

The Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor's response to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Report recommendations is attached. The Civil Grand Jury Report area of interest specific to the Office of the Assessor includes Proposition 19 Implementation and Related Matters.

Should you have any questions regarding our response, please contact George Renkei, Chief Deputy Assessor at (213) 974-3101.

Sincerely,

JEFF PRANG
Assessor

JP:SH:mm

Attachment

c: Fesia Davenport, Chief Executive Officer
Celia Zavala, Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Oscar Valdez, Auditor-Controller
Keith Knox, Treasurer and Tax Collector

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
PROPOSITION 19 IMPLEMENTATION AND RELATED MATTERS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
The BOS should appropriate funds for the development of public education about Proposition 19, proper completion of Preliminary Change of Ownership Reports (PCOR), and related matters, particularly for the purpose of outreach and professional education for real estate professionals such as real estate brokers and agents.

RESPONSE
The Assessor agrees with the recommendation. The recommendation has been partially implemented.

The Assessor aggressively pursues several opportunities each year to educate the public on Proposition 19, ownership issues such as PCORs and other programs and services. The Assessor will work with the BOS to identify funding for further Proposition 19 public education and education on the proper filing of PCORs and other related ownership issues affecting the public. Additional funding would help the Assessor increase public education opportunities and create additional online resources to assist the public in understanding reassessment exclusions and ownership responsibilities. Identification of funding is necessary to increase public education across the County.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
The BOS should consider increasing the filing fees for assessment appeals, while making a portion or all of it refundable in cases where the appellant prevails.

RESPONSE
The Assessor agrees with the recommendation. The recommendation requires further analysis.

The Assessor agrees that the fees should reflect costs associated with the filing of the application and the Assessor agrees that the costs associated with flings should include costs incurred by the Assessor's office to prepare responses to the application. The Assessor will work with the Assessment Appeals Board (AAB) to study and analyze policies and processes of other counties that have implemented similar fees. The implementation of the filing fee has significantly reduced the number of claims filed by tax agents that have monetized the assessment appeal process. The Assessor believes that further cost recovery will result in the continued

reduction of claims to the most meritorious appeals thereby reducing the backlog and providing expedient resolutions of assessment appeals benefiting the public as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
The assessment appeals system should be examined by the County Assessor's office and by the BOS with a view to reforming it and improving the timeliness of appeals and hearings.

RESPONSE
The Assessor agrees with the recommendation. The recommendation has been implemented in part.

The Assessor has actively collaborated with the Executive Office of the BOS to improve the business operations of the multi-agency assessment appeals process. As one of the stakeholders in the process, the Assessor realizes the importance of an efficient and well-operated process. The Assessor recognizes the hard work of the Executive Office of the BOS to modernize the AAB process and business operations and will fully continue to collaborate and support the Executive Office of the BOS to further implement opportunities for efficiencies. There are opportunities to implement additional operational efficiencies and the Assessor and Executive Office have developed a collaborative relationship to explore those opportunities.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CELIA ZAVALA
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
EXECUTIVE OFFICE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 383
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1411 • www.bos.lacounty.gov

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

July 21, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Celia Zavala
Executive Officer

2022-23 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY RESPONSE

Attached are responses to the 2022-23 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations related to the following sections:

- Proposition 19 Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations. Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
- Zero Emissions and Air Quality Monitoring

Despite not being a designated department for the Proposition 19 response, it is important to mention that we provided feedback because it relates to the operations of the Assessment Appeals Board division within the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 974-1401, or your staff may contact Hanna Cheru, Assistant Executive Officer, at (213) 893-2564 or hcheru@bos.lacounty.gov.

CZ:HC:ja

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS – ASSESSMENT APPEALS BOARD (EO-AAB)

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
PROPOSITION 19 IMPLEMENTATION AND RELATED MATTERS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
The BOS should appropriate funds for the development of public education about Proposition 19, proper completion of Preliminary Change of Ownership (PCORs) and related matters, particularly for the purpose of outreach and professional education for real estate professionals such as real estate brokers and agents.

RESPONSE
The respondent partially agrees with the finding. This recommendation will not be implemented.

The AAB serves as the board of equalization for the BOS, and therefore does not interact with property owners when filing for Proposition 19 applications, filling out PCORs or other property tax forms until after the assessment of their property and only when an appeal is filed. Nonetheless, the AAB agrees that funding should be appropriated for the development of public education about property taxation to avoid unnecessary filings of appeals applications. The AAB agrees to collaborate with the Assessor's Office to develop educational content funded by the BOS.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
The BOS should consider increasing the filing fees for assessment appeals, while making a portion or all of it refundable in cases where the appellant prevails.

RESPONSE
The respondent agrees with the finding. The recommendation requires further analysis.

The AAB will reevaluate its application filing fees and conduct a cost study including charges by other counties. This study will consider the actual cost of processing appeal applications and consider a refund process. A refund process would need to be evaluated to determine the feasibility of implementation (i.e., minimum reduction amount that warrants a refund, impact on County revenue, percentage of reduction to roll value, etc.). The study will also require research of the policies of other counties and interviews of their staff to determine the challenges of increased filing fees or refunds. Additional meetings will be scheduled with the Assessor's office to discuss process and procedures related to their function. The study is anticipated to take six months.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
The assessment appeals system should be examined by the County Assessor's Office and by the BOS with a view to reforming it and improving timeliness of appeals and hearings.

RESPONSE
The respondent agrees with the finding. The recommendation has been implemented.

The process to appeal a property tax assessment in the County has evolved organically to service the needs of multiple stakeholders. It is decidedly manual and paper-based, with approximately 60 percent of applications arriving as a paper form, mailed-in or dropped off at the AAB office, despite the option for online submission via a web portal.

The AAB implemented its Business Process Improvement (BPI) multi-phase implementation plan. This plan includes process enhancements using automation and current technologies to streamline our processes, system, online services, and information delivery, as well as the implementation of new scheduling strategies for optimal hearing efficiencies and increased closure rate. As a result, the AAB has been able to schedule new applications within six to eight months (or sooner) from when the appeal is received, as opposed to prior times that could be 10 to 12 months. The AAB has also increased the number of Board hearings from three to four prior to the pandemic, to now eight hearings per day, due to the effectiveness of using virtual hearings. Hearing Officer hearings have also increased from one per day pre-pandemic to two to three virtual hearings per day. The AAB continues to strategize on how to streamline the appeal process and optimize the customer's overall experience.

The AAB has also focused on enhancing the public's experience when navigating the AAB website, including improving the accessibility to information and online services by ensuring the website can be translated and designing an intuitive webpage. The AAB has also increased its public outreach and education efforts by attending community events related to homeownership. More recently, the AAB implemented electronic forms to eliminate manual processing of administrative paperwork to reduce wait times on the submission of forms.

Although the AAB is currently focused on eliminating the existing backlog and enhancing the current AAB system to alleviate major process pain points that exist today, these phases are about getting back to a healthy state. Once there, the AAB will shift its focus to set a new bar and deliver a best-in-class service to taxpayers and County staff. Designing a better user experience will allow for even more efficiencies in application processing and correspondence to be enjoyed by AAB staff.

SHERIFF'S OPERATIONS

Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LA County Sheriff's Department



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
SHERIFF'S OPERATIONS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1(a)
If Law Enforcement Gang (LEG) membership is disclosed, the staff admission should be noted in employee personnel file and submitted to an intra-office database tracking LEG membership, rehabilitation and recidivism.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1(b)
If willingly disclosed, leadership personnel should flag employee for counseling and constructive monitoring.

RESPONSE
Disagree in part. This recommendation will not be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for additional information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1(c)
If uncovered involuntarily, staff belonging to an LEG must begin an immediate review process to determine membership and follow a termination process consistent with the law and due process.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1(d)
If leadership is made known of a staff member's involvement in an LEG and action is ignored, punishment delayed or aid provided to conceal illegal gang status, they should be immediately removed from ranked duties pending review.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
All identified LEG logos and emblems, including the "Fort Apache" logo at the East LA Station, must be removed from all LASD stations and property.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
LASD personnel must hold themselves to a strict non-partisan personae while in uniform and comply strictly with official policies and procedures.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
LASD and oversight monitors should publicize the existence of the Special Counsel by adding contact information somewhere on their public websites.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation falls outside the jurisdiction of LASD and will not be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to LASD's response for additional details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5(a)
The Constitutional Policing Advisors (CPA) should participate in teambuilding exercises with Station Sergeants to get them familiar with the role of the unit and understand the importance of disseminating, implementing and upholding the CPA's recommendations.

RESPONSE
Disagree in part. This recommendation will not be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for additional information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
CPAs should publish written progress reports published to a dedicated tab located on lasd.org/transparency.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for additional information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
Add a link on the lasd.org TRANSPARECY page listing ongoing consent decrees, restraining orders and lawsuits involving oversight monitors.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
Require a brief, written discussion of events leading up to the shooting incident and any findings or results in order to give videos context.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation requires further analysis by the LASD. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for details of the analysis.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
All weapon discharge cases should be submitted to the District Attorney's (DA) office for outside review.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. This recommendation will not be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for additional information.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10(a)
The Incoming Sheriff's Information Bureau (SIB) director should establish new Information policies and procedures to reflect modern marketing and information sharing trends.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will be implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10(b)
Collaborate with the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Bureau to ensure updated policies and procedures are focused on best practices on how the public should best receive Department communications.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.11
Implement Community Advisory Committees (CAC) Department-wide.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.12
Law Enforcement (LE) Bystander Training programs like the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Active Bystandership in Law Enforcement Project (ABLE) should be incorporated into standing LASD Training.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation is in the process of being implemented per the LASD's response. The BOS defers to the LASD's response for implementation details.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.13
The DA's Office must develop a quick evaluation to determine if a case needs immediate action or if could be kicked back to the LASD for an internal investigation.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation is outside the jurisdiction of LASD and will not be implemented per the DA's and LASD's response. The BOS defers to the DA's and LASD's response for further details.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
HALL OF JUSTICE
ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF

August 7, 2023

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

Dear Supervisors:

RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORTS OF THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

Attached is the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Department) response to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Report (CGJ) recommendations. The CGJ's areas of interest specific to the Department included:

- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track (Attachment C)
- Have we M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Team and How They Work (Attachment D)
- Sheriff's Operations: An Erosion of Trust. Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Attachment E)
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, and the Justice System (Attachment F)

Should you have questions regarding our response, please contact Division Director Conrad Meredith, Administrative Services Division, at (213) 229-3310.

Sincerely,

R. Luna

ROBERT G. LUNA
SHERIFF

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
SHERIFF'S OPERATIONS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1a
If Law Enforcement Gang (LEG) membership is disclosed, the staff admission should be noted in employee personnel file and submitted to an intra-office database tracking LEG membership, rehabilitation and recidivism.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented.

All lawful action will be taken against deputies or their supervisors who participate in, support, or knowingly ignore the existing policies and laws prohibiting law enforcement gang participation. Newer policies relating to these issues have been drafted and are in the review process.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1b
If willingly disclosed, leadership personnel should flag employee for counseling and constructive monitoring.

RESPONSE
Disagree in part. The recommendation will not be implemented.

All lawful action will be taken against deputies or their supervisors who participate in, support, or knowingly ignore the existing policies and laws prohibiting law enforcement gang participation. Newer policies relating to these issues have been drafted and are in the review process. The actions undertaken by the Department will be in accordance with the law, and not based upon whether the information was voluntarily or involuntarily disclosed. Counseling and constructive monitoring may or may not be appropriate in an individual case but will not be based solely upon whether LEG membership was voluntarily disclosed.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1c
If uncovered involuntarily, staff belonging to an LEG must begin an immediate review process to determine membership and follow a termination process consistent with the law and due process.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented.

All lawful action will be taken against deputies or their supervisors who participate in, support, or knowingly ignore the existing policies and laws prohibiting law

enforcement gang participation. Newer policies relating to these issues have been drafted and are in the review process. However, the actions undertaken by the Department will be in accordance with the law, and not based upon whether the information was voluntarily or involuntarily disclosed. Termination may be appropriate in either situation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1d
If leadership is made known of a staff member's involvement in an LEG and action is ignored, punishment delayed or aid provided to conceal illegal gang status, they should be immediately removed from ranked duties pending review.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented.

All lawful action will be taken against deputies or their supervisors who participate in, support, or knowingly ignore the existing policies and laws prohibiting law enforcement gang participation. Newer policies relating to these issues have been drafted and are in the review process.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
All identified LEG logos and emblems, including the "Fort Apache" logo at the East La Station, must be removed from all LASD stations and property.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented.

All lawful action will be taken against deputies or their supervisors who participate in, support, or knowingly ignore the existing policies and laws prohibiting law enforcement gang participation. Newer policies relating to these issues have been drafted and are in the review process. These new policies include a policy specific to logos and includes all stations not just East Los Angeles.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
LASD personnel must hold themselves to a strict nonpartisan personae while in uniform and comply strictly with official policies and procedures.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented.

Department personnel are aware that they must act in a non-partisan manner to build trust with all members of the community.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
LASD and oversight monitors should publicize the existence of the Special Counsel by adding contact information somewhere on their public websites.

RESPONSE
Disagree. The recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside of the LASD.

Any publicity relating to the position of Special Counsel is at the discretion of the Civilian Oversight Commission, or any other entity that is empowered to create and appoint a person to that position.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5a
The Constitutional Policing Advisors' (CPA) should participate in teambuilding exercises with Station Sergeants to get them familiar with the role of the unit and understand the importance of disseminating, implementing and upholding the CPA recommendations.

RESPONSE
Disagree in part. The recommendations will not be implemented as written.

The role and responsibilities of CPAs will not include team-building exercises. Furthermore, it is not anticipated that they will be disseminating or implementing CPA recommendations. The Office of Constitutional Policing will, however, conduct training and/or engage in presentations and discussions as to its role and responsibilities. The Office will also discuss recommendations made by oversight Monitors, the Office of Inspector General, and/or the Civilian Oversight Commission.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
CPAs should publish written progress reports published to a dedicated tab located on lasd.org/transparency.

RESPONSE
Disagree in part. The recommendations will not be implemented.

It is not anticipated that CPAs will be publishing progress reports. The Office of Constitutional Policing will, however, contribute materials to the transparency page of the LASD website that describe the progress on recommendations made by oversight Monitors, the Office of Inspector General, and/or the Civilian Oversight Commission.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
Add a link on the lasd.org TRANSPARECY page listing ongoing consent decrees, restraining orders and lawsuits involving oversight monitors.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented.

The Office of Constitutional Policing previously updated the website to include key settlement agreements and court proceedings in those matters. The website will continue to be updated to include relevant material, in consultation with County Counsel.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
Require a brief, written discussion of events leading up to the shooting incident and any findings or results in order to give videos context.

RESPONSE
Agree. LASD agrees with this recommendation, but further exploration would have to be conducted with County Counsel in six months.

The scope of the narrative of events provided will be subject to conversations with County Counsel.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
All weapon discharge cases should be submitted to the DA's office for outside review.

RESPONSE
Partially agree. The recommendation cannot be implemented at this time, as described by the DA in his response to this recommendation.

The Office of the District Attorney responded to this recommendation on July 17, 2023, in which he stated that: "The recommendation to review all weapon discharge cases would require, at the outset, a renegotiation of the current protocol with all participating agencies and would significantly increase the number of shooting cases reviewed by the LASA. Without a corresponding increase in staffing, the LASA does not currently have the operational capacity to effectively and efficiently respond to an increase in the number of cases reviewed and is therefore unable to implement this recommendation."

The LASD is, however, willing to engage in further discussions with the Office of the District Attorney on this and other matters related to oversight and accountability and will follow all protocols to advance these objectives.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10a
The Incoming SIB director should establish new Information policies and procedures to reflect modern marketing and information sharing trends.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented.

Any new communications team member will utilize best practices to ensure factual information and contemporary practices are used in providing information to the public.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10b
Collaborate with the COPS Bureau to ensure updated policies and procedures are focused on best practices on how the public should best receive Department communications.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is in the process of being implemented.

Dr. Barney Melekian has joined the Office of Constitutional Policing, and he previously served as the Director of the COPS Office at the Department of Justice. His skill and experience will assist the LASD in ensuring best practices are implemented.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.11
Implement Community Advisory Committees (CAC) Department-wide.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is in the process of being implemented.

LASD is working with the Center for Policing Equity (CPE) and the United States Department of Justice's (DOJ) Community Relations Service (CRS) to develop a robust community engagement program.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.12
Law Enforcement (LE) Bystander Training programs like the DOJ's ABLE should be incorporated into standing LASD Training.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is in the process of being implemented.

LASD is currently reorganizing its training program to ensure it is robust and comprehensive and addresses 21st Century Policing principles. It should be noted that ABLE is one such program which is managed by Georgetown Law and not DOJ. A number of programs are being evaluated to identify the appropriate training program.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.13
The DA's office must develop a quick evaluation to determine if a case needs immediate action or if could be kicked back to the LASD for an internal investigation.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented by the LASD as jurisdiction falls outside of the LASD.

This recommendation relates to the DA's Office developing an evaluation guide for cases. The Office of the District Attorney responded to this recommendation.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

HALL OF JUSTICE

ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF

July 21, 2023

The Honorable Samantha P. Jessner
Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Presiding Judge Jessner:

LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY'S REPORT ON SHERIFF'S OPERATIONS

Thank you for providing a copy of the Civil Grand Jury report entitled: "Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the LASD." I thank the Civil Grand Jury for its work and dedication to public service, and their efforts in creating a meaningful report.

While many of the grand jury's observations were made about activities that took place during a prior administration, I welcome the opportunity to offer comments. First, as noted in the report, the "Public Integrity Unit" was in fact disbanded and the primary purpose of the Sheriff's Information Bureau is to provide factual information to the public.

The report does not mention the formation of the newly created Office of Constitutional Policing ("OCP"), which never previously existed. Once fully staffed, it will consist of attorneys, paralegals, investigators, and sworn personnel who will work on many of the issues described in the report. The report only refers to the individual position of Constitutional Policing Advisors (CPAs) but does not fully describe the expansive effort being undertaken to focus efforts into constitutional and community-based policing.

The report also references the Civilian Oversight Commission's ("COC") report entitled "Report and Recommendations of the Special Counsel to Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission Regarding Deputy Gangs and Cliques in the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department," and suggests that the recommendations would not be implemented given the Department's history. I have attached hereto a copy of my latest update to the COC report regarding the progress made regarding those recommendations. This report is not being ignored.

The following reflects the Department's specific response to recommendations made in the Grand Jury Report:

- Recommendations 1.1(a)-(d) and 1.2 relate to law enforcement gangs and policies. Details about the Department's efforts are highlighted in the attached COC letter. All lawful action will be taken against deputies or their supervisors who participate in, support, or knowingly ignore the policy against law enforcement gang participation. Policies relating to these issues have been drafted and are in the review process.
- Recommendation 1.3 relates to Department personnel acting in a non-partisan manner while on duty. Department personnel are aware that they must act in a non-partisan manner to build trust with all members of the community.
- Recommendation 1.4 relates to publicizing the position of Special Counsel. Any publicity relating to the position of Special Counsel is at the discretion of the Civilian Oversight Commission, or any other entity that is empowered to create this appoint a person to that position.
- Recommendations 1.5 -1.7 relate to transparency and the work of the Office of Constitutional Policing. The Office of Constitutional Policing has already updated the website and will continue to post relevant material to the website as it is available.
- Recommendations 1.8 related to posting additional details relating to shooting incidents. The scope of the narrative of events provided will be subject to conversations with County Counsel.
- Recommendation 1.9 relates to submitting additional cases to the Office of the District Attorney. The Office of the District Attorney responded to this recommendation.
- Recommendation 1.10(a) relates to the new position in the Sheriff's Information Bureau. Any new communications team member will utilize best practices to ensure factual information and contemporary practices are used in providing information to the public.
- Recommendation 1.10(b) relates to collaboration with the COPS Bureau. Dr. Barney Melekian has joined the Office of Constitutional

Policing, and he previously served as the Director of the COPS Office at the Department of Justice. His skill and experience will assist the Department in ensuring best practices are implemented.

- Recommendation 1.11 relates to implementing Community Advisory Committees ("CACs") Department-wide. The Department is working with the Center for Policing Equity ("CPE") and the United States Department of Justice, Community Relations Service ("CRS") to develop a robust community engagement program.
- Recommendation 1.12 related to active bystander training. The Department is reorganizing its training program to ensure it is robust and comprehensive and addresses 21st Century Policing principles.
- Recommendation 1.13 relates to the District Attorney's Office developing an evaluation guide for cases. The Office of the District Attorney responded to this recommendation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback. Should you have any questions, please contact Division Director Eileen Decker, Office of Constitutional Policing, at (213) 229-3096.

Sincerely,

R. Luna

ROBERT G. LUNA
SHERIFF

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CELIA ZAVALA
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
EXECUTIVE OFFICE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 383
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1411 • www.bos.lacounty.gov

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

July 21, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Celia Zavala
Executive Officer

2022-23 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY RESPONSE

Attached are responses to the 2022-23 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations related to the following sections:

- Proposition 19 Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations. Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
- Zero Emissions and Air Quality Monitoring

Despite not being a designated department for the Proposition 19 response, it is important to mention that we provided feedback because it relates to the operations of the Assessment Appeals Board division within the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 974-1401, or your staff may contact Hanna Cheru, Assistant Executive Officer, at (213) 893-2564 or hcheru@bos.lacounty.gov.

CZ:HC:ja

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS – OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL AND CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
SHERIFF'S OPERATIONS: AN EROSION OF TRUST, EXAMINING TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND COMMUNITY POLICING WITHIN THE LASD

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
LASD and oversight monitors should publicize the existence of the Special Counsel by adding contact information somewhere on their public websites.

RESPONSE
The respondent agrees with the finding. The recommendation has been implemented.

In June 1993, the Los Angeles County BOS designated Merrick Bobb to serve as Special Counsel to the BOS to report to the Board on LASD's implementation of the Kolts Commission recommendations. Special Counsel served in that capacity and issued semi-annual reports between 1993-2014. The Office of Inspector General was created by Los Angeles County Code Section 6.44.190 in 2014, to promote constitutional policing and the fair and impartial administration of justice by providing comprehensive oversight, monitoring, and reporting about LASD. The Ordinance states that the Inspector General serves as Special Counsel to the BOS and to the Civilian Oversight and Probation Oversight Commissions. The Office of Inspector General's and the Civilian Oversight Commission's websites were updated to better publicize this.

GEORGE GASCÓN
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

HALL OF JUSTICE
211 WEST TEMPLE STREET, SUITE 1200 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3205 (213) 974-3500

July 26, 2023

TO:

SUPERVISOR HANICE HAHN, CHAIR
SUPERVISOR HILDA L. SOLIS
SUPERVISOR HOLLY J. MITCHELL
SUPERVISOR LINDSEY P. HORVATH
SUPERVISOR KATHRYN BARGER

FROM: GEORGE GASCÓN
District Attorney

RE: SHERIFF'S OPERATIONS: EXAMINING TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND COMMUNITY POLICING WITHIN THE LASD

Thank you for providing a copy of the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report, in which the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office (LADA) is mentioned in certain Findings and corresponding Recommendations.

Pursuant to Penal Code §§ 933(c) and 933.05, my response to Recommendations 1.9 and 1.13 of the Civil Grand Jury's report on Sheriff's Operations, Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the LA County Sheriff's Department, is attached to this cover letter.

I am available if any further clarification or requests are needed on this matter.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE GASCÓN
District Attorney

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
SHERIFF'S OPERATIONS: AN EROSION OF TRUST, EXAMINING TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND COMMUNITY POLICING WITHIN THE LASD

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
All weapon discharge cases should be submitted to the District Attorney's (DA) office for outside review.

RESPONSE
Partially agree due to protocols currently in place as established by MOUs. This recommendation will not be implemented at this time given the current structure and protocols in place to investigate these types of incidents. The Protocol for District Attorney Officer-Involved Shooting Response Program For Officer/Deputy-Involved Shootings and In-Custody Deaths (Protocol) sets forth the agreement between The Los Angeles District Attorney (LADA) and participating local law enforcement agencies regarding the LADA response to the scene of officer-involved shootings and the subsequent investigation to determine the existence of potential criminal liability, or lack thereof, of any law enforcement officer. The protocol specifies that the LADA shall respond to incidents in which a peace officer, on or off duty, shoots and injures any person during the scope and course of employment. At this time, the protocol with law enforcement agencies does not include all firearm discharge cases including accidental or unintentional discharges and officer involved shootings when an individual is not injured. Currently, 67 law enforcement agencies across Los Angeles County participate in the protocol. See Protocol available at:
https://da.lacounty.gov/sites/default/files/policies/JSID%20DART%20Protocol%202014.pdf.

The LADA currently responds to an average of 69 shooting cases per year county-wide that are consistent with the Protocol.[1] Of the 32 deputy-involved shootings that occurred in 2020, 26 persons were struck by a bullet and six were non-hits; In 2021, 24 persons were struck by a bullet and 11 were non-hits; In 2022, 18 persons were struck by a bullet and eight were non-hits; Between January 1, 2023 and March 31, 2023, six persons were struck by a bullet and eight were non-hits.[2] It is unknown how many accidental or unintentional discharges of a firearm occurred during those time periods. The recommendation to review all weapon discharge cases would require, at the outset, a renegotiation of the current Protocol with all participating agencies and would significantly increase the number of shooting cases reviewed by the LADA.

[1] Representing calendar years 2020, 2021, and 2022.
[2] Los Angeles County, Office of Inspector General, Reform and Oversight Efforts: Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department reports 2020-2023.

Without a corresponding increase in staffing that considers available resources and competing priorities, the LADA does not have the operational capacity to effectively and efficiently respond to an increase in the number of cases reviewed and is therefore unable to implement this recommendation.[3]

However, this response in no way prohibits or impedes law enforcement agencies from submitting for charge evaluation, any officer-involved shooting cases in which the subject has not been struck or injured as well as any accidental or unintentional discharges of a firearm, to the LADA for charge evaluation if there has been a determination of probable cause to believe that a criminal offense has been committed. Additionally, when any such shooting is brought to the LADA's attention and there is reason to believe the conduct might be criminal, the LADA is free to reach out to the law enforcement agency for relevant reports and has never been denied access to them for purposes of review and evaluation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.13
The DA's office must develop a quick evaluation to determine if a case needs immediate action or if [sic] could be kicked back to the LASD for an internal investigation.

RESPONSE
Partially agree due to protocols currently in place as established by MOUs. This recommendation will not be implemented at this time given the current structure and protocols in place to investigate these types of incidents. The manner in which a local law enforcement agency conducts an administrative review of officer-involved shooting cases lies solely within the discretion of the respective agency. This discretion includes whether an administrative review will be conducted concurrent with a criminal review, such as with the LAPD and other local agencies. Thus, the LADA must defer the resolution of this matter to LASD, as it has the discretion and authority to review and/or modify its policies and memorandum of agreements with their unions regarding the timing of administrative reviews. See LASD's Internal Affairs Bureau Unit Order #49 – Gate/Johnson Settlement Agreement, available at https://pars.lasd.org/Viewer/Manuals/16084/Content/16209.

[3] In addition to investigating officer-involved shooting cases in which a person is struck by a bullet, the LADA investigates and prosecutes all allegations of criminal misconduct by law enforcement personnel, where probable cause exists to believe that a crime has been committed, whether felony or misdemeanor, and whether the member of the law enforcement agency was on-duty, off-duty, sworn or non-sworn.

GEORGE GASCÓN
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

HALL OF JUSTICE
211 WEST TEMPLE STREET, SUITE 1200 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3205 (213) 974-3500

July 17, 2023

Judge Ricardo R. Ocampo
Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, 13th Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Judge Ocampo,

RE: SHERIFF'S OPERATIONS: EXAMINING TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND COMMUNITY POLICING WITHIN THE LASD

Thank you for providing a copy of the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report, in which the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office (LADA) is mentioned in certain Findings and corresponding Recommendations.

Pursuant to Penal Code §§ 933(c) and 933.05, my response to Recommendations 1.9 and 1.13 of the Civil Grand Jury's report on Sheriff's Operations, Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the LA County Sheriff's Department, is as follows:

Recommendation 1.9:

All weapon discharge cases should be submitted to the DA's office for outside review.

Response:

This recommendation cannot be implemented at this time. The Protocol for District Attorney Officer-Involved Shooting Response Program For Officer/Deputy-Involved Shootings and In-Custody Deaths (Protocol) sets forth the agreement between LADA and participating local law enforcement agencies regarding the LADA response to the scene of officer-involved shootings and the subsequent investigation to determine the existence of potential criminal liability, or lack thereof, of any law enforcement officer. The protocol specifies that the LADA shall respond to incidents in which a peace officer, on or off duty, shoots and injures any person during the scope

and course of employment. At this time, the protocol with law enforcement agencies does not include all firearm discharge cases including accidental or unintentional discharges and officer involved shootings when an individual is not injured. Currently, 67 law enforcement agencies across Los Angeles County participate in the protocol. See Attachment I.

The LADA currently responds to an average of 69 shooting cases per year county-wide that are consistent with the Protocol.[1] Of the 32 deputy-involved shootings that occurred in 2020, 26 persons were struck by a bullet and six were non-hits; In 2021, 24 persons were struck by a bullet and 11 were non-hits; In 2022, 18 persons were struck by a bullet and eight were non-hits; Between January 1, 2023 and March 31, 2023, six persons were struck by a bullet and eight were non-hits.[2] It is unknown how many accidental or unintentional discharges of a firearm occurred during those time periods. The recommendation to review all weapon discharge cases would require, at the outset, a renegotiation of the current Protocol with all participating agencies and would significantly increase the number of shooting cases reviewed by the LADA. Without a corresponding increase in staffing, the LADA does not currently have the operational capacity to effectively and efficiently respond to an increase in the number of cases reviewed and is therefore unable to implement this recommendation.[3]

However, this response in no way prohibits or impedes law enforcement agencies from submitting for charge evaluation, any officer-involved shooting cases in which the subject has not been struck or injured as well as any accidental or unintentional discharges of a firearm, to the LADA for charge evaluation if there has been a determination of probable cause to believe that a criminal offense has been committed. Additionally, when any such shooting is brought to the LADA's attention and there is reason to believe the conduct might be criminal, the LADA is free to reach out to the law enforcement agency for relevant reports and has never been denied access to them for purposes of review and evaluation.

Recommendation 1.13:

The DA's office must develop a quick evaluation to determine if a case needs immediate action or if [sic] could be kicked back to the LASD for an internal investigation.

Response:

The manner in which a local law enforcement agency conducts an administrative review of officer-involved shooting cases lies solely within the discretion of the respective agency. This discretion includes whether an administrative review will be conducted concurrent with a criminal review, such as with the Los Angeles Police Department and other local agencies. Thus, the LADA will defer the resolution of this matter to LASD, as it has the discretion and authority to review and/or

[1] Representing calendar years 2020, 2021, and 2022.
[2] Los Angeles County, Office of Inspector General, Reform and Oversight Efforts: Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department reports 2020-2023.
[3] In addition to investigating officer-involved shooting cases in which a person is struck by a bullet, the LADA investigates and prosecutes all allegations of criminal misconduct by law enforcement personnel, where probable cause exists to believe that a crime has been committed, whether felony or misdemeanor, and whether the member of the law enforcement agency was on-duty, off-duty, sworn or non-sworn.

modify its policies and memorandum of agreements with their unions regarding the timing of administrative reviews.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE GASCÓN
District Attorney

Protocol for District Attorney Officer-Involved Shooting Response Program

For Officer/Deputy-Involved Shootings and In-Custody Deaths

PREAMBLE

Law enforcement officers perform a vital and often dangerous job in our communities. Situations will occur where peace officers must use deadly force; we expect that such force will be used only when legally necessary and as prescribed by law. When officers or deputies use deadly force, the public has a right to expect that a thorough and neutral examination will be conducted of these incidents and that all parties shall be held legally accountable for their actions.

The Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office and participating local law enforcement agencies agree that district attorney personnel will immediately respond to the scene of officer-involved shootings and in-custody deaths. The policies and procedures to be followed as well as the focus of our response team are set out in this protocol.

SEPARATION OF CRIMINAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

Law enforcement agencies may have the responsibility in an officer-involved shooting or in-custody death investigation to address several issues, such as: (1) whether any criminal law violations have occurred, (2) whether any participant has incurred or is at risk of incurring civil liability, (3) whether departmental policies have been followed, (4) whether appropriate law enforcement tactics were utilized under the circumstances.

It is the District Attorney's role to only investigate and determine whether any violation of criminal law may have occurred. However, the role of the law enforcement agency may also be to administratively investigate other issues as well, and they may sometimes choose to conduct an administrative review concurrently with the criminal investigation.

During the course of an administrative inquiry, law enforcement agencies are authorized by law to compel their officers to give statements regarding matters that are the subjects of administrative investigation. (Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act, Government Code sections 3300 et seq.) However, the law provides that such a compelled statement and any evidence derived therefrom may be inadmissible in a criminal prosecution. Therefore, it is very important from the outset of an investigation to clearly separate the administrative from the criminal investigation. District Attorney personnel should not be present during any compelled interview, nor should they receive any information concerning the content of a compelled statement, absent unusual circumstances.[1] Because evidence derived from a compelled statement may be inadmissible in a criminal proceeding, care should be given to keep separate criminal and administrative investigations.

[1] For further discussion on this subject, see section entitled "Interviews of Officers and Deputies."

© 2014 Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

Deputy district attorneys and investigators from the Justice System Integrity Division of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office will respond to the incident site to work with law enforcement officers and, when appropriate, conduct their own independent investigation. The District Attorney's Office will work with the investigating agency to ensure that the inquiry is conducted in a fair and professional manner that will serve the interest of justice, the community, the involved officers, those persons injured, and the families of those affected. The primary objective of this program is to accurately, thoroughly, and objectively investigate all relevant evidence and to determine the potential criminal liability, or lack thereof, of any party.

INCIDENTS TO BE INVESTIGATED

This protocol shall apply when either of the following incidents occur within Los Angeles County:

1) A peace officer, on or off duty, shoots and injures any person during the scope and course of employment.

2) An individual dies while in the custody or control of a law enforcement officer or agency and the law enforcement agency investigating the death or the police agency in whose custody the deceased was confined requests our presence and assistance. This protocol will only apply to in-custody deaths where the use of force by a peace officer may be a proximate cause of the death.

This protocol will apply to peace officers employed by an agency outside Los Angeles County, if the incident occurs within Los Angeles County. This protocol will not apply where officers or deputies from Los Angeles County are involved in incidents that occur outside the borders of Los Angeles County.

There may be occasions where one law enforcement agency, which is a member of the DART program, is conducting an investigation on behalf of another agency, which is not a member of the program. Upon request of the investigating agency and with the express consent of the non-member agency, the District Attorney will roll-out to the scene and later issue a closing report.

Upon the request of any law enforcement agency, the District Attorney's Office will review an officer-involved shooting investigation for criminal violations, even if that agency is not a signatory to the protocol.

NOTIFICATION OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY COMMAND CENTER

For all incidents described in 1 and 2 above, it is the responsibility of the law enforcement agency investigating the incident to immediately notify the District Attorney Command Center.

© 2014 Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

Notification should be made as soon as practicable. Each agency should notify the District Attorney Command Center immediately after notification is made to its own investigators.

If the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department is conducting the investigation on behalf of another agency, which has agreed to participate in the District Attorney's Officer-Involved Shooting Response Program, both the Sheriff's Department and the participating agency shall notify the District Attorney Command Center regarding the incident.

The District Attorney Command Center should be given a brief summary of all the facts known at the time, including: location of the incident, command post location, suggested access routes, and any safety concerns. The notification should be made as soon as possible, preferably no later than 30 minutes after the incident. An early response to the scene of an investigation is critical so that district attorney personnel may gain first-hand knowledge of lighting conditions, witness demeanor, trajectories, vehicle and pedestrian traffic conditions, etc.

The District Attorney Command Center will notify the deputy district attorney and the district attorney investigator on-call who will respond to the scene.

AT THE SCENE

The investigating law enforcement agency shall have primary responsibility to conduct a thorough, objective, and professional investigation of the incident. They shall be responsible for securing the location, collecting all physical evidence, photographing and/or diagramming the scene, and interviewing witnesses in cooperation with district attorney personnel.

The District Attorney's Office has the authority to conduct an independent investigation. The responsibilities of the on-scene district attorney personnel shall include the following:

1) Assist and advise the investigating officer on criminal law issues as they relate to the investigation.

2) Observe and participate fully with the investigative agency in the police investigation. District Attorney personnel should take notes of their observations and record interviews of witnesses.

3) Advise and assist investigative officers as to the collection of evidence and the interview of witnesses, when appropriate.

4) Conduct an independent investigation, at the District Attorney's discretion, separate from the law enforcement investigation when it is determined that the circumstances of the particular case make this appropriate. It is understood that

© 2014 Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

an independent investigation may include evidence collection and witness interviews.

District Attorney personnel will notify the officer maintaining the log listing personnel at the scene upon their arrival. As soon as practical, the officer in charge of the investigation will provide district attorney personnel with an initial briefing of the incident. The briefing will consist of all relevant information known at that time, including but not limited to:

1) the names and present whereabouts of the officers involved in the incident;

2) the names, addresses and present whereabouts of all civilian witnesses to the incident;

3) the statements of the officers, if not compelled, pursuant to Government Code sections 3300 et al. (*Lybarger*);

4) the physical evidence discovered;

5) a summary of witness statements and the status of the investigation;

6) a "walk through" at the scene, including witness descriptions of the events and the evidence recovered;

7) the medical condition of injured parties.

The investigating officer will ensure that district attorney personnel have access to the scene of the investigation. All physical evidence shall remain in the custody of the police agency conducting the investigation.

If district attorney personnel determine that additional district attorney personnel are needed to assist the investigation, additional district attorney investigators or deputy district attorneys can be called to the scene.

INTERVIEWS OF CIVILIAN WITNESSES

District Attorney personnel, with the investigating agency, will make every attempt to locate, identify and interview all potential witnesses to an incident. District Attorney personnel will be present and participate with the investigating agency in all interviews of civilian witnesses whenever practicable. All witnesses shall be interviewed separately to maintain the integrity of their statements. All interviews should be electronically recorded.

© 2014 Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

INTERVIEWS OF OFFICERS AND DEPUTIES

All officer or deputy witnesses to the events of the incident shall be separately interviewed. The interviews should take place as soon as is practical and should be recorded. During the pendency of the investigation and prior to the interview, all witnesses or potential witnesses should be kept apart to maintain the integrity of their individual statements. When appropriate the interviews may take place at the scene to aid the officer in recalling and explaining the exact locations of the parties and the events that took place.

District Attorney personnel will be available to participate in interviews of law enforcement personnel at the request of the investigating agency. However, if the officer chooses to make a non-compelled statement outside the presence of district attorney personnel, investigators will inform district attorney personnel of the substance of the statement and provide access to any recording of the statement.

If the officer chooses not to make a voluntary statement and the police agency elects to compel a statement pursuant to the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act (Government Code sections 3300 et seq.), district attorney personnel will be available to participate in the compelled interview at the request of the investigating agency, if the deputy district attorney assigned to the investigation determines, in his or her judgment, that our presence will not compromise any criminal investigation.

MEDICAL EVIDENCE

When circumstances permit, district attorney personnel should remain at the scene of a fatal shooting or in-custody death until the coroner's investigator arrives and completes his investigation at the scene. When an individual has been wounded by the police, district attorney and law enforcement personnel shall attempt to question the medical doctor who has treated the wounded individual and make efforts to preserve evidence that could be obtained from the doctor, such as the angle of bullet entry, lacerations, contusions, or the presence and effect of any drugs or alcohol.

INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS

It is the intent of the District Attorney's Office and participating law enforcement agencies to complete their review of these matters as quickly as possible, consistent with the primary goal of conducting a thorough and objective review of the facts.

The investigating agency will submit all relevant reports regarding the incident to the District Attorney's Justice System Integrity Division as soon as possible and absent unusual circumstances within 60 to 90 days, depending on the policy of the investigating agency. As the investigation proceeds, reports should be forwarded to the Justice System Integrity Division as they are completed regardless of whether all reports are completed. This procedure will permit the review process to proceed simultaneously with the

© 2014 Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

investigation. It will also permit timely requests and implementation of any additional investigation and clarification of completed reports if required.

FINAL ACTION

At the conclusion of the investigation, the District Attorney's Justice System Integrity Division will review and analyze all the evidence to determine whether the officer acted lawfully.

The crime charging standards are the same for civilians and peace officers. The District Attorney's policies regarding crime charging are set forth in the District Attorney's Legal Policies Manual and state in part:

> "The prosecutor should charge only if the following four basic requirements are satisfied:
>
> 1. The prosecutor, based on a complete investigation and a thorough consideration of all pertinent facts readily available, is satisfied that the evidence proves that the accused is guilty of the crime to be charged:
>
> 2. There is legally sufficient, admissible evidence of a corpus delicti:
>
> 3. There is legally sufficient, admissible evidence of the accused's identity as the perpetrator of the crime charged; and
>
> 4. The prosecutor has considered the probability of conviction by an objective fact finder and has determined that the admissible evidence is of such convincing force that it would warrant conviction of the crime charged by a reasonable and objective fact finder after hearing all the evidence available to the prosecutor at the time of charging and after considering the most plausible, reasonably foreseeable defense inherent in the prosecution evidence."

If no charges are filed, the District Attorney's Office will issue a closing report summarizing the results of the investigation and analyzing the evidence. This report will address the question of whether or not there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that an officer, deputy, or any other person committed a crime. It is not the purpose of the District Attorney's investigation or report to determine if any officer or deputy violated police policy or procedure, or committed any act which would be subject to civil sanctions. The Justice System Integrity Division will review all matters in a timely manner and, except in unusual circumstances or where additional investigation is required, issue a closing report containing its findings and conclusions within 60 days of the receipt of the completed investigative package. This report shall be sent to the involved police agencies.

© 2014 Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

The District Attorney's Office will notify the appropriate Chief of Police or Sheriff's representative prior to releasing to a third party any document related to an officer-involved shooting or in-custody death, and prior to conducting a news conference or issuing a press release concerning an officer-involved shooting or in-custody death.

Updated January 2014

© 2014 Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

STORM WATER CAPTURE AND WASTEWATER REUSE



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

MARK PESTRELLA, Director

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

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE SWP-0

July 20, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

Attention Cheri Thomas

FROM: Mark Pestrella, PE
Director of Public Works

REPONSES TO THE 2022-23 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

We received your memo dated July 3, 2023, requesting responses to the 2022-23 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury report titled *Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse*.

Attached are the recommendations and corresponding responses from Public Works for Recommendation Numbers 1.1 thru 1.4 and 1.6 thru 1.10.

If you have any questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Assistant Director Anthony Nyivih at (626) 458-4014 or anyivih@pw.lacounty.gov.

JA
2022-23 laco civil grand jury final rept responses (07 20 2023)

Attach.

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS/ FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
STORM WATER CAPTURE AND WASTEWATER REUSE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.1
LACFCD should continue to capture stormwater.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is currently being implemented and is a crucial part of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District's (LACFCD) mission. In current Water Year 2022-23, LACFCD has captured over 180 billion gallons of stormwater (the equivalent supply for over 4.4 million LA County residents for one year), which represents over 276% of the annual average capture.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.2
LACFCD should operate facilities to maximize stormwater capture and water conservation.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is currently being implemented through day-to-day operational efficiencies, annual and adaptively managed maintenance routines, and strategic long-term planning.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.3
LACFCD should continue to evaluate increased reservoir storage opportunities.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is currently being implemented through the LACFCD's ongoing and planned reservoir restoration projects to remove accumulated sediment and/or to maintain/enhance storage capacity at its dams.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.4
LACFCD should conduct a study to identify unused/under-utilized areas conducive to groundwater recharge and prepare a priority list for purchase and development of same.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation is currently being implemented. Multiple studies (some of them under the umbrella of the Safe Clean Water Program's regional Scientific Studies Program) are already underway to identify and analyze unused or under-utilized areas conducive to groundwater recharge. These studies, along with the LACFCD's Metric and Monitoring Study, are anticipated to be used to help develop watershed scale planning documents and recommendations. The resulting

recommendations could help inform potential project applicants of areas of need and opportunity (including prioritizing projects that maximize water supply benefits) as well as support Watershed Area Steering Committees' development of Stormwater Investment Plans.

RECOMMENDATION 1.6

LACFCD should review the application process for Measure W funding (primarily the feasibility report) to see if revisions can be made to simplify the application while still ensuring fiscal responsibility.

RESPONSE

Agree. The recommendation will be implemented and is anticipated to completed by December 31, 2023. The application process for Measure W, also known as the Safe, Clean Water Program (SCWP) Regional Program, is designed to be robust (to ensure good stewardship of the substantial investments involved) and is also intended to be adaptively managed. Processes are already in place to provide technical assistance to individuals or organizations who may lack expertise in the Program. Furthermore, upgrades to the Program's online portal occur annually to continue to help streamline the application process to ensure that even those without specialized expertise can effectively navigate the process or access the necessary help to do so. Additional evaluation is also in progress as part of the SCWP Biennial Progress Report development process, including a survey of all applicants following the July 31st close of the current Call for Projects.

RECOMMENDATION 1.7

LACFCD should prepare a presentation for school districts and Parent Teacher Associations extolling the environmental benefits of green space and semi-permeable pavements.

RESPONSE

Agree. The recommendation will be implemented and is anticipated to be completed by late 2024 due to the extensive level of engagement and development required to establish the desired suite of broader educational components most effectively. Green space and permeable pavements are indeed important aspects of the multi-benefit SCWP. Within the SCWP, the development of upcoming school education programs is currently underway and is anticipated to include materials/programs for school curriculum that could also be shared with school districts and Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs). The LACFCD recognizes the value of incorporating input and feedback from diverse stakeholders as part of that effort, as well as the broader range of other education initiatives associated with the SCWP and is committed to adaptively managing these subprograms. Education materials are therefore intended to represent all goals and priorities of the SCWP and creation of green space or permeable areas is often already part of the nature-based solutions built into a multi-benefit stormwater capture projects funded by the SCWP.

RECOMMENDATION 1.8
LACFCD should make their aerial photographs available to cities, other County agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations for their use in identifying opportunities for creating or rehabilitating green space.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation has been implemented. Elements of the SCWP use data from the LA Region Imagery Acquisition Consortium (LARIAC). The LARIAC is a multi-jurisdictional purchasing arrangement that enables participating local governments and agencies to benefit from combined economies of scale to acquire high-definition aerial data efficiently and cost-effectively. Certain data from the LARIAC is subject to licensing restrictions and cannot be shared by LACFCD. However, the existing SCWP Spatial Data Library serves as a comprehensive repository containing a diverse range of location-based data and aerial imagery that is already publicly available for use in identifying overarching project opportunities. In addition to aerial photographs, the library includes (but is not limited to):

i. Existing SCWP-Funded Projects
ii. Hydrogeologic Forebays
iii. Groundwater Basins
iv. Water Quality Data
v. Water Treatment Plants and LACFCD Facilities
vi. Community Characteristics
vii. Political and Management Boundaries

This information supports cities, County agencies, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and anyone else in making well-informed decisions related to opportunities for creating or rehabilitating green spaces.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
LACDPW should establish a committee to study and identify potential users of recycled wastewater (industry, commercial nurseries/growers, regional and local parks, etc.). Committee to include, at a minimum, representatives of the City of Los Angeles, the City of Long Beach, and the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented and is anticipated to be completed by late 2024 due to the extensive level of collaboration with other water agencies and stakeholders that is required for the efforts described below, as well as necessary approvals from the LA County BOS. Recognizing the new climate reality and the need to be thoughtful stewards of future water supplies, the BOS envisioned and directed the development of a Countywide water plan focused on collaborative management of Los Angeles County's water resources.

The draft County Water Plan focuses on leveraging local resource development like maximizing recycled water through agency-led projects like those mentioned above and the Safe, Clean Water Program. To avoid duplication of efforts and to maximize efficiency, the BOS will continue to utilize the County Water Plan framework to work with recycled water agencies to accomplish the goals of the Plan

through facilitation of partnerships and information-sharing between agencies, including the support of existing efforts related to planned regional recycled water programs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10
LACDPW should develop a master plan to distribute recycled wastewater (purple water) throughout the County.

RESPONSE
Agree. The recommendation will be implemented and is anticipated to be completed by late 2024 due to the extensive level of collaboration with other water agencies and stakeholders that is required for the efforts described below, as well as necessary approvals from the LA County BOS. Significant recycled water programs are being spearheaded by agencies including the City of Los Angeles, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, and Santa Clarita Valley Water District. The County Water Plan team will be building off the work these agencies are doing to further regional collaboration that has already begun through these programs.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS | Hilda L. Solis First District | Holly J. Mitchell Second District | Lindsey P. Horvath Third District | Janice Hahn Fourth District | Kathryn Barger Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
STORM WATER CAPTURE AND WASTEWATER REUSE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.5
The BOS should provide funding for sediment removal behind dams, enlargement of spreading basins, and purchase of property for additional spreading basins.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation continues to be implemented.

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (DPW) has and intends to continue to make recommendations to the BOS to approve sediment removal projects from dams and spreading basins and projects to create new or enhance/expand existing spreading basins. The Los Angeles County Flood Control District has numerous ongoing and planned reservoir restoration projects to remove accumulated sediment and/or to maintain/enhance storage capacity at its dams.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.11
The BOS should provide funding for the design and construction of a backbone purple water system.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented.

The BOS continues to focus on governance and policymaking, ensuring efficient and effective allocation of public resources, leveraging regional partnerships for funding opportunities, and addressing various community needs. As such, the BOS has led the collaborative effort of highlighting the need for regional water resilience through collaborative strategies.

Recognizing the new climate reality and the need to be thoughtful stewards of future water supplies, the BOS envisioned and directed the development of a Countywide water plan focused on collaborative management of Los Angeles County's water resources.

The draft County Water Plan focuses on leveraging local resource development like maximizing recycled water through agency-led projects and the Safe, Clean Water Program. To avoid duplication of efforts and to maximize efficiency, the BOS will continue to utilize the County Water Plan framework to work with recycled water agencies to accomplish the goals of the Plan through facilitation of partnerships and information-sharing between agencies, including the support of existing efforts related to planned regional recycled water programs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.15
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power should continue to remediate the San Fernando Basin to allow the reopening of wells that are currently closed.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for the implementation falls outside the County.

The remediation of the San Fernando Basin and decisions regarding the reopening of wells fall under the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.16
The BOS should work with State Government to establish expedited procedures for water supply and water remediation projects.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation continues to be implemented.

The BOS will continue to collaborate with State partners and provide a consistent regional voice on efforts to improve permitting and regulations related to water supply and water remediation projects.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
SANITATION DISTRICTS
Converting Waste Into Resources

Robert C. Ferrante
Chief Engineer and General Manager

1955 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90601-1400
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998
(562) 699-7411 • www.lacsd.org

July 20, 2023

VIA EMAIL cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov

Ms. Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Office
745 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Ms. Davenport:

Responses to the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report
Stormwater Capture and Wastewater Reuse

Please find attached the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts' (Sanitation Districts) response to the Grand Jury Report titled *Stormwater Capture and Wastewater Reuse*. The Sanitation Districts is submitting this response for the "Required Agencies" listed in the Required Responses section of your June 21, 2023, letter as "Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County."

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Mr. Ray Tremblay at (562) 908-4288, extension 2701, or at rtremblay@lacsd.org.

Very truly yours,

Robert C. Ferrante

RT:AM:pb

Enclosure

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
SANITATION DISTRICTS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
STORM WATER CAPTURE AND WASTEWATER REUSE

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
LACDPW should establish a committee to study and identify potential users of recycled wastewater (industry, commercial nurseries/growers, regional and local parks, etc.). Committee to include, at a minimum, representatives of the City of Los Angeles, the City of Long Beach, and the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County.

RESPONSE
The Sanitation Districts agree with the finding. The recommendation will be implemented. The idea of establishing a committee is a very good one but there are already at least two regional recycled water committees performing this role in the County. First of all, Metropolitan Water District has formed the Water Reuse Collaborative Group to coordinate the planning for regional recycled water treatment and distribution systems. The Collaborative Group aims to coordinate the planning for two very large regional recycled water projects intended to provide over 350 million gallons per day of purified recycled water. The City of Los Angeles, City of Long Beach, Sanitation Districts, LACDPW already participate in this group as well as additional organizations such as the City of Torrance, West Basin Municipal Water District, and Central Basin Municipal Water District.

Furthermore, the California WateReuse Association's Los Angeles County Chapter has formed the Los Angeles County WateReuse Committee. The mission of the Los Angeles Chapter of the WateReuse Association is to increase the amount of safe and beneficial uses of recycled water in and around the County. Its objectives shall be to promote water reclamation and recycling as a sustainable supplemental source of water for the state; to work for the adoption of legislation and regulations that allow the safe use of recycled water; to facilitate the development of technology aimed at improving water recycling; to promote legislation that would increase funding for water recycling projects; to provide mutual assistance and support between and among Los Angeles Chapter members involved with water recycling projects; and to increase public awareness and understanding of related water problems and solutions. Participants include Metropolitan Water District, Sanitation Districts, City of Los Angeles as well as State and County entities.

LACDPW is in the process of finalizing the Los Angeles County Water Plan. The Water Plan focuses on collaborative management of Los Angeles County's water resources. As part of implementation and to avoid duplication of efforts, LACDPW can utilize the County Water Plan framework to work with recycled water agencies to accomplish this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.12
Continue to construct ATW facilities to lessen the need for imported water.

RESPONSE
The Sanitation Districts agree with the finding. The recommendation is in the process of being completed. The Sanitation Districts have supported use of recycled water to lessen the need for imported water for many decades. Since the early 1960s, the Sanitation Districts have operated water recycling plants designed to recycle water used to replenish groundwater basins. More recently, the Sanitation Districts have participated in projects that take treated water from our water recycling plants and further purifies it using advanced treated water (ATW) facilities. However, statutory authority limits the Sanitation Districts' ability to directly provide recycled water to customers. As a result, we rely upon water agency partners to construct the ATW facilities and water distribution infrastructure. We are currently supporting the preliminary planning, engineering, and environmental review of substantial water recycling projects involving the construction of ATW facilities in both the Los Angeles Basin and Antelope Valley. Of note, the Sanitation Districts is partnering on a 150 million gallon per day recycling project with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California using ATW facilities, known as Pure Water Southern California. When completed, this project could provide purified water to supply the needs of up to 1.5 million people.

KAREN BASS
MAYOR

October 6, 2023

Samantha P. Jessner
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Stormwater Capture and Wastewater Reuse
Report by the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury

Dear Honorable Judge Samantha P. Jessner:

The City of Los Angeles acknowledges receipt of the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Pre Report regarding Stormwater Capture and Wastewater Reuse, its findings and recommendations. The City respectfully submits Attachment A as the City's formal response, inclusive of recommendations relevant to both the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and the City of Los Angeles. The City's responses were prepared by knowledgeable staff working in the Department of Water and Power and the LA Sanitation and Environment Bureau of the Department of Public Works.

For additional questions or comments, your staff may contact Randall Winston, Deputy Mayor of Infrastructure, at randall.winston@lacity.org.

Karen Bass
KAREN BASS
Mayor

Paul Krekorian
PAUL KREKORIAN
City Council President

CITY OF LOS ANGELES RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Subject: 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Recommendations For:
Stormwater Capture and Wastewater Reuse

Recommendation 1.9 LACDPW should establish a committee to study and identify potential users of recycled wastewater (industry, commercial nurseries/growers, regional and local parks, etc.). Committee to include, at a minimum, representatives of the City of Los Angeles, the City of Long Beach, and the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County.

The City agrees with this recommendation and is very interested in participating in this committee if this recommendation is implemented by LACDPW in the future.

Recommendation 1.13 Establish permanent funding to complete the construction of the Hyperion and Donald C. Tillman projects.

The City agrees with the recommendation and is implementing it by actively pursuing funding for both projects. Being fully invested in establishing reliable and sustainable local water resources also requires a commensurate commitment to providing funding. Both the Donald C Tillman project (part of the broader Los Angeles Groundwater Replenishment Project) and Hyperion (part of the broader Operation NEXT project) are prioritized in the City's capital planning process. The City is committed to ensuring that its ratepayers pay the lowest cost possible for these vital projects. As such, the City is evaluating the viability of all available options, including grants and low-interest financing, to alleviate rate impacts for its customers.

Recommendation 1.15 LADWP should continue to remediate the San Fernando Basin to allow the reopening of wells that are currently closed.

The City agrees with this recommendation and is implementing it. LADWP is completing construction of three remediation projects, which are scheduled to begin operation over the next 12 months. Collectively, these projects will remove contaminant mass and capture groundwater contamination plumes, while also restoring the ability of LADWP to extract and treat groundwater from three major well fields: Tujunga, Rinaldi Toluca and North Hollywood West. Additionally, LADWP negotiated and executed two settlements with potentially responsible parties (Honeywell International Inc. and the Lockheed Martin Corporation), which will enable the remediation of groundwater plumes and operation of groundwater production wells in the North Hollywood East Well Field (and, if certain conditions are met, two wells in the Whitnall Well Field). Separately, LADWP has initiated an investigation of the contaminant plumes in the southern portion of the San Fernando Basin, which is intended to provide additional information to LADWP and others about the nature and extent of groundwater contamination, as a first step towards potential remediation of this portion of basin.

Correction Regarding Recommendation 1.14

The Chart on Page 22 of the Report suggest that LADWP should respond to Recommendation 1.14, but this is possibly a typo, as that recommendation regards "Establish[ing] permanent funding to complete the construction of JWPCP ATW projects," and LADWP does not have any involvement in JWPCP. This recommendation cannot be implemented by LADWP because the project is not owned or led by LADWP or the City of Los Angeles. It is being developed by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and the Los Angeles County Sanitation District.

LONG BEACH Utilities
Water · Gas · Sewer

CHRISTOPHER J. GARNER, General Manager

1800 E. Wardlow Road, Long Beach, CA 90807
562.570.2300 | LBUtilities.org

June 30, 2023

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: **STORMWATER CAPTURE AND WASTEWATER REUSE REPORT**

The City of Long Beach is in receipt of the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury's Stormwater Capture and Wastewater Reuse report as well as its recommendations.

Consistent with Recommendation 1.9 of the report, the City of Long Beach agrees to participate in a committee to be established by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works to study and identify potential users of recycled wastewater.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Garner
General Manager

Attachment

cc: Rex Richardson, Mayor
Board of Utilities Commissioners
Tom Modica, City Manager
Eric Lopez, Director of Public Works
Monique De La Garza, City Clerk

THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Office of the General Manager

Via Electronic and U.S. Mail

October 2, 2023

Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012
[redacted]

Dear Presiding Judge:

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Response to Grand Jury Report *Stormwater Capture and Wastewater Reuse*

On June 12, 2023, the Los Angeles Grand Jury released a report titled, *Stormwater Capture and Wastewater Reuse* (Grand Jury report), that examined the complex issues surrounding water supply conditions in Los Angeles County. The Grand Jury report presented information on the status of stormwater capture and water recycling efforts in Los Angeles County.

In partnership with local water agencies throughout the region and in Los Angeles County, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) is a leader in implementing a One Water approach for water supply reliability. Metropolitan has invested over $1.5 billion in drought-resilient resources such as conservation, recycling, stormwater, and groundwater recovery. Our 17 member agency partners in Los Angeles County have invested billions more.

Metropolitan appreciates the Grand Jury's effort to examine the complex issues surrounding Los Angeles County's water supplies. The Grand Jury requested that Metropolitan respond to findings and recommendations in the report. In accordance with California Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05, the 2022-2023 Grand Jury requires (or, as noted, requests) each agency affected by the findings and recommendations presented in the report to submit their responses to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court. Per the Grand Jury's request, below are Metropolitan's responses to Findings F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F7, F8, F9, F10, F11, F12, F13, F14, and F15, and Recommendation R1.14.

Background of Metropolitan

Metropolitan is a voluntary cooperative created in 1928 under authority of the Metropolitan Water District Act. Metropolitan's primary purpose is to provide wholesale water for domestic and municipal uses to its member public agencies. Metropolitan has no retail customers. The mission of Metropolitan is to provide its service area with adequate and reliable supplies of high-quality water to meet present and future needs in an environmentally and economically responsible way.

Metropolitan is a public agency and the largest regional wholesale provider of water in the United States. It is comprised of 26 member public agencies that serve approximately 19 million people in Metropolitan's 5,200-square-mile service area that includes portions of six counties in Southern California, including Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Ventura. Metropolitan's 26-member public agencies include 14 cities, 11 municipal water districts, and one county water authority, which collectively serve the residents and businesses of more than 300 cities and numerous unincorporated communities.

For most member agencies, Metropolitan's water serves as a supplemental source of water and for others, it is the primary source of water. Member agencies are not required to purchase or use any amount of the water available from Metropolitan. Some agencies depend on Metropolitan's supply nearly for all their water needs, regardless of the weather. Other agencies, with local surface reservoirs or aqueducts that capture rain or snowfall, rely on Metropolitan's supply more in dry years than in years with heavy rainfall. Yet other agencies, with ample groundwater supplies, purchase Metropolitan water only to supplement local supplies and to recharge groundwater basins. All agencies are always connected to Metropolitan's system and Metropolitan stands by to provide the water upon request. Member agencies provide estimates of demands to Metropolitan for each year and request water from Metropolitan at various delivery points within Metropolitan's system. The member agencies pay for such water at uniform rates established by Metropolitan's Board of Directors for each class of water service. Consumer demand and locally supplied water vary from year to year, resulting in variability in the volume of Metropolitan's water transactions with its member agencies.

Metropolitan owns and operates regional infrastructure to convey, treat and deliver water to its member agencies. This includes the 242-mile Colorado River Aqueduct and five associated pump stations, over 830 miles of large diameter pipelines, five large water treatment plants, and nine reservoirs with a combined storage capacity of 1.072 MAF. In addition to developing storage and exchange programs with partners throughout California and Colorado River Basin, Metropolitan also collaborates with its member agencies to fund regional water use efficiency and local supply development programs. Metropolitan's Board of Directors is also leading the development of our Climate Adaptation Master Plan that is anchored in reuse, stormwater capture, storage, and enhanced conveyance.

Comments

In the Grand Jury report, there were a few statements that Metropolitan would like to provide clarification on. These items are summarized below. The bulleted items below were taken from the Grand Jury report.

- Page 4: "*The three main importers of water are the City of Los Angeles (City), the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD).*"

Clarification:

The three main importers of water in Los Angeles County are the City, San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (SGVMWD), and Metropolitan. The City imports water from Owens Valley via the Los Angeles Aqueduct (LAA). Water from the LAA is treated at Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's (LADWP's) Los Angeles Filtration Plant and serves customers within the City. SGVMWD, which serves four cities (Alhambra, Azusa, Monterey Park, and Sierra Madre) in the San Gabriel Valley, imports water from the State Water Project (SWP). The SWP is managed by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and conveys water from the Northern Sierras via the California Aqueduct. SGVMWD imports water from the SWP for groundwater recharge in the San Gabriel Valley. Metropolitan, in its role as supplemental supplier, imports water from the SWP and the Colorado River via the Colorado River Aqueduct.

- Page 5: *"In 2023, it is anticipated that number will rise to thirty percent (30%)."*

Clarification:

On April 20, 2023, DWR increased the SWP allocation to 100 percent.

- Page 17: *"'Purple water' is treated wastewater. It is called 'purple water' because it is transported in purple pipes."*

Clarification:

"Purple water" is treated wastewater for non-potable uses such as landscape irrigation and, industrial uses. Because the water is non-potable, it is conveyed in purple pipes and designated with purple placards to distinguish it from potable water supplies.

- Page 18: *"The JWPCP is a joint project by MWD and LACSD... The JWPCP, when certified, is designed to produce 150 MGD (168,000 AFY) of ATW".*

Clarification:

Pure Water Southern California (Pure Water), Metropolitan's proposed regional purified water program, is a partnership with the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) that would purify treated wastewater from LACSD's JWPCP. The program could produce up to 150 MGD, or an average of 155,000 acre-feet per year of purified water for groundwater replenishment, non-potable use, and raw water augmentation. The agencies have been working together since 2010 on the program. Metropolitan and LACSD are currently operating a demonstration facility and are in the environmental planning and preliminary design phase. At full scale, the program would be one of the largest water reuse efforts of its kind in the world.

On July 21, 2023, State officials presented Metropolitan with $80 million in funding to help advance Pure Water. Metropolitan and LACSD are partnering on work to accelerate the

project's design and construction, with the potential to begin construction as early as 2025 and water deliveries to start in 2032.

Metropolitan Responses on Findings:

Finding F1: *"The LACFCD captures stormwater in reservoirs and spreading grounds."*

Response: Agree
Metropolitan agrees that LACFCD captures stormwater in reservoirs and spreading grounds.

Finding F2: *"Stormwater capture can provide a valuable source of water within the LACFCD."*

Response: Agree
Metropolitan agrees that stormwater capture can provide a valuable source of water within the LACFCD and throughout Southern California.

Finding F3: *"Increasing storage volumes behind dams will allow increased stormwater capture."*

Response: Agree.
Agree, but Metropolitan believes that expanding existing spreading grounds may provide more stormwater capture potential. In addition, distributed stormwater capture can be an effective tool, especially in fully developed urban areas

Finding F4: *"Increasing the number of spreading grounds will allow more infiltration of stormwater."*

Response: Agree
Agree, but Metropolitan believes that expanding existing spreading grounds may provide more stormwater capture potential.

Finding F5: *"Measure W projects are beneficial to stormwater capture, but dams and spreading grounds provide, by far, the largest volume of stormwater capture."*

Response: Agree
Agree. Spreading grounds and dam modifications do provide more water supply benefits compared to sub-regional or distributed stormwater projects. Distributed stormwater capture can be an effective tool, especially in fully developed urban areas

Finding F6: "*The application process for Measure W funding is time consuming and expensive.*"

Response: Agree partially.

While Metropolitan does not agree that Measure W funding is unnecessarily time consuming, Metropolitan does encourage efforts to streamline the application process for Measure W to prioritize project implementation. We recognize the groundbreaking work of LA County Public Works and their partners in the advancement of Measure W. As Southern California faces climate whiplash, the need for climate adaptation is urgent. It is imperative to accelerate every effort.

Finding F7: "*Measure W outreach funds are under-utilized.*"

Response: Agree
Metropolitan encourages efforts to expand Measure W outreach funds.

Finding F8: "*Increasing green space is beneficial to groundwater recharge.*"

Response: Agree partially.

The recharge effectiveness of green space projects is dependent upon whether there are groundwater recharge elements in the project and whether the groundwater conditions are confined or unconfined. In areas where there are unconfined groundwater conditions, increasing green space may be beneficial to groundwater recharge. In areas where there are confined groundwater conditions, there may not be a benefit to groundwater recharge.

Finding F9: "*Treated wastewater is being under-utilized.*"

Response: Disagree, partially

LACSD currently recycles and uses about 115,000 acre-feet per year. The City currently recycles and uses about 134,000 acre-feet per year. Between LACSD and the City, about 30 percent of the available recycled water is reused. The biggest opportunities are at the Hyperion Plant and at the JWPCP, where most of the wastewater is discharged to the ocean. Metropolitan is proposing Pure Water and the City is proposing Operation Next, which will increase the utilization rate of recycled water to above 80 percent.

Finding F10: "*There is no master planned county wide system to distribute treated wastewater.*"

Response: Disagree, partially.

While there is no overarching county-wide master plan effort for treated wastewater, LACSD and the City have completed master planning efforts for their service areas. LACSD completed the Clearwater Program Master Facilities Plan in 2012. The City is currently underway with the master planning effort entitled Hyperion 2035.

Finding F11: "*There is no funding program to establish a comprehensive purple water system.*"

Response: Disagree

Since 1982, Metropolitan has assisted local agencies in the development of water recycling projects under the Local Resources Program (LRP). The LRP has evolved over time to help support the development of local water recycling projects including the methodology for providing the incentives to the member agencies. In October 2014, Metropolitan's Board approved additional LRP refinements to support further development of water recycling in the service area. These refinements covered increasing the maximum incentive amount, offering three incentive payment structures, including on-site recycled water retrofit costs, and providing reimbursable services for Metropolitan's technical assistance. In addition, Metropolitan is developing its own regional program, Pure Water, that would provide advanced treated water for both potable and non-potable reuse. To date, Metropolitan has provided member agencies with $534 million for water recycling projects that have produced more than 3 million acre-feet since the initiation of the program.

Finding F12: "*ATW can be a substitute for imported water.*"

Response: Agree, partially

At this time, recycled water can only serve non-potable and potable reuse for groundwater recharge projects. Therefore, ATW can only substitute for imported water if the projects are for non-potable uses or replenishment projects. Raw water augmentation and drinking water augmentation regulations are currently in development and are expected to be final by the end of 2023.

Finding F13: "*Construction of ATW facilities is expensive and seriously underfunded.*"

Response: Disagree, partially

Metropolitan agrees that the construction of ATW facilities is expensive. However, Metropolitan disagrees that it is seriously underfunded. As described above, Metropolitan has invested $534 million to date in order to accelerate water recycling projects, including ATW.

In addition, Metropolitan and LACSD have partnered to fund the Pure Water project. Other utilities such as Orange County Water District and Orange County Sanitation District have partnered to complete the Groundwater Replenishment System (GWRS) that currently produces up to 130 mgd for groundwater replenishment in the Orange County Basin.

Finding F14: *"The San Fernando Basin remains on the Environmental Protection Agency's Super Fund list."*

Response: Agree, partially

Metropolitan agrees that the San Fernando Basin remains on the Environmental Protection Agency's Super Fund list. In addition, portions of the Main San Gabriel Basin are also on the Environmental Protection Agency's Super Fund list.

Finding F15: *"The permitting process for stormwater and wastewater projects take several years to complete."*

Response: Agree

Agree. In particular, the permitting process for wastewater projects can be many years, depending upon the complexity of the project.

Metropolitan Responses on Recommendations:

Recommendation R1.14: *"Establish permanent funding to complete the construction of JWPCP ATW projects."*

Response: Agree.

As discussed previously, Pure Water, Metropolitan's proposed regional purified water program, is a partnership with LACSD that would purify treated wastewater from LACSD's JWPCP. The program could produce up to 150 MGD, or an average of 155,000 acre-feet per year of purified water for groundwater replenishment, non-potable use, and raw water augmentation. Metropolitan and LACSD are currently operating a demonstration facility and in the environmental planning and preliminary design phase.

On July 21, 2023, State officials presented Metropolitan with $80 million in funding to help advance Pure Water. Metropolitan and LACSD are partnering on work to accelerate the project's design and construction, with the potential to begin construction as early as 2025 and water deliveries to start in 2032. Metropolitan and LACSD intend to fund Pure Water through our respective rate structures, state and federal grants, and other funding. Similarly, the City of Los Angeles is planning to fund Operation Next. However, these programs are very expensive when compared to traditional supply sources and the infrastructure to develop and move these supplies where needed will be costly. Alternative and sustainable funding sources could be important to ensure the success of these programs.

Thank you for providing Metropolitan with the opportunity to respond. Please feel free to contact us if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
8E4063CE65EF4D2...
Adel Hagekhalil
General Manager

CIV:vsm

ZERO EMISSIONS AND AIR QUALITY MONITORING



2022 – 2023

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

CIVIL GRAND JURY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis	Holly J. Mitchell	Lindsey P. Horvath	Janice Hahn	Kathryn Barger
First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District

Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Fesia A. Davenport

August 31, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport FOR
Chief Executive Officer

2022-2023 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached are responses to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations dealing with the following sections:

- Aging Out: Transitional Aged Youth
- All Aboard: Is Metro Rail on Track
- Civil Grand Jury Compensation
- Election Operations
- Have We M.E.T.? Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work
- Housing Vouchers For Low income and Homeless Angelenos
- The Inmate Reception Center: An Outdated Process Imperils Staff, Inmates, and the Justice System
- Juvenile Justice CYA
- Lack of Housing: The Social Injustice of the 21st Century
- Los Angeles County Fire Department Workers Compensation
- Medi-Cal Reimbursement: The Final Resolution of an Ongoing Issue
- Proposition 19: Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations: Examining Transparency, Accountability, and Community Policing within the LASD
- Storm Water Capture and Wastewater Reuse
- Zero Emissions: Air Quality Monitoring

Attachment A represents the Chief Executive Officer's responses; Attachments B through V represent the departments' responses; and Attachment W represents a matrix of the questions and responses from each department.

If you have any questions regarding our responses, please contact me, or your staff may contact Cheri Thomas, by phone at (213) 974-1326 or by email at cthomas@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:CT:md

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
Children and Family Services
Fire
Health Services
Human Resources
Internal Services
Mental Health
Probation
Public Health
Public Social Services
Public Works
Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Development Authority
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
Zero Emissions and Air Quality Monitoring

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
This committee supports the option of green hydrogen but recommends that the exposure of nitrous oxide pollution be identified and eliminated in its energy applications.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for the implementation falls outside the County.

Green hydrogen is produced using renewable energy. Once the hydrogen is produced, it can be used to generate carbon-free electricity through fuel cells or combustion turbines. When hydrogen is used in fuel cells, the byproducts are heat and water vapor. However, hydrogen can also be combusted like gas to produce electricity, which creates water vapor and nitrogen oxide byproducts.

Nitrogen oxide emissions from fired combustion equipment are regulated by the Air Quality Management Districts (AQMD), of which there are two that cover the County: Antelope Valley AQMD and South Coast AQMD. All owners and operators of equipment or facilities that may emit nitrogen oxide must meet AQMD permitting requirements and not exceed established emissions thresholds.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
Nitrous oxides need to be contained during hydrogen production operations.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for the implementation falls outside the County.

Green hydrogen is produced using renewable energy. Once the hydrogen is produced, it can be used to generate carbon-free electricity through fuel cells or combustion turbines. When hydrogen is used in fuel cells, the byproducts are heat and water vapor. However, hydrogen can also be combusted like gas to produce electricity, which creates water vapor and nitrogen oxide byproducts.

Nitrogen oxide emissions from fired combustion equipment are regulated by the AQMD, of which there are two that cover the County: Antelope Valley AQMD and South Coast AQMD. All owners and operators of equipment or facilities that may emit nitrogen oxide must meet AQMD permitting requirements and not exceed established emissions thresholds.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
(A) Schools, county/city public agencies/buildings, and commercial offices should be retrofitted with energy efficient systems, thereby modeling consistent ZE goals and practices.

(B) Construction building codes should reflect ZE goals.

RESPONSE
(A) and (B) Agree. This recommendation will be implemented.

The BOS issued a motion on March 15, 2022 titled, "Ensuring the Equitable Decarbonization of Buildings," directing multiple County departments including the Chief Sustainability Office (CSO) and DPW in partnership with the CEO and Department of Regional Planning to reduce local air pollution and global climate change effects from building emissions. A coordinated effort is pending to develop recommendations for an ordinance or building code changes that would phase in the decarbonization of all new residential and commercial construction and substantial renovations. The recommendations are currently scheduled to be submitted to the BOS in November 2023.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
To comply with SB 1383, separating food waste from regular garbage disposal into green collection bins and its collection needs to be closely monitored.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation has been implemented.

The BOS adopted the Zero Waste Plan on September 13, 2022, which outlines strategies and initiatives to reduce the amount of waste going to landfills and the greenhouse gas emissions created by landfill waste. The County has been amending existing waste collection contracts and developing new contracts to include mandatory organic waste collection service to all residents and businesses. The County also prepared an Organic Waste Disposal Reduction Ordinance adopted by the BOS in November 2021 to ensure the organic waste collection service is being utilized. The Sustainable Waste and Recycling Management subcommittee developed under the Infrastructure LA Workgroup meets quarterly to discuss issues related to solid waste infrastructure and SB 1383 implementation. The County continues to conduct outreach by using existing and developing new outreach.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10
Each Los Angeles Sanitation District should publish updated reports on their community's adherence to SB 1383.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for the implementation falls outside the County.

The Los Angeles Sanitation District is not a county entity and jurisdiction falls under the Los Angeles Sanitation District.

LA COUNTY PLANNING ESI. 1923 100

AMY J. BOEDK, AICP
Director,
Regional Planning

DENNIS SLAVIN
Chief Deputy Director,
Regional Planning

July 18, 2023

Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Office
713 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attention: Cheri Thomas

Dear Ms. Davenport:

2022-23 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS RESPONSE FOR ZERO EMISSIONS AND AIR QUALITY MONITORING

Attached for your consideration is the Department of Regional Planning's response to the 2022-23 Civil Grand Jury report, as required by California Penal Code sections 933(c). Please contact me or Thuy Hua @thua@planning.lacounty.gov if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

AMY J. BOEDK, AICP
Director of Regional Planning

AJB:CC:lg

Attachment

S_07_18_2023_AP_L_FESIADAVENPORT_GRANDJURYREPORT

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
REGIONAL PLANNING

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
ZERO EMISSIONS AND AIR QUALITY MONITORING

RECOMMENDATION NO 1.6
This committee supports the option of green hydrogen but recommends that the exposure of nitrous oxide pollution be identified and eliminated in its energy applications.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for implementation of this recommendation falls outside County Planning. Green hydrogen is produced using renewable energy. Once the hydrogen is produced, it can be used to generate carbon-free electricity through fuel cells or combustion turbines. When hydrogen is used in fuel cells, the byproducts are heat and water vapor. However, hydrogen can also be combusted like gas to produce electricity, which creates water vapor and nitrogen oxide byproducts.

Nitrogen oxide emissions from fired combustion equipment are regulated by the AQMD, of which there are two that cover the County: Antelope Valley AQMD and South Coast AQMD. All owners and operators of equipment or facilities that may emit nitrogen oxide must meet AQMD permitting requirements and not exceed established emissions thresholds.

RECOMMENDATION 1.7
Nitrous oxides need to be contained during hydrogen production operations.

RESPONSE
See response above for Recommendation No. 1.6.

RECOMMENDATION 1.8
(a) Schools, county/city public agencies/buildings, and commercial offices should be retrofitted with energy efficient systems, thereby modeling consistent ZE goals and practices.

(b) Construction building codes should reflect ZE goals.

RESPONSE
Agree. This recommendation requires further exploration to be completed by November 2023. The BOS issued a motion on March 15, 2022 titled, "Ensuring the Equitable Decarbonization of Buildings," directing multiple County departments including the CSO and DPW in partnership with the CEO and Department of Regional Planning to reduce local air pollution and global climate change effects

from building emissions. A coordinated effort is pending to develop recommendations for an ordinance or building code changes that would phase in the decarbonization of all new residential and commercial construction and substantial renovations. The recommendations are currently scheduled to be submitted to the BOS for their consideration in November 2023.

RECOMMENDATION 1.9
In order to comply with SB 1383, separating food waste from regular garbage disposal into green collection bins and its collection needs to be closely monitored.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for implementation of this recommendation falls outside County Planning. The BOS adopted the Zero Waste Plan on September 13, 2022, which outlines strategies and initiatives to reduce the amount of waste going to landfills and the greenhouse gas emissions created by landfill waste. The County has been amending existing waste collection contracts and developing new contracts to include mandatory organic waste collection service to all residents and businesses. The County also prepared an Organic Waste Disposal Reduction Ordinance adopted by the BOS in November 2021 to ensure the organic waste collection service is being utilized. The Sustainable Waste and Recycling Management subcommittee developed under the Infrastructure LA Workgroup meets quarterly to discuss issues related to solid waste infrastructure and SB 1383 implementation. The County continues to conduct outreach by using existing and developing new outreach material to help educate residents and businesses on how to comply with SB 1383.

RECOMMENDATION 1.10
Each Los Angeles Sanitation District should publish updated reports on their community's adherence to SB 1383.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction for implementation of this recommendation falls outside County Planning. The County supports transparency and encourages all public agencies to make information publicly available. The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD) is a public agency independent of the County government consisting of a confederation of 24 special districts. They publish annual reports on collective progress on wastewater and trash management. Reports can be accessed here: https://www.lacsd.org/about-us/who-we-are/annual-reports. Information on LACSD's process of food waste recycling to meet SB 1383 can be found here: https://www.lacsd.org/services/solid-waste-programs/food-waste-recycling.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CELIA ZAVALA
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
EXECUTIVE OFFICE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 383
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1411 • www.bos.lacounty.gov

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

July 21, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Celia Zavala
Executive Officer

2022-23 LOS ANGELES CIVIL GRAND JURY RESPONSE

Attached are responses to the 2022-23 Civil Grand Jury Final Report. We are responding to specific recommendations related to the following sections:

- Proposition 19 Implementation and Related Matters
- Sheriff's Operations. Examining Transparency, Accountability and Community Policing within the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
- Zero Emissions and Air Quality Monitoring

Despite not being a designated department for the Proposition 19 response, it is important to mention that we provided feedback because it relates to the operations of the Assessment Appeals Board division within the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 974-1401, or your staff may contact Hanna Cheru, Assistant Executive Officer, at (213) 893-2564 or hcheru@bos.lacounty.gov.

CZ:HC:ja

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS - CHIEF SUSTAINABILITY OFFICE (CSO)

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
ZERO EMISSIONS AND AIR QUALITY MONITORING

RECOMMENDATION NO .1.6
This committee supports the option of green hydrogen but recommends that the exposure of nitrous oxide pollution be identified and eliminated in its energy applications.

RESPONSE
The respondent agrees with the finding. However, the recommendation requires additional analysis to understand the most appropriate applications for green hydrogen and how the consequences of hydrogen use, such as nitrous oxide pollution, can be best be identified and eliminated.

The CSO plans to do a preliminary exploration of the sustainability and equity considerations associated with the production and use of hydrogen and discuss next steps with the BOS and relevant Departments over the next six months.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
Nitrous oxides need to be contained during hydrogen production operations.

RESPONSE
The respondent agrees with the finding. However, the recommendation requires additional analysis to understand the considerations associated with hydrogen production, including containment and mitigation of nitrous oxide pollution.

The CSO plans to do a preliminary exploration of the sustainability and equity considerations associated with the production and use of hydrogen and discuss next steps with the BOS and relevant Departments over the next six months.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
(a) Schools, county/city public agencies/buildings, and commercial offices should be retrofitted with energy efficient systems, thereby modeling consistent ZE goals and practices.

(b) Construction building codes should reflect ZE goals.

RESPONSE
The respondent agrees with the finding. The recommendation will be implemented.

The State and County both have climate pollution reduction goals that include decarbonization for new and existing buildings, and the County is actively pursuing strategies to achieve these goals. Areas of activity include how to prioritize buildings for retrofits and regulations, technological challenges and solutions associated with converting new and existing buildings from gas to electric equipment, potential sources of funding to address the needs of different building types and planning for engagement and outreach around building decarbonization. Currently, the County is exploring available regulatory mechanisms to incorporate decarbonization goals into building codes and standards. The CSO will have more detailed implementation strategies to share over the next six to 12 months to align with relevant considerations, including anticipated state guidance on funding for decarbonization of existing buildings and an anticipated ruling from the 9th Circuit on relevant case law for new buildings.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
In order to comply with Senate Bill (SB) 1383, separating food waste from regular garbage disposal intro green collection bins and its collection needs to be closely monitored.

RESPONSE
The respondent disagrees with the finding. The recommendation will not be implemented since CSO does not have a monitoring or reporting role related to waste.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10
Each Los Angeles Sanitation District should publish updated reports on their community's adherence to SB 1383.

RESPONSE
The respondent disagrees with the finding. The recommendation will not be implemented since CSO does not have authority over the Los Angeles Sanitation District.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Public Health

BARBARA FERRER, Ph.D., M.P.H., M.Ed.
Director

MUNTU DAVIS, M.D., M.P.H.
County Health Officer

MEGAN McCLAIRE, M.S.P.H.
Chief Deputy Director

313 North Figueroa Street, Suite 806
Los Angeles, CA 90012
TEL (213) 288-8117 • FAX (213) 975-1273

www.publichealth.lacounty.gov

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis
First District

Holly J. Mitchell
Second District

Lindsey P. Horvath
Third District

Janice Hahn
Fourth District

Kathryn Barger
Fifth District

July 31, 2023

TO: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Office
713 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attention: Cheri Thomas

FROM: Barbara Ferrer, Ph.D., M.P.H., M.Ed.
Director

SUBJECT: **2022-23 Civil Grand Jury Recommendations Response For: Aging Out of Transitional Aged Youth, Zero Emissions and Air Quality Monitoring, Have We M.E.T Mental Health Evaluation Teams and How They Work**

Attached for your consideration is the Department of Public Health's response to the 2022-2023 Civil Grand Jury report, as required by California Penal Code sections 933(c). Please note that Public Health's Toxicology and Environmental Assessment Branch has been folded into the new Office of Environmental Justice and Climate Health. Please contact Joshua Bobrowsky at jbobrowsky@ph.lacounty.gov if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Attachment
BF:nq:tf

cc: Chief Executive Officer
Acting County Counsel
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Internal Services Department

RESPONSE TO THE CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH - ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIVISION, OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND CLIMATE HEALTH

2022-2023 CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
ZERO EMISSIONS AND AIR QUALITY MONITORING

FINDING NO. 7
Producing hydrogen using electrolysis can produce nitrous oxides.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree, as this finding is only partially accurate. DPH suggests that further analysis into this finding be conducted. It is our understanding that production of hydrogen gas using electrolysis does not result in the formation of nitrous oxides, but rather that the use and burning of hydrogen gas can form nitrous oxides.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.6
This committee supports the option of green hydrogen but recommends that the exposure of nitrous oxide pollution be identified and eliminated in its energy applications.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside DPH. Green hydrogen is produced using renewable energy. Once the hydrogen is produced, it can be used to generate carbon-free electricity through fuel cells or combustion turbines. When hydrogen is used in fuel cells, the byproducts are heat and water vapor. However, hydrogen can also be combusted like gas to produce electricity, which creates water vapor and nitrous oxide byproducts. Nitrous oxide emissions from fired combustion equipment are regulated by the Air Quality Management District (AQMD).

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.7
Nitrous oxides need to be contained during hydrogen production operations.

RESPONSE
Partially disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside DPH. It is the understanding of the Department that the production of hydrogen does not produce nitrous oxides, but rather that the combustion of hydrogen that can produce nitrous oxides. Nitrous oxide emissions from fired combustion equipment are regulated by the AQMD.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.8
(a) Schools, county/city public agencies/buildings, and commercial offices should be retrofitted with energy efficient systems, thereby modeling consistent ZE goals and practices.
(b) Construction building codes should reflect ZE goals.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside DPH.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.9
In order to comply with Senate Bill (SB) 1383, separating food waste from regular garbage disposal into green collection bins and its collection needs to be closely monitored.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside the DPH.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.10
Each Los Angeles Sanitation District should publish updated reports on their community's adherence to SB 1383.

RESPONSE
Disagree. This recommendation will not be implemented as jurisdiction falls outside DPH. The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts are a public agency consisting of 24 independent special districts that operate independently of Los Angeles County Government.

THE PORT
OF LOS ANGELES

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

Karen Bass | *Mayor, City of Los Angeles*

Board of Harbor Commissioners: Lucille Roybal-Allard, *President*; Diane L. Middleton, *Vice President*; Michael Muñoz, *Commissioner*; Edward R. Renwick, *Commissioner*; I. Lee Williams, *Commissioner*

Eugene D. Seroka | *Executive Director*

November 17, 2023

Presiding Judge
Los Angeles County Superior Court
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
Los Angeles County Grand Jury
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(via E-mail: n.rascon@lacourt.org)

Dear Presiding Judge:

SUBJECT: RESPONSES TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT

Attached please find responses from the City of Los Angeles Harbor Department (Harbor Department) to the Findings and Recommendations in the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Report titled *Zero Emissions Air Quality Monitoring*.

Thank you for providing the Harbor Department with the opportunity to respond. If you have any additional questions or concerns, please contact Lisa Wunder, Acting Director of Environmental Management via email at lwunder@portla.org.

Sincerely,

Michael DiBernardo

MICHAEL DiBERNARDO
Deputy Executive Director

MD:LW:TD:TP:mrx

Attachment

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

Karen Bass | *Mayor, City of Los Angeles*

Board of Harbor Commissioners | Lucille Roybal-Allard *President* | Diane L. Middleton *Vice President* | Michael Muñoz *Commissioner* | Edward R. Renwick *Commissioner* | I. Lee Williams *Commissioner*

Eugene D. Seroka | *Executive Director*

RESPONSE TO THE 2022-2023 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT ZERO EMISSIONS & AIR QUALITY MONITORING PORT OF LOS ANGELES RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

TRANSPORTATION

FINDING No. 1

The total electrical load for the entire port can be exceeded.

RESPONSE:
Respondent agrees. Estimates developed in a formal study with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) and the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)[1] indicate that adopting zero emission equipment could significantly increase the port's electrical demand.

FINDING No. 2

Switching the cargo ship's onboard diesel engines to electrical power is held up when ships are waiting to be docked.

RESPONSE:
Respondent agrees. Ships inbound to the Port of Los Angeles are given specific berth assignments, and per CARB regulations[2] are required to have their engine emissions controlled by connection to shore power or approved alternative within one hour of "ready to work" status, which is when the ship has been fully tied to the dock and can be boarded. Following COVID, for a period in 2021 to 2022, there was an unprecedented level of ship queuing waiting for a berth. In response, the Marine Exchange (port vessel traffic manager) and the shipping industry devised a new ship queueing system[3] in place since

[1] EPRI, Zero-Emission Planning and Grid Assessment for the Port of Los Angeles, June 2023. https://kentico.portoflosangeles.org/getmedia/6b15966c-e99f-4ec0-9eca-3b9974e8a976/EPRI-POLA-ZE-Planning-Grid-Assessment

[2] https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ocean-going-vessels-berth-regulation

[3] https://mxsocal.org/assets/pdf/announcements/container-vessel-queuing-process-faqs-for-la-lb-oak-v-2.pdf

June 2022, in which ships slow-steam in the Pacific before being assigned to enter the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach waters. As a result, currently wait times for ships to dock have returned to pre-COVID levels. The Port and the shipping industry continue to collaborate on ensuring that ships will not need to wait for docking stations.

FINDING No. 3

A high percentage of trucking companies cannot afford to replace their single or small fleet of trucks, therefore needing financial assistance or subsidies to transition to ZE vehicles.

RESPONSE:
Respondent agrees.

FINDING No. 4

The number of infrastructure electric charging stations must keep pace with public demand for converting to ZE alternative vehicles.

RESPONSE:
Respondent agrees. Fueling Infrastructure for hydrogen fuel cell ZE vehicles must also keep pace with demand for such vehicle types.

FINDING No. 5

As ZE vehicles are replacing gasoline and diesel trucks, the recycling and disposal of those trucks is a concern.

RESPONSE:
Respondent disagrees in part with this finding. While recycling of vehicles is always an environmental concern, the expected increase in the need for recycling diesel trucks is likely to be managed by market response to increased demand for such services under the already extant processes for recycling vehicles.[4]

FINDING No. 6

Hydrogen is an alternative to electricity to generate power for motor vehicles.

RESPONSE:
Respondent agrees.

---

[4] https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2020-10/documents/eol_vehicle_guide_final_english.pdf

FINDING No. 7

Producing hydrogen using electrolysis can produce nitrous oxides.

RESPONSE:
Respondent disagrees in part with this finding. The production of hydrogen via electrolysis requires water and energy and produces hydrogen gas. The combustion of the resulting hydrogen gas can produce nitrous oxides. However, hydrogen fuel cells can be used to generate electricity without producing nitrous oxides[5].

RECOMMENDATIONS

TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATION 1.1

The Ports' electrical grid should be managed to service expanding energy needs.

RESPONSE:
This recommendation is being implemented. Estimates developed in a formal study with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) and the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) [6] indicate that adopting zero emission equipment could significantly increase the port's electrical demand. Respondent continues to work with LADWP to manage expanding energy needs.

RECOMMENDATION 1.2

Violations should be implemented if docked beyond wait time.

RESPONSE:
If this recommendation refers to "violations" of the CARB 2020 At-Berth Regulation[7], this recommendation should be referred to the California Air Resources Board, as the regulatory agency with the appropriate authority under its At-Berth Regulation 2020 to implement the Grand Jury's recommendations for ship violations enforcement. Respondent does not have the authority to enforce non-compliant actions under this particular regulation.

---

[5]https://afdc.energy.gov/fuels/hydrogen_benefits.html

[6] EPRI, Zero-Emission Planning and Grid Assessment for the Port of Los Angeles, June 2023. https://kentico.portoflosangeles.org/getmedia/6b15966c-e99f-4ec0-9eca-3b9974e8a976/EPRI-POLA-ZE-Planning-Grid-Assessment

[7] https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ocean-going-vessels-berth-regulation/ocean-going-vessels-berth-regulatory

RECOMMENDATION 1.3

Payments from the POLA and POLB Clean Truck Program should be prioritized as a means of helping small business truck companies purchase ZE trucks.

RESPONSE:
This recommendation is being implemented. Respondent has adopted, through its Board of Harbor Commissioners, a formal Spending Plan for the Clean Truck Fund Rate that collects approximately $30-40 Million annually. The Plan identifies several key elements to support small business truck companies via direct incentives and the support for regional infrastructure. Most recently, Respondent has expanded the Clean Truck Fund's Voucher program to include an additional $25,000 for small truck companies towards the purchase of a ZE truck, for a total added incentive of $100,000 per truck[8].

RECOMMENDATION 1.4

The Ports Complex should determine the best locations for electric charging stations for both present and planned electric trucks/cars.

RESPONSE:
This recommendation is being implemented. Respondent continues to work with the Port of Long Beach, various agencies, and other stakeholders in the region to determine the best locations for electric charging stations for ZE drayage trucks calling at the SPB ports. Several projects are either underway or in the early stages of development, including projects both within and outside the Port Complex.

RECOMMENDATION 1.5

The Clean Truck Program should develop a means for potential buyers and sellers to market the recycled truck materials.

RESPONSE:
This recommendation will not be implemented, as it is not reasonable and beyond the port's statutory requirements to use its resources for purposes of maritime commerce, navigation, and fishery. The Clean Truck Program does not have a nexus to the industry for recycling trucks and has no role in that process.

RECOMMENDATION 1.6

This committee supports the option of green hydrogen but recommends that the exposure of nitrous oxide pollution be identified and eliminated in its energy applications.

---

[8] https://www.portoflosangeles.org/references/2023-News-Releases/news_110923_hvip_ze_trucks

RESPONSE:
This recommendation is being implemented. Respondent is aware of the concerns related to nitrous oxide production in various uses of hydrogen and will work to identify and eliminate any such uses related to the Port.

RECOMMENDATION 1.7

Nitrous oxides need to be contained during hydrogen production operations.

RESPONSE:
This recommendation is being implemented. Respondent is working with the hydrogen industry throughout the state of California to minimize and ultimately eliminate nitrous oxide emissions that occur as part of some hydrogen production operations.

RECOMMENDATION 1.8.a and 1.8.b

(a) Schools, county/city public agencies/buildings, and commercial offices should be retrofitted with energy efficient systems, thereby modeling consistent ZE goals and practices.
(b) Construction building codes should reflect ZE goals.

RESPONSE:
The recommendation is being implemented by the City of Los Angeles. This recommendation is consistent with the City of Los Angeles' Green New Deal goal of making all new buildings in the City net-zero carbon by 2030 and decarbonizing all existing City buildings by 2050.[9]

RECOMMENDATION 1.9

In order to comply with SB 1383, separating food waste from regular garbage disposal into green collection bins and its collection needs to be closely monitored.

RESPONSE:
The recommendation is being implemented. Respondent is updating, and will adopt, its Zero Waste Plan, which contains goals and measures to comply with SB1383. The Zero Waste Plan will also incorporate the City of Los Angeles Ordinance 187718 (Zero Waste City Facilities on City Property), which requires Respondent and its applicable tenants and contractors to segregate waste and recycle organics. Respondent is working with its franchised waste hauler for developing service levels of black, blue, and green waste. Per AB939 (California Integrated Waste Management Act), Respondent will monitor and report its waste diversion quantities and programs.

[9] https://plan.lamayor.org

RECOMMENDATION 1.10

Each Los Angeles Sanitation District should publish updated reports on their community's adherence to SB 1383.

RESPONSE:
Not applicable to Respondent, as this recommendation references the Los Angeles Sanitation District rather than the Los Angeles Harbor Department.

Port of
LONG BEACH
THE PORT OF CHOICE

August 14, 2023

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 W. Temple Street, Thirteenth Floor, Room 13-303
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Zero Emissions and Air Quality Monitoring Report

Your Honor,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process, including an interview held between the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury (Civil Grand Jury) and Port of Long Beach (Port) staff on January 31, 2023 and to review the 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Zero Emission and Air Quality Monitoring Report (Report). The Port appreciates the thoroughness and dedication exhibited by the Civil Grand Jury in conducting the investigation and compiling the Report. We also value the critical role the Civil Grand Jury plays in ensuring transparency, accountability, and the highest standards of governance in the County of Los Angeles.

The Report was developed to investigate the transition to zero emissions in support of the Los Angeles County carbon neutrality goal. We share the understanding that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions produced worldwide must be reduced significantly if we are going to be able to limit global warming to 1.5°C in alignment with the Paris Agreement. The Port of Long Beach has long been committed to environmental stewardship, and to that end, we are actively pursuing zero emissions and decarbonization for port-related operations. In the 2017 update to our Clean Air Action Plan[1], we established goals to transition to zero emission terminal equipment by 2030 and trucks by 2035. As identified in our Energy Policy, adopted in 2013, we are further committed to promoting energy conservation and efficiency, optimizing generation of renewable energy, and fostering innovative energy technologies. Our efforts directly support the Los Angeles County's goal to reach carbon neutrality by 2045.

[1] https://cleanairactionplan.org/

Port of
LONG BEACH
THE PORT OF CHOICE

For more than two decades, the Port of Long Beach has been implementing measures to reduce air emissions from port-related operations. These efforts have been tremendously successful, as evidenced by our 2021 emissions inventory report[2] which identified an 88% reduction in overall diesel particulate matter and 49% reduction in overall nitrogen oxides from 2005 levels. While our 2021 emission inventory identified an increase in greenhouse gas emissions compared to 2005 due to the impacts of pandemic-related cargo congestion that occurred during the reporting period, we anticipate that future inventories will continue on the downward trend now that cargo operations have returned to more typical conditions. On pages 7-8 of the Grand Jury Report, it identified that the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in Los Angeles County is the transportation sector, accounting for 52% of the GHGs produced within the County borders. Of the transportation sector however, it is important to point out that passenger vehicles are the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions[3]. In the Grand Jury Report on page 10, is a statement that the port complex is the largest source of pollution in Los Angeles County. While the port sector is a major source of pollution and has been identified as the largest contributor in the region to certain pollutants, passenger vehicles are in fact the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions.

The Port of Long Beach is aggressively moving forward with our efforts to decarbonize port-related operations. The Port's 2021 Emission Inventory identified that 249 units or 17% of all of the cargo handling equipment used in the Port of Long Beach terminals is already electric. We continue to work with marine terminal tenants on the preparation of electrical infrastructure master plans to better understand the infrastructure requirements to support the transition to zero emissions. Further, we are continuing to secure grant funding to help offset the costs, recently receiving the largest grant awarded in the state through the Port Freight Infrastructure Program in the total amount of $383M, with $224M dedicated to zero emission projects. For trucks, as of July 2023, the Port Drayage Truck Registry has 117 zero emission trucks registered for port service. We continue to implement our Clean Truck Fund Rate, collecting approximately $40M per year to use toward zero emission truck incentives and infrastructure to accelerate the transition. For vessels, shorepower is available at all of our container terminals and efforts are underway to control at-berth emissions from tankers and car carriers in the next few years. In addition the Port of Long Beach continues to provide financial

[2] https://polb.com/environment/air/#emissions-inventory
[3] https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/ghg-inventory-data

incentives for ships that reduce their speeds on approach and departure from the port, resulting in less fuel burned, and lower greenhouse gas emissions. Currently greater than 90% of the vessels that call at the port participate in this program. Lastly, the Port continues to push forward with new innovative technologies to further reduce emissions, helping to support the demonstration of new technologies through financial contributions awarded through our Technology Advancement Program.

In response to the specific findings and recommendations in the Grand Jury Report, we offer the following responses:

- The Report identified that the "...total electrical load for the entire port can be exceeded" and recommended that the "...ports' electrical grid should be managed to service expanding energy needs." Port of Long Beach has a close working relationship with our electrical utility provider, Southern California Edison (SCE). The Port of Long Beach recently completed a Power Systems Resiliency Assessment which included a forecast of anticipated electrical demand, the results of which were shared with SCE. We continue to work with SCE on anticipated projects and forecasting of future electrical demand to ensure that adequate electricity will be available when needed.
- The Report identified that the ability to benefit from the use of shorepower is "...held up when ships are waiting to be docked." And that "violations should be implemented if [vessels are] docked beyond wait time." In response, we want to identify that it is standard operating practice for vessel schedules to be coordinated in order to maximize efficiencies and minimize conflicts with availability of berth space. It is extremely rare for containerships in particular to be tied up at anchor waiting for a berth space to open. The pandemic-related cargo congestion in recent years that lead to a backup of containerships at anchor was an unprecedented event. Currently, there are no containerships at anchor waiting to berth. Further, it is important to clarify that ships do not need to plug into shore side power "within thirty minutes after a ship docks". The California Air Resources Board (CARB) At Berth Regulation requires control of ship emissions at berth within two hours of the vessel being declared "Ready to Work." According to the rule[4], ""Ready to Work" means that the vessel is tied to the berth, the

[4] https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/2019/ogvatberth2019/fro.pdf

gangway has been lowered with netting down, and all government authorities with jurisdiction over the vessel visit have cleared the vessel."[5]

- The Report recommended that Clean Truck Program funds should be prioritized for small business truck companies to purchase zero emission trucks. The Port of Long Beach currently has approximately $25 million available for clean truck vouchers and we anticipate to grow that by another approximately $8 million over the next year. These funds have been identified in the Harbor Commission's approved year 1 and year 2 Clean Truck Fund Rate spending priorities to be used for voucher supplements, adding on to the CARB's Hybrid and Zero Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Program (HVIP) vouchers for zero-emission truck purchases. Our approach is to provide $75,000 supplements to CARB's standard $150,000 voucher for the purchase of a zero-emission drayage truck, bringing the total voucher amount to $225,000 for a truck serving the port. In the interest of supporting small operators, we have increased the incentive by an additional $25,000 for fleets of less than 10 trucks, bringing their total incentive to $250,000 per zero-emission truck. Therefore, in alignment with your recommendation, we anticipate that at least $10 million will be available to small operators. Going forward we will monitor the specific utilization of port-funded incentives by the small operators to determine if any adjustments need to be made to meet this minimum $10 million target. Further, I will note that while we recognize the desire to ensure that the small operators have access to funding, we are also trying to balance the needs of building the market for zero-emissions trucks. Currently zero-emissions trucks are limited and very expensive. Financial incentives to bring down the cost for the purchase of these zero-emission trucks by all operators, large and small, are essential to accelerate deployment. For the cost of zero-emission trucks to come down, much greater numbers of trucks will need to be produced and sold. Small drayage truck operators that have less access to capital have typically not purchased new trucks, waiting instead to purchase lower cost trucks in the secondary market. In order for the zero-emission truck market to develop, larger fleets with greater access to capital will be critical first movers. Therefore, while we will ensure that there are opportunities for small operators to access the funds and provide them with higher levels of incentives, we also need to balance that with supporting investments by larger operators at this early stage to help build the market.

[5] https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/2019/ogvatberth2019/fro.pdf

- The Report recommends that the Ports should identify the best locations for electric charging stations for electric trucks and cars. Keep in mind that our Clean Truck Program is focused on transitioning the heavy-duty trucks that perform port drayage service to zero emission by 2035. In support of that goal, the Port of Long Beach has completed a Public Truck Charging and Fueling Assessment to identify potential locations for zero emission charging and fueling infrastructure within and adjacent to the port. That effort was followed up with a Request for Information to gauge interest and solicit information from potential developers of public truck charging. In the past few years, the Port of Long Beach has developed the first two publically available heavy-duty truck charging stations for drayage in the nation at our Clean Truck Program Terminal Access Center. We have also entered into new leases with three operators that collectively could result in the development of more than 100 heavy-duty truck charging stations at full build out. It is important to keep in mind as well however that charging needs for zero-emission drayage truck operations will not be met by installing infrastructure only in the port area. Zero-emission charging infrastructure will need to be distributed throughout the entire region, along major corridors, and near distribution centers and warehouses, similar to fueling operations today. To that end, the Port will continue to partner with other regional organizations and agencies to support studies, grant funding applications, and projects to address this regional infrastructure need. Furthermore, the Port has recently issued a Request for Information from hydrogen project developers to understand what types of projects could be developed on Port land to support a hydrogen ecosystem. Several of the project proposals we received are related to heavy-duty hydrogen fueling stations.
- The Report identifies that the Ports should develop a market for recycled truck materials. We believe this is a statewide challenge, in response to the California Air Resources Board's recently adopted Advanced Clean Fleet Regulation that will transition all trucks statewide to zero emissions over the coming decades. This is also a challenge for off-road vehicles, such as the cargo-handling equipment used by marine terminals, which is anticipated to be subject to a future statewide regulation. To the extent possible, we would encourage owners to consider repowering this equipment by replacing engines and drive trains to accommodate grid-connected, battery-electric, or hydrogen fuel cell components, where practicable.
- And finally, the Report identifies that "nitrous oxides need to be contained during hydrogen production operations". Further, the Report on page 7 states, "Producing

Port of
LONG BEACH
THE PORT OF CHOICE

hydrogen using electrolysis can also produce nitrous oxides which are harmful to humans through a chemical reaction of the released oxygen and atmospheric nitrogen." This is reiterated on Page 15 as Finding #7: "7. Producing hydrogen using electrolysis can produce nitrous oxides." These statements are not footnoted and we were unable to independently identify information that supports this position. Production of hydrogen via electrolysis produces hydrogen and oxygen. We are not aware of a reaction of excess of oxygen produced from electrolysis, mixing in the atmosphere, to produce any oxides of nitrogen. Air itself is a mixture of oxygen (21%) and nitrogen (78%). Combustion of fuel (e.g., fossil fuel, hydrogen) however, does produce oxides of nitrogen as a product of combustion. The high temperatures of combustion break the triple bond of a nitrogen molecule and thereby enable the nitrogen atoms to combine with oxygen to form oxides of nitrogen. The ARCHES partnership, in charge of developing a sustainable clean hydrogen hub in California, has identified that combustion of hydrogen produces significantly less oxides of nitrogen than burning natural gas, and dramatically less than burning coal[6]. It's also important to identify that the production of electricity from hydrogen using a fuel cell produces zero emissions of nitrogen oxides.

We hope the feedback in this letter helps to paint a complete picture of both the significant success of our transportation decarbonization efforts and our Clean Air Action Plan and the challenges that face California and the County of Los Angeles as it transitions to zero emissions. Thank you for your investigation of this important subject matter and for allowing us to participate in this process.

Respectfully,

Mario Cordero
Chief Executive Officer
Port of Long Beach

[6] https://archesh2.org/frequently-asked-questions/

CITY OF
LONG BEACH

Office of the City Manager
411 West Ocean Boulevard, 10th Floor Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 570-6711 FAX (562) 570-7650

December 15, 2023

Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury
222 South Hill Street, Suite 670
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: 2022-2023 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Zero Emissions and Air Quality Monitoring Report

Dear Members of the Civil Grand Jury,

The City of Long Beach (City) appreciates the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury's (CGJ) dedication to examining the operations of various government agencies within Los Angeles County. The CGJ initiated an investigation and compiled a report titled "Zero Emission and Air Quality Monitoring" to investigate the transition to zero emissions in support of the Los Angeles County carbon neutrality goal. The City is committed to significantly reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and creating a more sustainable and resilient city in the face of climate change impacts. The City's efforts are in alignment with Los Angeles County's goal to reach carbon neutrality by 2045.

On August 16, 2022, the City Council approved the Long Beach Climate Action Plan (LB CAP), which provides a framework for reducing our city's greenhouse gas emissions and mitigating the impacts of climate change. One of the primary objectives of LB CAP is for the city to reach complete carbon neutrality by 2045, with a target of reducing GHG emissions to 40 percent by 2030. To help reach this goal, LB CAP outlines detailed actions across several sectors to combat issues related to extreme heat, air quality, drought, sea level rising and flooding, building and energy, transportation, and waste. With the newly established Office of Climate Action and Sustainability, the City is now organized to centrally coordinate interdepartmental efforts for LB CAP implementation and take steps to reduce GHG emissions. Furthermore, through the Grow Long Beach Initiative, the City has set in motion a citywide transition towards a more climate-sustainable economy and away from its historical dependence on oil revenues by investing in five strategic industry sectors that show promise for continued growth: aerospace and aviation; healthcare; ports and logistics; housing and education; and arts, culture, and tourism.

The Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report identifies key needs to create a zero emissions environment by addressing the importance of a cleaner and more stable electric grid, sustainable transportation modes, and decarbonizing buildings. Stationary Sources Recommendation 1.8 calls for energy efficiency through building retrofitting of schools, public facilities, and commercial offices aligns with the following LB CAP Building Energy Goal: Long Beach buildings are energy efficient, and our communities run on affordable, renewable

electricity. This LB CAP goal is comprised of eight actions that identify the importance of transitioning to a carbon-free more resilient electricity system, increasing the efficiency of buildings/facilities, and ensuring new buildings are low-carbon or carbon-neutral. The LB CAP utilizes a development checklist to guide discretionary projects subject to the California Environmental Quality Act analyses to decarbonize buildings through various strategies, including building energy efficiency retrofits. Decarbonizing buildings is an effective way to mitigate climate change and effectuate sustainable development.

In response to the specific findings and recommendations in the Grand Jury Report, however, it is important that Recommendation 1.8B stating "Construction building codes should reflect ZE goals" be fleshed out in greater detail. As currently written, the recommendation is unclear and vague. Additionally, while the City shares the report's support of expanding adoption of electric vehicles and charging infrastructure, the report should also consider the equity impacts for lower-income communities. Expanding support and resources for public transit and multi-modal transportation options are important considerations for the effort to decrease air quality impacts from the transportation sector, in an equitable and inclusive manner.

Regarding Recommendation 1.9 related to food waste, the City directly services all single family residences for trash collection along with a portion of the City's commercial and multifamily locations. Private waste haulers service the remaining commercial and multi-family locations. Private haulers have already implemented organics collection to almost all of their customers in the City. For City-serviced accounts, the City will be providing organics collection to our customers and has just completed providing the service to all city-serviced commercial customer accounts that are required to have the service. The City is in the planning phases to provide the service to remaining accounts. The City is working closely with Cal Recycle on the status of the implementation of this program. Prior to 2020, as required by SB 1383, the City updated the Municipal Code to require services as outlined by SB 1383.

Lastly, transportation-related items, including Recommendations 1.1-1.7, are addressed by the Port of Long Beach's comments, and Recommendation 1.10 is related to the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, not the City.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments in response to the CGJ report.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. MODICA
City Manager